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ABSTRACT

There is an ongoing debate regarding Chrysostom’s understanding of image. Certain modern scholars such as Elizabeth Clark insist that Chrysostom viewed the male alone to be in God’s image. Others, such as Valarie Karras, insist that Chrysostom always believed that woman was created in the image of God. This investigation supports the second point of view, as Chrysostom’s views on woman are examined by taking into account the era in question: pre-lapsarian, post-lapsarian, Christian or Escatological.

Chrysostom’s interpretation of Galatians 3:28, 1 Corinthians 11:3-16, and Ephesians 5:21-33 express his views of man and woman in the post-lapsarian and Christian eras. In the post-lapsarian era, Chrysostom viewed the image as being “amputated” with woman now being subject to her husband. Whereas the authority given to both man and woman to rule is natural, the authority of the husband over his wife is elective and not innate to the human condition.

The image of the authority established a relationship of master/steward between God and his creature: Chrysostom believed that for all who are baptized in Christ a new image established a relationship of father/child. In the Christian era (which co-exists with the post-lapsarian era) baptized children of God are given full authority and power to become what they are originally called to be: like God, and eternally with him in the eschatological era. All Christians are again equal in status before God; however, the husband remaining head of his wife is called to image Christ who is the head of the Church. However, the Christian marriage can only be beneficial if the persons involved live as virgins do, without cares for worldly things. As it is difficult for Christian marriages to refrain from such cares, virginity was seen as the better state for a Christian.

Chrysostom saw the celibates of the church as having greater authority over their own person. Whereas all baptized Christians are equal in the sight of God the Father having become coheirs with Christ for the Kingdom that is to come, virgins have the power to more easily foretaste that Kingdom in the present.
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Introduction

One of the notable emphases in the Christian tradition has been its view that human beings are the greatest of God's creation, as they were created in the image and likeness of God. This statement found in Genesis is a profound one, for it immediately links humanity to the Creator in a dynamic way. The theology of God's image is very important in the study of patristics as it dominates the Christology, anthropology and spirituality of both the Greek and the Latin Fathers.¹ As the theme of image is nowhere explicitly expanded upon or clarified in Scripture² it results in various patristic interpretations.³

There is patristic consensus with regards to what it means to be in the image of God in Paradise. All of the early Christian Fathers are in agreement as to the happy and carefree state of the human condition before the first transgression where Adam and Eve lived in harmony with each other and with God and were complete in their personhood. However, there are varying opinions as to the state of the image after the first transgression. The image of God in humanity became lost or distorted after the first sin. As the relationship between humanity and God was dependent upon our being in his image, the issue of image and identifying it became crucial for humanity's redemption and soteriology. To identify what the image was or where in humanity the image lay, became the first step in the journey to re-obtaining or restoring the distorted image and thus, the relationship between humanity and God.

The Christian Fathers agreed that something significant had happened to the image of God in humanity at the first transgression, and that it was impossible for any human being to re-obtain or restore the image without Christ. Thus, the Incarnation,

² Only three New Testament passages deal with the issue of humanity's image: the human image needing to be renewed in Christ (Col. 3:10), the need for humans to change (2 Cor. 3:18), and the need for humans to be transformed into the image of Christ (From. 8:29); as stated in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity, 2nd ed.*, vol. 1, s. v. "Image of God," J. L. Garret, 560.
and Resurrection of Christ were seen as absolutely essential in the “restoration” of the image, and each human being could renew or restore this image through Christ, by becoming Christlike.⁴

Various points of view naturally arose among the early Christian Fathers about what aspect of the human condition became distorted. This variety led to the numerous attempts to locate where the divine image in the human being is to be found. Each of the various positions attempting to explain how human beings are in the image of the almighty Creator are subject to how the individual or particular school of thought interprets Scripture as a whole.⁵

Frederick G. McLeod in his text *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* made the following conclusions regarding the “image of God” tradition during the early Christian era up to the time of Chrysostom. He states:

...there exists a wide disparity of viewpoints among the Scripture exegetes and Fathers of the Church regarding the meaning of the phrase “to be created in God’s image.” While all concede that it indicates that Adam and Eve possessed not only a special but even a unique relationship with God, they disagree over whether it must be entirely spiritual and, if so, how it includes the body as a co-element with it. The Alexandrians, the Cappadocians, and Augustine readily maintain that the body is good, serving as the temple in which the image resides, but they restrict image to the highest reaches of the mind, maintaining emphatically that only a spiritual reality can image and participate in the spiritual, transcendent nature of God. They appear to be following the intellectual lead of Philo, Origen, and Plotinus.

As regards the Antiochenes, the extant writings, particularly those of Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius, are relatively sparse. Yet when taken together with Chrysostom and Theodoret’s statements about image, they provide us with enough material to depict their approaches to the meaning of image. It would seem that they derived their viewpoints from a literal reading of the scriptural passages on image. By insisting that image must refer to the whole composite of human soul and body, they also give another indication that they belong to a Semitic exegetical tradition. They might also have been opposed to the viewpoint of those locating image in the highest reaches of the rational soul because it served as a possible way for explaining how a person could become mystically united to God and

---

truly divinized. They would likely regard such an approach as an example of how pagan philosophical ideas regarding divinization have directed theology, rather than the other way around. For them it would be an inversion of what ought to be the approved theological method—a reliance on what the Scriptures factually reveal.  

McLeod continues to present what he sees as being the Antiochene interpretation of “image of God.” However, I do not share the following interpretation. McLeod states:

The Antiochenes themselves, however, divided into two camps over their explanation of how image pertains to the whole human person. Diodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret understood image to be the power that God has, as it were, officially delegated to man qua male to rule over the whole material universe. While granting that women also have a share in this power, they insisted on the basis of a literal interpretation of Genesis 1:26-28 and 3:16 in light of 1 Corinthians 11:7-9 that women are nevertheless to be considered subordinate to men. They reached this conclusion because they saw that image was referred in Genesis to “man” in the generic sense of the term. Since they interpreted the context as signifying that the “image of God” is connected with the authority humans can have over creation, they had to grant that women too share in this power. But because Paul in 1 Corinthians explicitly asserts that man as a male is God’s “image” and woman the “glory of man,” they believed that only men as such have been truly and fully created in God’s image.

Employing the same hermeneutical principles, Theodore and Nestorius, however, arrived at a conclusion that appears at first glance to be different but is actually a fuller explanation than that put forward by the other Antiochenes. They admitted that by being created in God’s image humans represent God’s power and person on earth, but Theodore and, so it seems Nestorius explained image in terms of the threefold unitive.

---

7 I oppose this view and will argue in this thesis that God delegated in the pre-lapsarian world man and woman to equally share in the rule over the material universe. Women’s subordination to man was a result of the first transgression and existed only in the post-lapsarian era. The young Chrysostom understood image to mean full authority (i.e. having no one else rule over you) and thus as women were subject to their husbands. only the post-lapsarian man was seen as retaining a diminished image of God. Chrysostom later changed this opinion, believing that both man and woman retained a diminished authority. Woman, however, as second authority possessed less of the diminished image to rule than did man.
revelatory, and cultic roles that humans ought faithfully to exercise as types of Christ within creation. 8

Some of the early Christian writers and Fathers of the Church, such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen make a distinction between εἰκών and ὑπόμοιωσις, 9 while others, such as Cyril of Alexandria do not. However, almost all of the Fathers were in agreement that a resemblance to God was to be found in the soul. 10 Here, within the soul’s faculties of reason, freedom of choice and dominion, the image was said to abide. Although this understanding of image was not unknown elsewhere, it was among the Antiochene Fathers that the idea of dominion over nonrational creation as forming an aspect of the image of the divine met with the most approbation. John Chrysostom (349-407), 11 the second Patriarch (Bishop) of Constantinople (398-404), traditionally identified as one of the four great Fathers of the East, was the only one of the four from the school of Antioch. Staying true to this recognized Antiochene tradition Chrysostom throughout his homilies developed the idea of humanity’s dominion over the created order as comprising, not an aspect, but the aspect of the image of the divine.

Chrysostom’s position regarding image raises serious questions regarding the manner in which human beings are in the image of God. Is the image of God to be found in the male and female together, or is it as McLeod believed, in the male alone? This question is still being debated among contemporary theologians. If woman is also created in God’s image, is she also to be understood as having equal power and dominion over the nonrational created order? If so, then how is it that woman, created in the beginning in the image and likeness of God in a position of power and authority, is referred to later in Scripture as being under the headship and dominion of her husband? Is the male to be understood as being in the full image of God and the female as being a lesser image? What effect did sin have upon the image of God, in the male and female

9 Gen. 1:26 (LXX).
11 Chrysostom’s date of birth is uncertain. Various dates between 344 and 354 have been proposed. According to J.N.D. Kelly, Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 4, that which fits most of the known facts is 349.
and how did Christ's saving act of redemption affect the image of God in the male and female respectively?

While attempting to answer these questions, I discovered that there has yet to be done any in-depth study on John Chrysostom's interpretation of image. George Maloney in his book\(^\text{12}\) also concludes that study in the Antiochene interpretation of image is greatly lacking. McLeod has only recently come out with his text dealing with the Antiochene interpretation of "image of God." In a world where the issue of gender is in the fore and feminist theology is making great advances, it is very easy to overlook the value of the early patristic writings. It would be detrimental to cast these writings aside as misogynistic without taking a closer "objective"\(^\text{13}\) look at what they have to offer us today. What may seem as misogynistic in our times could be very revolutionary in the times past. For this reason I propose to lead an investigation of John Chrysostom's interpretation of image as authority and how he viewed this interpretation not only as affecting gender and gender distinctions, but also how one's gender affected one's road to salvation.

The early Church focused through the councils on defining and defending the faith in the Triune God. Unlike the doctrines regarding the Trinity, however, the meaning of gender and theological anthropology, though addressed in the patristic era, had not been formally defined. It is for this reason that numerous opinions can be found with regards to gender and gender issues during the patristic era. The formative period for issues of gender and theological anthropology belong to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In the words of Thomas Hopko:

[The meaning of women and their role in the Church] is a new issue for Christians; it has not been treated fully or properly in the past. But it


\(^{13}\) The term "objective" must here be qualified for there is no interpretation of the Bible or of other religious text which does not include a person's "historical setting, church tradition, faith commitment, culture, race, sex, morals and politics." [As cited in Thomas Hopko, "Galatians 3:28: An Orthodox Interpretation" St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 35 (1991): 170.] As a woman born and raised in Canada and belonging to the Greek Orthodox Tradition, I will inevitably bring my own presuppositions and prejudices to the texts in question. However, I will attempt to keep an open mind in dealing with the issues that will arise.
cannot be avoided. How we respond to it, I believe, clearly demonstrates what we believe about everything: God and man, Christ and the Church, life and death. It is, in a manner of speaking, our particular issue or controversy: our Gnosticism, our Arianism, our Origenism, our iconoclasm. ... The Orthodox Church has hardly begun to formulate her response to the issue, but she must take it up and complete it. It is, I believe, not a task of discovering what the truth is—it is rather the task of articulating and explaining it in proper theological language and concepts. It is the perennial theological task of finding the "words adequate to God."\textsuperscript{14}

The focus of this investigation, then, is to examine the writings of one early Christian Father, John Chrysostom, to understand his views of image and how men and women share in this image respectively.

The debate over "Sexual Politics"

Chrysostom's homilies and writings dealing with the issue of image are significant to contemporary scholarship as they contribute views and opinions that expand the scope of gender issues. What was the true opinion of this early Christian Father with regards to the status of women in the Church? First, Chrysostom was not a misogynist as Elizabeth Clark suggests,\textsuperscript{15} in that he never denied that Eve was created equal with Adam in paradise and shared equally with him the image of God. He also never denied women the hope of salvation, acknowledging often that women were known to surpass men in spiritual growth and Christian virtue. Thus, it is not women that Chrysostom looked down upon, but the sin that many women, like men, allow themselves to become acquainted with. The subjection of women to their husbands according to Chrysostom is totally sin related, and will remain so long as women live in a sinful state, or in other words, in the world as we know it.

At the present time there is an ongoing debate between Elizabeth A. Clark and Valerie Karras with regards to the question, "Did Chrysostom believe that woman was created in the image of God?" Elizabeth Clark in her book, Jerome, Chrysostom, and


Friends, as well as in her article “Sexual Politics in the Writings of John Chrysostom,” advocates that Chrysostom believed that only man was truly created in the image of God, as the “notion of power rests with the male alone.”¹⁶ McLeod, as was noted above, also agrees with Clark.

Both Clark and McLeod fail to recognize the effect that sin had on the original plan of God in the beginning. Neither of them differentiates between pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian humanity. Neither of them differentiates between what Chrysostom believed to be natural in paradise and natural in the fallen world. Failure to recognize these distinctions that Chrysostom made leads to false conclusions and significantly diminishes his contribution to modern scholarship.

Valerie Karras in “Chrysostom’s “Sexual Politics” Revisited”,¹⁷ notes these differences and goes on to say that for Chrysostom, “man’s “natural” domination over woman is not Gen. 2:21-23, where woman is created for and from the man, but rather. Gen. 3:16, which specifies the consequences of the Fall: ‘your yearning will be for your husband, and he will be your master.’” Thus, as will be noted in the following chapters, male domination over woman is to be viewed as directly resulting from sin. Whereas the human being’s gift of the image, to first rule over all of creation, and second to have control over the self, is innate to the human being both male and female. male domination over woman is not and cannot be innate to the human condition.

If Clark’s position were accepted that Chrysostom believed the innate human quality given in the beginning to rule over the created world included the man’s authority to rule over his wife, then Chrysostom’s writings would be full of contradictions. Chrysostom never stated that only pre-lapsarian man possessed the image of God. Throughout his life, he remained consistent in this teaching that both man and woman were created equal and shared equally in the image.

A change is noted only in Chrysostom’s dealing with the human condition in the post-lapsarian era. In one of his earlier writings, *Homiliae 9 in Genesin*, he declared that only post-lapsarian man retained the image of God. Had Clark based her position on this writing on Genesis, I would agree that there would be some merit to her argument. However, Chrysostom later changed his position in his second treatises on Genesis, *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* where he stated that both post-lapsarian man and woman retained part of the image though unequally. I will demonstrate that Chrysostom in his *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* not only viewed Eve as being created in the image of God and equal in authority with Adam, but that all post-lapsarian women have retained part of the image being “second in authority.” He remained consistent in his teaching that man and woman were created innately equal for the rest of his life.

Chrysostom divided human history into four eras. The first is the pre-lapsarian human era where both man and woman were created equal, and shared equally the image of God in Paradise as God’s stewards. The second is the post-lapsarian era where sin brought about not only the subjection of the woman to her husband, but more importantly the sub-equality of woman to man before God. The third is the Christian era where Christ established a new image of son/daughtership of God and woman regains her equality with man, yet her subjection to her husband remains. The fourth is the eschatological era, where there is no male and female, and both are equal once again before God the Father.

Clark and McLeod do not distinguish in their reading of Chrysostom that he altered his address with regard to the state of the human condition depending on the era in question: pre-lapsarian, post-lapsarian, Christian and eschatological. This misreading leads them to inaccurately conclude that Chrysostom believed that only the male was created in the beginning in the image of God. What Chrysostom does say, is that in the beginning both were created equally in the image of God, but now in the post-lapsarian era the male has retained more of that image than the woman has.

---

Clark also does not distinguish that Chrysostom's views on marriage developed. She states: "Chrysostom, even more than Paul before him, thought of marriage as a bondage, not as freedom." Clark correctly sees Chrysostom as providing the state of virginity as an escape from the post-lapsarian male (husband) authority, yet views the married state for Christian women as being "patriarchy as usual" ignoring his writings on Ephesians dealing with the Christian era. Chrysostom's early views of marriage in his treatise On Virginity do appear quite harsh, yet his later writings reveal a more balanced view of marriage. As will be discussed in the fifth chapter of this thesis dealing with Ephesians 5:21-33, Chrysostom believed that Christ, ushering in the Christian era, provided post-lapsarian human beings with a new model for marriage. The husband imaging Christ is called to repent and break from the post-lapsarian way of behaving towards a wife. The true Christian husband and the true Christian wife are called to image the marriage relationship between Christ and the Church. Chrysostom did not support or advocate "patriarchy as usual" and viewed such marriages as sinful.

This ongoing debate with regards to Chrysostom's position in regards to women, specifically whether their subordination to men was a result of the first transgression or if it was imposed upon them from the moment of their creation, has soteriological implications. This is why this ongoing debate is critical.

Chrysostom taught that the image given to the human being in the beginning was nothing more than the authority to rule over the created world. What does this mean? "Chrysostom made no attempt to elaborate on ... why God had empowered Adam to rule on earth as His image." As a student of the Antiochene school it is clear that he avoided reading into the text and allegorizing possible meanings. Chrysostom clearly and simply stated what was written about the image of God, and did not take this

statement further. However, upon closer examination of his writings dealing with image I have noted that this image of God given to the human being to govern and rule the created world established a relationship between God, the creator, and the human being, the creature. The relationship was that of master to steward. The gift of the image permitted man and woman to relate equally with God the creator. It allowed man and woman to experience an intimate relationship with God. Asserting that the image of God as dominion and authority is innate to the human condition leads to the conclusion that both male and female are able to establish a personal relationship with their creator. The innate authority to rule made the man and woman responsible to God alone. This innate image of authority to govern did not only empower the human being, male and female, to govern over the creatures of the earth as Chrysostom declared but more importantly, it empowered the human being to be able to establish a rapport with God. After the human being disobeyed the commandment of the master, his/her power was diminished. The master “demoted” his stewards to a lesser rank. The image was “amputated”\textsuperscript{24}. Thus, the human being’s relationship with God as a result of this disobedience (sin) became distant.

Woman’s relationship to God became even more distant now that she was second in authority after the man. This was the state of woman in the post-lapsarian era. For this reason the Jewish women were seen as needing a circumcised father, husband or son in order to secure their salvation. It was through upholding the whole Law of God that the free, circumcised Jews were able to obtain right standing before God and reestablish their relationship with him, or in other words obtain salvation. Non-Jews, slaves and women were unable to follow the whole Law and thus, were unable to obtain right standing before God and establish a close and personal relationship with him. (See chapter 3).

According to Chrysostom, Christ’s act of salvation did not restore the original image of authority over the created world, for that would have simply restored the master/steward relationship. What Christ did was establish a new image of son/daughtership that established an even closer relationship between God and his creature, that of father and child.

\textsuperscript{24} *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* ix. 4. (*PG* 53. 78), Hill, 121-22. ἀκρωτηριαζέων.
What was the importance therefore of this innate equality of dominion given as a gift in the beginning? If Chrysostom indeed taught that only man was created in the image of God, as Clark and McLeod claim, then it can be inferred that woman was never intended to communicate with God her creator and have a relationship with him. In saying this what is actually being said is that woman is not saved. If it was never God’s intent to have a relationship with woman in the beginning, then why establish a relationship with her later? Why include her in Christ’s new image? However, woman, in Galatians 3:28 was included in the new image of Christ. Woman was to have a relationship with God, and insofar as that was intended for her, it was intended for her also in the beginning. This is why the image of God’s authority to rule had to also be given to woman equally and innately. If one supports Clark’s and McLeod’s position that Chrysostom viewed only man as being in the image of God, then one is in effect saying that Chrysostom taught that salvation is only for the man. Chrysostom never taught this.

Similarly, post-lapsarian man’s rule and authority over his own wife cannot be innate. Chrysostom taught that the man has been given dominion over his wife only because sin entered the world, and to say that this dominion is an innate condition is to also declare sin innate to the human condition. If sin is indeed innate to humanity, if God created the human being predestined to rebel against God and predestined to sever relations with him, then any effort to restore relations is futile, and salvation is impossible. Chrysostom consistently taught that man’s dominion over his wife is not innate to the human condition. (See chapter 5). In this matter I support the opinion of Valerie Karras and David Carlton Ford.

According to Chrysostom, Christ did not restore the human being’s place as steward over the world, but rather elevated man and woman to something new and greater, that of children of God. However, as long as men and women live the earthly life in the state of marriage, both will remain subject to one another in the physical sense, with the wife being subject in all other matters to her husband. This subjection can only be overcome in part in this life by living a life in Christ, and overcome fully in the Kingdom. For Chrysostom, the true life in Christ can best be obtained by living a life of virginity. As it is, the cares of this world that bind us to sin, it is life without worldly
cares that free us. Though possible to obtain in the married state, Chrysostom in his homilies *On Virginity* explained that it is extremely difficult to live a carefree life while bound to a spouse and for this reason primarily advocates virginity. The virginal state gives power to the man or woman who practice it actively to pursue sainthood and acquire a relationship of righteousness before God.

My thesis will demonstrate that Chrysostom’s main focus was soteriological. As redemption and salvation through baptism are open both for men and women, his views should not be classified as misogynistic, or irrelevant for twenty-first-century society. The fact that Chrysostom viewed salvation as open to women is a clear indication that in his view woman was created in the beginning in the image of God.

**Methodology and Procedure**

I propose to lead my investigation in the following manner. First, I examine Chrysostom’s biography to find possible influences that may have led him to think that the image of God in humanity is nothing more than authority, and that one’s gender roles relate in the exercising of that authority. As a scriptural exegete, Chrysostom was not immune to bringing to his exegesis his own experiences, predispositions, and desires.\(^\text{25}\) Thus, it is necessary to become acquainted with the life of John Chrysostom.

In the first chapter, I will present John Chrysostom by first examining his early years: his education, his various instructors, both pagan and Christian, the languages with which he was familiar, and important events that had great impact on his way of thinking. An investigation of Chrysostom the acclaimed brilliant teacher and exegete, the “Golden Mouth” will then follow. Lastly, Chrysostom’s episcopal duties and ministry as Bishop of Constantinople will be examined in order to demonstrate the steadfastness of his character and his struggles to stay true to his Christian beliefs and ideals. It will become evident that John Chrysostom was a man who understood what it meant to be created in the image of God, and who struggled to uphold that image and obtain God’s likeness.

\(^{25}\) *Kelly, Golden Mouth, 7.*
The investigation will then proceed to examine in the second chapter Chrysostom’s own writings dealing with the issue of image as authority by first setting the stage as to the meaning of Genesis 1:26-27. Chrysostom’s exegesis will be examined and compared and contrasted to contemporary scholarship’s understanding of these two verses.26

There are two series of Chrysostom’s homilies on Genesis in existence. The first series, *Homiliae 9 in Genesin* (MG 54, 581-630) was delivered after the crisis at Antioch during Lent of 387.27 The homilies in this series with the exception of the last one deal with the first three chapters of Genesis. The second series, *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* (MG 53-54) offers a commentary verse by verse on the entire Book of Genesis in sections. These homilies are usually dated from 389.28

Three of Chrysostom’s sixty-seven homilies belonging to the second series on Genesis, homilies eight, nine and ten, deal with the creation of the human race, and the relationship that humanity had with the Creator and with the rest of creation. Here Chrysostom clearly and explicitly asserted that the image of God in humanity means nothing more than authority. These homilies will be examined in detail in order to establish a foundation upon which the remaining part of the investigation can be built. The meaning of the Greek terms Chrysostom uses, “ἀρχή” and “ἐξουσία” as well as “ἀκροατριάζειν” will be closely examined, and then compared to how Chrysostom understood and used these terms denoting authority. In order to form a consensus of Chrysostom’s understanding of Genesis 1:26-27, all of Chrysostom’s references to this pericope will be examined.29

Chrysostom understood the pre-lapsarian human image to mean dominion over the whole-created world order. This power to rule was an honor given to the human being, and was seen by Chrysostom as a gift. Before the first transgression, man and woman living in the presence of God shared equal authority over the created world.30

---

27 Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 76.
28 Ibid., 89.
29 See Appendix A.
30 There is still debate on Chrysostom’s view of pre-lapsarian humanity. Elizabeth Clark
Women for Chrysostom were ontologically created to possess the image of God on equal terms with men. Their relationship, if viewed as submissive, was to be no different to the free willed submission of the Son to the Father in the Trinitarian model.

After the first transgression, man lost his total power to rule, and was given dominion only over that part of creation that he needed to sustain himself, and woman was placed as a second authority under man because of her sin in overriding her power. The image of post-lapsarian humanity was distorted but not fully lost. Thus was the state of humanity until the coming of Christ through whom a new image was given. Once Chrysostom’s interpretation of image as authority has become firmly established, this study will then proceed to examine how Chrysostom connected his anthropological understanding of male and female created in the image of God in the Old Testament to apparently conflicting New Testament texts that deal with various types of relationships between men and women.

The main focus of my study will lie in the next section. As the presence of Genesis creation subtexts are predominant in three New Testament pericopes, specifically Galatians 3:28, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, and Ephesians 5:21-33, suggesting their intertextual character. I will proceed to examine how Chrysostom dealt with these three in her article “Sexual Politics in the Writings of Chrysostom,” Anglican Theological Review 59 (1977): 4, states that she believes that Chrysostom understood Adam as being given dominion by God over Eve in the very beginning. Valerie Karras, however, in her article, “Chrysostom’s ‘Sexual Politics’ Revisited,” (paper given at the North American Patristic Society Annual Meeting, Loyola University of Chicago, May 29-31, 1997. 2), argues that Chrysostom clearly states otherwise. I am of the same opinion as Valerie Karras.

Clark in her article “Sexual Politics” states that “the mere ‘fact’ of Adam’s prior origin is understood to entail his ‘headship’ and superiority” even prior to the first sin and the punishment of woman’s subordination.

32 See following chapter dealing with Chrysostom’s exegesis on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

pericopes of the Pauline epistles and the seeming differences that exist among them. Each of the three New Testament pericopes will be examined in turn, and will serve to reveal how Chrysostom paralleled human relationships and situations as images of the divine model that have become distorted due to sin.

First, the Galatians pericope, a declaration of freedom and equality for all baptized people where all are one in Christ Jesus, will be examined. Proclaimed as the "Magna Carta of Christian freedom," Galatians 3:28 has often been interpreted as having a theology of gender. However, for Chrysostom no such interpretation is given. Galatians 3:28 is a baptismal statement expounding upon the new life in Christ, and thus does not speak about the relationship between men and women in the church and society, but rather about the relationship between the individual and God. This probably accounts for Chrysostom in his text On Galatians (MG 61. 661-682), making no direct reference to Gal. 3:28. His omission in addressing the verse "no male and female" in his commentary on Galatians could wrongfully be interpreted as Chrysostom avoiding theological issues. Contrary to such opinions, I support Hopko's view that Gal. 3:28 was never intended to be a statement on gender relations, and that Chrysostom dealt successfully with the pericope as the baptismal statement which it was intended to be. His focus was on the relationship of baptized Christians to God regardless of their social status.

---


35 Thomas Hopko states that the letter to Galatians "does not have a theology of gender" and that any such interpretation is a misinterpretation of the passage. Thomas Hopko "Galatians 3:28: An Orthodox Interpretation." St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 35. no. 2-3 (1991): 179.

36 Manlio Simonetti, Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis, trans. John A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 74. Here Simonetti states that Chrysostom's objective of his "rhetorical output was to draw out of the sacred text a lesson to educate, warn, or edify his listeners, rather than to illustrate the text for its own sake." He proceeds to state that this often accounts for the superficial illustration of the text. Contrary to Simonetti's view I feel that what is not
on the relationship of the different classes and sexes within the social realm. For this reason, gender distinctions are not abolished for Chrysostom, but are enforced as they assist each human being in the condition they are found on their road to salvation.

In order to provide an accurate picture of Chrysostom’s view of the verse, “no male and female” however, all of his references to this pericope found in his other writings will be examined. (See Appendix B.)

The latter two pericopes to be examined, 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 and Ephesians 5:21-33, seem to build an orderly hierarchy where woman is apparently subordinate to her husband, her “head.” The first of these two pericopes, 1 Corinthians 11:3-16, deals with the different ways in which men and women should conduct themselves in worship. Women must be veiled while men must not. Here clearly, Chrysostom advocated that gender distinctions must be upheld. Man is the head of the woman. God the Father is the head of Christ. Chrysostom made the parallel between the headship of God the Father over Christ and the headship of man over woman. However, he stressed that the headship in the divine relationship is different from that of the human, as it is perfect, incorrupt and holy, whereas the human relationship is imperfect, corrupt and sinful. Chrysostom strongly advocated that equality is not lost between the Father and the Son in the Godhead as the submission of the Son is freely given, out of love and selflessness. What made woman lose her equality with man is not the fact that she ought to submit, but that it was sin that made her submission mandatory as opposed to voluntary as it is in the divine model. Thus, woman’s mandatory subordination is not innate or ontological, but imposed upon her after the first transgression.

Again in order to provide an accurate picture of Chrysostom’s view of headship all of his references to this pericope found in his other writings will be examined. (See Appendix C.)

Ephesians 5:21-33 deals with the relationship between husbands and wives, and how the passage compares with the relationship between Christ and His Church. Marriage in Ephesians is presented as a union of selfless love for the other. Chrysostom carried his view stated in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 in where he viewed headship to be

stated is more often than not more emphatic a statement than what is stated.
understood differently when speaking about things divine and things human, as sin and disobedience has infected the human condition. Due to sin the parallel is not perfect, however, Paul taught that the parallel could be perfect if humanity strove to live a Christlike life: a life that leads one to obtaining God's likeness. Although this is humanly unattainable, Christ's economy has made it possible for humanity to achieve this through Grace.

Chrysostom continued to emphasize that a wife cannot think that serving her husband is equivalent to serving her God. However, he also stressed that this does not negate the importance placed upon wives to submit to their husbands, as the harmony and order of their families depend upon their submissive role.

The subjection and submission of which Paul wrote and Chrysostom expounded is not oppressive or forced, nor as Clark sees it as "Sexual Politics." As all are called to be subject to Christ out of their own will and freedom, so too, Chrysostom saw women as being called to submit to their husbands freely. To have their submission inflicted and imposed upon them or to ask them to enter into subjection unthinkingly or unwillingly would negate the freedom of choice that all humans have whether or not to follow the will of God. The creator of humanity never forces his creation to obey, as this would negate the inviolable free will that was granted to all human beings in the beginning. Thus, when wives are called to submit yourselves to your husbands, as unto God, it must be understood that it is a call to them to exercise their freedom of choice whether or not to follow God's will with regard to their relationships with their husbands. The call for wives to submit to their husbands is to be understood similarly to the call for all humanity to serve the Lord.

Once again for an accurate picture of Chrysostom's view of the husband's headship over his wife, all of his references to this pericope found in his other writings will be examined. (See Appendix D.)

Again we see Chrysostom's primary concern being that of salvation. I agree therefore with Valerie Karras that Chrysostom's views of domination and submission are seen as roads leading to salvation. None of the social roles and relationships existing in post-lapsarian human society is innate or ontologically unequal. For Chrysostom there is
power and authority in voluntary personal submission. The one who submits to the will of God is one who breaks away totally and is free from worldly obligations and ties. One could only fully practice one’s freedom and authority in the virginal state. Chrysostom saw female virgins and widows who have no male headship and even male celibates who were not responsible for any woman, as expressing and fulfilling their true personhood. In 381/2 shortly after his return from the mountains where he attempted to live the life of an ascetic, Chrysostom wrote his famous treatises On Virginity and Widowhood (De virginitate, (MG 48, 533-596) and Ad viduam iuniorem (MG 48, 399-410)). Here, Chrysostom explained that the lifestyle of virgins allows them the freedom to exercise total control and authority over their inner self and reason, which is the only way an individual can fully realize the image of God. Addressed mainly to women, these treatises portray a rather negative view of marriage in spite of the fact that Chrysostom began by defending the state as honorable, and ended by saying that the married man who lives as if he is not married can also reach the same level of spiritual growth as the virgin. However, he held the opinion that though marriage existed in Paradise, sexual relations had no part in Paradise, but came after the first transgression when God ordained intercourse in marriage for the procreation of the human race and as a brake on incontinence. In this early text written in 381/2 there is no appeal to Eph. 5:21-31 in which the union of man and wife is compared to Christ and his Church. This omission of Eph. 5:21-31 is probably due to Chrysostom’s youth and lack of experience, or to his acute desire to advocate celibacy as the preferred lifestyle in light of his recent return to Antioch after an attempt to become an ascetic. The importance of these two treaties is to further establish Chrysostom’s view of image as authority.

Elizabeth Clark correctly sees Chrysostom as viewing virginity as a woman’s escape from the bondage of marriage, and as a means to rise above the curse imposed in Gen. 3:16. Having no husband the virgin has no head to be subject to, nor children to cause her pain and sorrow in their delivery. However, as Valerie Karras points out, Chrysostom also viewed the married man to be subject to his wife and to her care. The

37 De virginitate lxxiv. 4 (PG 48, 596), Shore, 128.
husband must concern himself with providing for his household and according to his curse in Gen. 3:17-19 is bound to suffer in a different sense but suffer nonetheless. Thus in a Christian marriage, Chrysostom viewed both husband and wife as being subject to one another. Virginity, therefore, is to be an escape not only for women but for men as well.

The conclusion to this investigation will reveal the importance of Chrysostom’s contribution to the world of scholarship with regards to what it means to be human in the image and likeness of Christ’s sonship before God as male or female. The image of stewardship given in the beginning to rule over the created world was greatly diminished. Christ did not restore this, but brought a new image to all those who accept him as the Son of God and are baptized. This new image was better than the first for it elevated the human being to the status of a child of God. Thus, being in the image of Christ’s sonship is directly connected with one’s ability to care for one’s soul, and to strive towards salvation. Chrysostom often stated that the only thing that is truly terrible is sin, as it takes us away from the presence of God. Thus, women are just as capable as men to obtain salvation, and in Chrysostom’s opinion, often surpass men in virtue. Women, therefore, do share with men the new image of Christ’s son/daughtership, as they do have power and authority to freely choose to live a life in Christ.

My investigation aims to be an original contribution to theology, one that will be of benefit and interest not only to systematic theologians, but also to those scholars whose interests extend into church history, ecology, feminist theology, and biblical studies. My study challenges modern prejudices and stereotypes set against early Christian writings and will expose a treasure of ideas that, though of relevance and importance for our present-day society, have been disregarded.

Chapter 1
Chrysostom: Created in God's Image, Striving for God's Likeness

Humans do not live in a vacuum or remain untouched by life's experiences and the world in which they dwell. John Chrysostom is no exception to this rule. To his many writings he brought his own experiences, predispositions, and even desires. For this reason, it is necessary to examine the life of the author of our study. By investigating the various influences that impacted upon his life, we will see why Chrysostom came to believe that the image of God given in the beginning to the human being is nothing more than authority over the created world. The numerous people in his life and the various experiences that he lived through all contributed to mould the man and his opinions. Every human being was created in God's image, and thus had authority in his/her life, whether it be as bishop over his flock, as husband over his wife, as mother over her children, or in general as a human, male or female, over the created world order.

Chrysostom believed that it was God's will for him to be elevated to the rank of bishop, and as such, he recognized that his authority over his flock was given to him from above. However, Chrysostom understood the limits of his authority, as well as the danger of ambition, and refrained from seeking more power than was intended for him. Holding before him the example of Eve's ambition for more authority, and seeing this as the cause to her being punished by God. Chrysostom strove to be true to his calling as bishop and to exercise properly the authority it entailed. Unfortunately, because he lived in the fallen world, Chrysostom's virtues were not admired by all, and he lost his episcopal see attempting to live like a true Christian created in the image of God, striving to obtain God's likeness.

We are fortunate in that none of the ancient Christian writers has had as many biographers as Chrysostom, beginning with that of Bishop Palladius of Helenopolis dating

---

before 415, to the most recent work by J.N.D. Kelly, 1995. However, this chapter is in no way an attempt to be a complete biography of the life of Chrysostom. As Chrysostom’s life has been adequately studied in the biographies of Baur and Kelly, the exposition that follows draws extensively on their findings. The prime objective of this chapter is to investigate the ever-maturing Chrysostom who developed through his pastoral teachings a soteriology that included equally the hope of salvation for both men and women, based on his beliefs that the image of humanity is authority.

The Early Years

The exact date of John Chrysostom’s birth is unknown. Various sources place it somewhere between 344 and 354. Born in Antioch, he was the son of a noble and well-to-do Christian family. His father, Sekoundos, was a prominent official in the army stationed in Syria. Sekoundos died suddenly soon after John’s birth leaving his mother, Anthousa, a widow at twenty years of age and a single mother of two small children. Thus, Chrysostom’s early education was received solely from his faithful mother who gave “religious direction to his thoughts and feelings.” She taught him mostly by her Christian example, her humility and piety. The fact that she never remarried and lived as a celibate widow from the age of twenty until her death not only made an impression on Chrysostom but also on his pagan (Stoic) teacher, Libanios, the professor of rhetoric in Antioch.

It is possible that it was his mother who fostered his early view of celibacy and more so virginity as being a woman’s escape from the bondage of marriage and the curse imposed upon women in Genesis 3:16. His widowed mother had no husband to be subject to in the later years of her life. It is possible that Anthousa’s decision to remain

---

4 Quasten, vol. 3, 424.
5 Dimitrios Balanou, Patrologia (Athens, 1930), 342, note 2.
7 Baur, vol. 1, 4.
8 “Great heavens, what remarkable women are to be found among the Christians!” Ad
faithful to his father could have also influenced Chrysostom in denouncing second marriages, viewing them as a sign of weakness. There is no doubt that Chrysostom held great respect for his mother. It was out of respect for her that he delayed his decision to embrace the life of a solitary, a life of withdrawal, contemplation, and studying the Scriptures, and that he continued to live with her until her death. It is commonly held that the most influential years of a person’s life are between the ages of one and four. Thus, the role of Anthousa upon her son’s upbringing and education cannot be overemphasized.

At around the age of seven, it was the practice in the Graeco-Roman world of the fourth century for young boys to follow the educational program of the elementary school, where reading, writing, and arithmetic were taught. Later, from ages ten to fourteen, they attended the grammar school, where they were drilled in Greek classical literature. As there is no evidence to prove one way or another, one can only conjecture that John Chrysostom was also educated in this manner, having no other alternative but to attend the traditional pagan schools.

At around the age of fourteen or fifteen, Chrysostom attended the school of rhetoric in Antioch under the guidance of Libanios, whom Chrysostom viewed as a very superstitious pagan. This famous teacher of rhetoric was born in Antioch, and came from a well-to-do family that held fast to the traditional pagan beliefs out of a respect for ancient Greek tradition and conservatism. He despised all things Roman, and based on this one doubts that he ever instructed his students in Latin, still the official language of the state.

Libanios (314-393) held the office of distinguished professor of rhetoric at Antioch from 354 until his death. Chrysostom’s early writings show a striking resemblance in style to those of his master. However, there is no evidence that indicates that Chrysostom borrowed any of his master’s pagan views in forming his own understanding of image as

viduam jun. 2 (PG 48. 601).

9 His mother begged him not to make her a widow for a second time. De sacerdotio i. 4. Also see J.N.D. Kelly, Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 16.

10 Kelly, 6.


12 Baur, vol. 1, 16.
authority. Libanios was a rhetorician, teaching literary style, not a philosopher. "He was an excellent teacher, who knew how to inspire youth, but not an outstanding thinker or original author." Andragathios was the professor of philosophy in Antioch, and it is recorded that Libanios and Chrysostom attended his lectures. However, nothing is known of Andragathios, and thus one can only speculate as to the degree of influence he had on the young student. Since Chrysostom often mentioned in his writings the people whom he felt impacted his life it is safe to conjecture that Andragathios had no major influence upon his pupil's future views of anthropology, more specifically, that of humanity being created in the image of God.

From Classics Scholar to Christian Philosopher

In his early years, Chrysostom was influenced mostly by his Christian mother. From the pagan schools he learned the basics needed for the career he was then pursuing in the higher civil service. He learned from them his wonderful elegance of expression, and the classic purity of his Greek diction that later gave him the name "Golden Mouth". Latin, however, formed no part of his instruction: "A Greek did not need to learn Latin in order to assimilate linguistic, literary or philosophical culture; the Romans had to learn Greek instead, for their education." Interestingly, Chrysostom never learned Syriac, either, which was the language of his native land, and Hebrew was also foreign to him.

In these early years Chrysostom developed and perfected the skills he needed in order to later proclaim the gospel to his listeners. The influence of his pagan professors is reflected in his early Christian writings that were written with perfect rhetorical artifice. At the age of eighteen, Chrysostom is said to have rebelled against his liberal arts teacher. W. Von Christ has this to say about Chrysostom as a Classicist: "Chrysostom is well read in pagan literature, but he does not parade his knowledge." He
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13 Kelly, 7.
14 Baur, vol. 1, 18.
15 Kelly, 6.
16 Baur, vol 1, 24.
17 Ibid.
18 Palladios, Dial. 5 (SC 341. 105-10).
adds, "He stands, in the main, very indifferent to it, or even leaning to the opposite side; in the conviction of possessing the only truth, he regards the Greek philosophers as of little value."\(^{19}\) In fact, Chrysostom once said, "The uneducated Christian peasants possess more insight and knowledge of divine things than the pagan philosophers."\(^{20}\)

The dramatic switch from a career in the civil service, and a prestigious life in "the world," for a life of withdrawal can be credited in part to two people whose example of Christian living was most influential: Chrysostom’s closest friend Basil, and Bishop Meletios of Antioch. From Chrysostom’s treatise *On the Priesthood*,\(^{21}\) we know that Basil belonged to the same social class, and had the same education as did Chrysostom. However, Chrysostom viewed him as being the stronger of the two in the pursuits of the spiritual life, and was being constantly entreated by his friend to leave their parents’ homes and live together the life of the monks.

Meletios, though not the recognized\(^{22}\) Bishop of Antioch at the time of Chrysostom’s conversion, was viewed by the main body of "orthodox" Christians as their leader. During this time Meletios noticed the gifted Chrysostom. Palladios noted that it was at this time that Chrysostom offered himself for baptism (368). For three years following his commitment to the Church and Christ Chrysostom was constantly in the Bishop’s presence.\(^{23}\)

It was during this period that the spiritually zealous Chrysostom desired to study the principles for spiritual excellence and put himself under the guidance of Diodore of Tarsos and Carterios (of whom nothing is known), "who were at that time in charge of an ascetic school or schools."\(^{24}\) This decision greatly influenced the outcome of Chrysostom’s future style of exegesis, for it was Diodore who taught Chrysostom the literal method of interpretation that was to eliminate all other possible interpretations for image save that of authority.

---


\(^{21}\) *De sacerdotio libri* 1-6 (*PG* 48. 623-692).

\(^{22}\) The government recognized the Arianizing Euzoios (361-76).

It is more than likely that he owed to him (among others) the marked preference he was to show in mature life for the literal, as opposed to the allegorical, method of interpreting scripture. The latter was widely popular, especially in Alexandrian circles, as a means of evading difficulties in the sacred texts, but Diodore was a sharp critic of allegorising and championed straightforward, historical exegesis, while allowing that the historical events could foreshadow spiritual realities later to be revealed.25

Diodore’s strong defence of the orthodox teachings of the Church kept his student strong in the faith of the triune God, to the point where, Chrysostom modeled his anthropology on these beliefs, as will be shown in following chapters.

John Chrysostom was one of many deeply religious upper-class Christian males who attended the *asketerion* in order to be grounded in ascetic commitment and Scripture exegesis under Diodore’s direction. Rather than being a monastic community, it is more likely that those who attended the *asketerion* were a fellowship of dedicated Christians who, while living in their own homes in the community at large, lived by self-imposed rules of rigorous self-discipline and came together to pray, study, and be counselled by their teacher.26 Diodore’s influence cannot be denied. In addition to his particular method of scriptural interpretation, he also set a high example of ascetic discipline for Chrysostom to emulate. As will be seen, Chrysostom’s health was so negatively affected by his rigorous ascetic practices that he was forced to abandon his life as an ascetic, and opt for a life as an ordained priest and most importantly as an orator and exegete.

In some ways, Diodore’s school resembled the private schools of the Sophists, with the exception that instead of expounding Homer and Plato, these Christian “sophists” expounded the Holy Scripture.27 Diodore provided numerous commentaries for his students on the Old Testament texts: the Pentateuch, Psalms, the books of Kings, sections of the Paralipomena,28 Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and the Prophets; and for the New Testament texts: the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles,
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24 Kelly, 18.
25 Ibid., 19.
26 Ibid.
28 The Paralipomena (A and B) as they are known in the Septuagint canon are what are known as the Book of Chronicles in the Hebrew canon.
the Epistles of St. Paul and those of St. John.\textsuperscript{29} He also composed various tracts dealing with doctrinal issues such as: the Holy Trinity, the Holy Spirit, various works on God, the resurrection of the dead and other topics.\textsuperscript{30} However, Diodore did not take a stance on how he understood Christ. By not clearly affirming that Jesus was fully God and fully human, he was open to future criticism that led to his being anathematised by a Greek synod in Constantinople a hundred years after his death. This anathema brought about the destruction of his writings. The Arians also sought to destroy Diodore’s writings at every opportunity.

On account of this, a deep and revealing glimpse of his theology and teaching methods are denied to us; above all, the possibility of an exact appraisal of his theological and literary influence on his still greater and more famous pupil, St. John Chrysostom.\textsuperscript{31}

Though almost all of Diodore’s vast literary writings were destroyed after his anathema in 449,\textsuperscript{32} a few fragments have survived. One of these discusses his understanding of image.

How, then, is man (\textit{\v{a}n\theta\rho\omega\pi\tau\varsigma}) God’s image? [It is] by his ability to rule and exercise authority. The voice of God is the witness [to this], saying: “Let us make man (\textit{\v{a}n\theta\rho\omega\pi\tau\varsigma}) according to our image and likeness,” and adding the way [this is so] “and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth” etc. Therefore just as God governs over all, so does man (\textit{\v{a}n\theta\rho\omega\pi\tau\varsigma}) govern over earthly beings. What then? Does the woman not also rule over the aforementioned? Though governing all others, the woman, nevertheless, has man (\textit{\v{a}v\nu\pi}) as her head. The man (\textit{\v{a}v\nu\pi}) is not subject to the woman. The blessed Paul rightly says that only man (\textit{\v{a}v\nu\pi}) is the image and glory of God, while woman is but the glory of man (\textit{\v{a}v\nu\pi}).\textsuperscript{33}

Thus, Diodore believed image to mean authority over all of creation. As woman had authority over all beings but was subject to her male head, Diodore viewed only the man as truly being in the image of God. However, it is clear that Diodore is referring to the status of post-lapsarian woman, women after the first transgression. It is obvious.

\textsuperscript{29} Baur, vol. 1, 93.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 94.
\textsuperscript{33} Diodore, (\textit{PG} 33. 1564. 65); cited by McLeod, 59.
therefore, that the young Chrysostom not only adopted his view of image to mean authority from his teacher Diodore, but that woman after the first transgression was not to be considered as having the image of God. As will be noted in the second chapter, though this may be the position that Chrysostom held early on, he very quickly modified this view to include post-lapsarian women in the image of God.

Though Diodore was Chrysostom's theology teacher, and as such had the greatest influence on him, he was not the only influence. Chrysostom also had at his disposal theological literature of his teacher's friends such as Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzus, and perhaps also of Gregory of Nyssa. However, the principal source of study for both Diodore and his students were the writings of Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa. Eusebius was the one who had placed the greatest importance on scriptural exegesis, and held to the historical-grammatical method of commentary, which explains scripture in the plain, historical sense, rather than in the arbitrary allegorising fashion of the day. 34 that he had learned from the school of Edessa.

However, on account of his adherence to the Semi-Arian party, only a few scanty remains of his literary output have been left to us. Thilo wrote of him: "What we know and have of Eusebius justifies the opinion that he was the most significant forerunner of the real Antiochene teachers." 35

Eusebius' method of scriptural exegesis followed that of Lucian of Samosata (312), the founder of the school of Antioch. Lucian was opposed to the "fantasies of the
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34 According to Philip Schaff’s introduction to Sozomenus’ Church History the method of interpretation that was most prevalent at the time was the allegorical method of interpretation. Schaff wrote:

[Sozomen] speaks of the Scriptures with uniform reverence, and holds to the θεωρια as the method of interpretation, as we see in v. 22, where he says of the Jews: "They were only acquainted with the mere letter of Scripture, and could not, like the Christians and a few of the wisest among the Hebrews, discover the hidden meaning (πρὸς θεωριαν)"; yet he speaks with respect (viii. 2) of Chrysostom’s way of expounding the sacred records and of his “teacher Diodorus’ method, employed in the many books of that bishop,” in which he explained the significance of the sacred words and avoided allegory (θεωρια). But when bishops and monks are declared to be skilled in the Scriptures, it is in this mystical sense.” Philip Schaff, ed. Socrates, Sozomenus: Church Histories, with an Introduction by Philip Schaff in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, vol. 2 (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, reprinted 1995), 205-206.
35 Baur, vol. 1, 96.
The allegorical method of Origen, which belonged to the school in Alexandria, Lucian's school in Antioch gave careful attention to the actual text and led its students away from the allegorising method of Alexandria. The scholars from these two schools were convinced themselves of a basic contradiction in their varied approaches to scriptural interpretation. At Alexandria and also Caesarea, the scholar attempted to find the figures of Christ. At Antioch the goal was to find in Scripture the most obvious meaning.

The beginnings of the theological school in Antioch appear modest. Unlike Alexandria, it could never claim to extraordinary teachers like Clement, Origen, Athanasius and Cyril. Yet Antioch produced great exegesis, reaching its peak under the direction of Diodore, with Chrysostom being its most famed pupil.

Palladios wrote that after three years of serving Meletios as his personal aide, Chrysostom was tonsured an official reader (ἀναγνώστης) in 371. It was also around this time that Anthousa died at about the age of 43, giving Chrysostom the freedom to retreat into the mountains and embrace the life of a hermit. Also during this time, Chrysostom's leader Meletios was finally forced into exile, and his guide Diodore left Antioch to join the Bishop in Armenia, his place of exile. Thus, after avoiding a plot to have him ordained to the priesthood, Chrysostom retreated to the nearby mountains.

For the next four years (372-6), Chrysostom was in the company of an old hermit from Syria. Under his guidance, he struggled against his passions, and learned the ways of an ascetic. Of his spiritual guide nothing is known. Of his time with him, we know that rather than living in isolation, the two were part of a larger community of hermits, each living on his own, yet all following a strict rule as laid out by the superior (προέστος) of the community. After the four years of ascetic training, Chrysostom
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embarked on his own as an ascetic. Palladios recorded that he went off to live alone in a cave in the mountain for a couple of years, “seeking complete escape from the world”.42

For the next two years, Chrysostom denied himself sleep, in order to memorize the Old and New Testaments. This skill was to prove most useful as he was thus able later to speak from the pulpit without notes and had the advantage of making scriptural connections. Chrysostom’s listeners were impressed with his ability to do this, as it was something that apparently they had not seen before.43 However, never allowing himself to lie down, and exposing himself to the cold, resulted in the deadening of his gastric organs, and the impairing of his kidney functions.44 His poor health forced him at last to return to Antioch and place himself at the disposal of his beloved Bishop, Meletios, who had by this time returned from exile. His physical condition would make him prefer to dine alone, an act that was to be used against him by his future enemies in Constantinople.

Chrysostom Takes Orders: Becoming an Exegete

Following the restoration of Chrysostom’s health, he resumed, according to Palladios, his old position as a reader for a couple of years until 380 or 381 when he was ordained by Meletios to the diaconate.45 Shortly after, Meletios died in Constantinople and was replaced by Flavian (who as a layman had taught asceticism together with Diodore). For the next five years, Chrysostom served as a deacon directly assisting Flavian in all aspects of his pastoral work: looking after the poor, the sick (both physically and mentally ill), widows and orphans, as well as imprisoned Christians. Though deacons were not permitted to preach, there was nothing preventing Chrysostom to write, and during this time he wrote a number of pamphlets addressing various topics, including the problems of marriage.

42 Palladios, Dial. 5 (SC 341.110).
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44 Ibid.
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The treatise, which is most relevant to this present study, is that known as *On Virginity*.\footnote{De virginitate (PG 48. 533-96).} A later chapter will deal with the issues addressed here in greater detail. For the purpose of this chapter, which is to acquaint the reader with Chrysostom, it is interesting to note Chrysostom’s treatment of the topic as it was written around 381/2 shortly after his return from the mountains. In defending virginity for women, he also indirectly defended his choice of the celibate life. He focused on the difficulties of virginity, stressing beyond the physical abstinence from sex, the purity of soul and consecration to Christ. He described the difficulties of this lifestyle, yet insisted that these can be conquered.\footnote{De virginitate xxii. 1 (PG 48. 551), Sally Rieger Shore, *On Virginity: Against Remarriage*, (Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983), 36.}

Marriage was viewed as a state “preventing human nature from relapsing into bestiality” and not to be preferred when compared with virginity.\footnote{De virginitate ix. 1 (PG 48. 539), Shore, 12.} Most interesting about his defense of virginity is that he viewed it as an escape for women from the curse of Eve. Having no husband, virgin women are not under any man’s authority. They desire only Christ. Thus, the virgins experience the image of God as was originally intended in Paradise. Also of interest is that marriage was not seen as being part of the original divine plan, but rather was viewed by the young Chrysostom as being ordained by God for the continuation of the human race, a necessary anecdote to death, the result of sin.\footnote{De virginitate xiv-xv (PG 48.543-545), Shore, 19-23.} He focused on 1 Corinthians 7:38, ignoring completely the passage in Ephesians 5 (21-31) in which the union of husband and wife is compared to that between Christ and the Church. Yet we will see that an older and more experienced Chrysostom did deal with this passage in a positive light. His youthful attitude towards women was also negative, viewing them as hindrances when it comes to serious matters.\footnote{De virginitate xlvi (PG 48. 568), Shore, 72.} Yet, it must not be forgotten that the young Chrysostom was only able to deal with his sexual desires by avoiding women and their company, making him unfamiliar with the opposite sex and their abilities. A more positive view of women can be noticed in his later writings.
Another treatise worth mentioning is *Against the Enemies of Monasticism*. Written in three parts, it was as a response to the numerous violent attacks against the monastics of the region. Chrysostom defended the holy men and noted their worth as instructors for boys of the true philosophy that is genuine Christianity. In the third part, he made a comment regarding the rampant pederasty in schools, and the high degree of sexual relations between men in the city, “that a youth can hardly escape unscathed.” Though he made no reference to himself, one cannot help wonder if Chrysostom had fallen victim or was personally sexually abused while a student of rhetoric. This would certainly account for his negative views towards sexuality and his preference of virginity over the married state.

In 386 Flavian ordained Chrysostom to the priesthood and for the next twelve years the priest became renowned as the greatest of Christian orators, earning him the title Chrysostom (Golden Mouth).

**The Golden Mouth of Antioch**

As a priest, Chrysostom had more responsibilities than as a deacon, most importantly, teaching responsibilities.

At Antioch the priests also, it seems, collaborated with the bishop in administering the property of the see. John [Chrysostom] apparently found this an irksome and uncongenial duty, for a few years later we find him grumbling that, as a result of the meanness of the laity, the Antiochene church was obliged to own farms, real estate, houses for letting, carriages for hire, packhorses and mules, and the clergy had to employ themselves, to the neglect of the care of souls, on tasks properly belonging to rent collectors, accountants, and petty tradesmen.

Nonetheless, Chrysostom’s principal functions as a priest were to give instruction to the laity. Little did he then know that the fame he would obtain from the pulpit would change his name to the Golden Mouth, and thus, he was to become known from hereafter
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as Chrysostom. It was neither his piety, nor his exegetical writings, nor even his future appointment as Bishop of Constantinople that gave him this title.

Chrysostom’s oratory career began shortly after his ordination where he gave a series of homilies on Genesis. Of this series of talks, eight have been preserved.\textsuperscript{55} Though this series of homilies will be dealt with in a following chapter, they will be briefly discussed here in order to bring to light Chrysostom’s views and attitudes.

Chrysostom began his exegesis of Genesis by focusing in each of his talks on a controversial doctrinal point. The first homily defended the doctrine of ex nihilo, creation out of nothing.\textsuperscript{56} His hostility to pagan philosophy can here be seen once again for he stressed that human knowledge has limits, and that which is needed is a firm trust in scripture. He also brutally attacked Manichaeism, revealing his genuine concern for the spiritual state of his parishioners.

In his next two homilies on Genesis\textsuperscript{57} Chrysostom dealt with the topic of this thesis, that is, what it means to be male and female in the image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:26). He defended the Trinitarian doctrine by arguing, against the Jewish authorities, that the plural verb of “let us” proves that the Father’s only-begotten Son co-existed and co-operated in his Father’s creation. Having established a relational or communal Godhead, he then explained that creation in God’s “image” (\textepsilon\textit{ikw}\textnu) does not imply an anthropomorphic view of the Trinitarian God. God does not have the physical attributes which human beings all share, nor does the image of God in humanity refer to sharing any part of God’s essence, but only that of authority (\textalpha\textomicron\textchi\texttau\textomicron). Chrysostom argued that God has given man dominion over the created world, and that alone is the image. However, the “likeness” (\textomicron\textomicron\omicron\textomicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron) asserts that humans should be like God in his qualities: kind and gentle (\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron).\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} Sermones 1-9 in Genesim (PG 54. 581-620), these eight homilies are not to be confused with the 67 homilies on Genesis printed in the same volume.
\textsuperscript{56} Homiliae in Genesim (PG 54. 581-4).
\textsuperscript{57} In Gen. Sermo 2 and 3 (PG 54. 587-90; 590-2).
\textsuperscript{58} Kelly, 59.
The fourth homily on Genesis deals with gender issues. When God created woman, He made her "of equal honour" with the man, entrusting her as man’s helper (Gen. 2:18). She is not to be compared to beasts which help man, such as cattle and horses, but as "a helper fit for him", language which stresses her equality with man. This was the intended state for woman, but when she sinned, she violated her position and showed herself inept to co-rule with the man, therefore, God cursed her to a role inferior to her once equal mate (Gen. 3:16). However, the sentence was moderate in that woman’s lot would be made easier, for God stated that her “desire shall be for your husband”. This is to be interpreted that he would be her refuge and comfort during times of trouble. Chrysostom continued to defend his exegesis of image as authority by making reference to 1 Tim. 2:12, where it states that woman is not allowed to teach or to exercise authority over man. Chrysostom argued that when woman became dissatisfied with her equal position and tried to exercise authority over the man, and teach him by her example, the results led to the corruption of the whole human race.

In his homilies dealing with the Book of Genesis, Chrysostom examined a mass of scriptural texts true to the Antiochene tradition, upholding literal exegesis. Within a year, Chrysostom delivered the homilies On the Statues that were to make him famous as an orator. He was to become so renowned that even pagans would go to hear the acclaimed leading preacher. These homilies were delivered after the famous Antioch Riot.

Some time during the last week of February of 387, there was a riot in Antioch in response to “a government decree that imposed, without previous notice, a new, exorbitant tax.” The frenzy climaxed when rioters set about pulling down, and breaking to pieces, the portraits and statues of the imperial family set up before the palace and in public places. Mounted messengers were quickly dispatched to Constantinople to report the events to the emperor. The city quickly recoiled to the horror of what had happened. To show disrespect to any image of the reigning emperor was counted as high treason.
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The citizens of Antioch now awaited the emperor’s punishment. Citizens feared the worst: the annihilation of the city. A mass exodus ensued of panicking people to the nearby mountains. Bishop Flavian also left the city; however, he was to travel to the capital to plead with emperor Theodosius in an effort to “rescue so great a people from the imperial wrath.”\textsuperscript{63} This act of Flavian was viewed by Chrysostom to be that of a bishop asserting his true authority, in order to protect the lives of his flock. Chrysostom viewed the bishop’s authority to be greatly connected with the responsibility of the spiritual and physical well being of his flock. Later when Chrysostom would himself become bishop, he too would assert his authority, as he felt himself accountable before God.

These were the events that preceded Chrysostom’s second series of Lenten discourses, the homilies \textit{On the Statues}. Yet nothing could distract this dedicated cleric from his spiritual duties. He proceeded as planned to give religious and moral instruction, and to explain the difficult passages of Genesis, which were the prescribed Lenten passages, to his panic-stricken parishioners. The homilies concluded with Chrysostom expounding on Flavian’s success in persuading the Emperor to spare the city and on the people’s proper response during the time of crisis of seeking refuge in God and his Church. One can only imagine how Flavian’s success strengthened Chrysostom’s opinion of the power and authority granted by God to his Bishops.

The homilies \textit{On the Statues} have often been acclaimed as being among the finest examples of Chrysostom’s oratory. Chrysostom’s greatness as an orator lies beyond his classical style of writing in his ability to reach the most uneducated of his people. He stated what needed to be said clearly, simply, and used countless examples to stress his point. That he was charismatic cannot be disputed, for within a year of preaching, his fame as an orator was known even beyond the reaches of Antioch.\textsuperscript{64}

The years from 387 to 397 were formative as practical experience cannot but mould a working priest. Thus, previous rigid views become more tempered. For example, Chrysostom still defends monasticism; however, now he stresses that a monk

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Ad populum Antiochenum} 3. 1 (\textit{PG} 49. 47).
\textsuperscript{64} Kelly, 82, 105.
should always be ready to place himself at the service of the community, since “there is nothing chillier than a Christian who is not trying to save others.” Also, his views of education become more reasonable. He still advocates that children need a thorough moral and spiritual education; however, it is now the parents’ responsibility to educate, rather than the monks’. This change in attitude puts greater importance upon the married state and family life.

During his priestly years in Antioch, Chrysostom presented a vast number of sermons that dealt with a wide range of topics. Among these are the seven enthusiastic eulogies of the Apostle Paul. In these eulogies one can see Chrysostom’s deep admiration for this Apostle to the Gentiles. His esteem for Paul did not go unnoticed by Anianus of Celeda (a Pelagian: fl. 400), the first Latin translator of these eulogies who stated that in these talks, Chrysostom had not so much drawn a portrait of his hero as brought him back to life again. It is important to note Chrysostom’s respect and admiration for Paul, for his homilies dealing with his various letters attempt not only to expound on what the Apostle is saying but attempt to dig into the deeper meaning, if possible into the very mind of Paul himself. It is for this reason that Chrysostom is often depicted in Eastern Christian iconography as writing while having the Apostle Paul whispering in his right ear. Though this thesis is not a study of biblical exegesis, so closely connected is Chrysostom with Paul, that it would be impossible not to address Paul’s writings as they directly influenced Chrysostom’s views of image and gender. Thus, Paul and his pertinent writings will be examined through the eyes of Chrysostom, and his style of exegesis. Any contemporary scholarship used will be done so to shed further light on the investigation at hand.

In addition to sermons dealing with a vast array of topics Chrysostom also wrote numerous commentaries on various books in the Old and New Testaments. Relevant to this investigation are the sixty-seven homilies that expound on the whole book of
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Genesis. These sermons, probably addressed in 388, were obviously meant to teach the uneducated masses, for their language is clear and simple, and the format is that of presenting one verse at a time. The other texts which Chrysostom wrote during his priestly years in Antioch and that are relevant to this investigation, are as follows: the fourteen homilies on 1 Corinthians delivered in 392/3, the course on Galatians, of the same year or perhaps delivered in 394, and the twenty-four homilies of Ephesians, argumentatively dated 395-7.

When expounding 1 Corinthians and Ephesians, the priest Chrysostom can be found holding more balanced opinions to those of his diaconate years. We see him here discussing the issues of marriage and sexuality in a more positive light than in his earlier works, as he now stresses the equality of husband and wife in sexual relations, insisting that neither must deprive the other of intercourse without the other’s consent.

Chrysostom’s homilies give us further insight into the author’s developing character. When studied in sequence, his homilies reveal a man growing steadily in confidence in his authority as a church leader. Gone are the days of an orator apologizing and asking for the prayers of his bishop and flock. By the end of his term as a priest in Antioch, he appears to be possessing powers equal to his bishop in matters of teaching and presiding over the church.

John Chrysostom’s homilies form an impressive collection of patristic commentaries of Scripture. Their principal value for scholars today lies in Chrysostom’s understanding of Christian faith, the moral and social obligations of a Christian, and secondly, in his exegetical methods. It would be unfair to expect any Christian writer of the fourth century to carry out exegesis as contemporary scholars have come to realise it. Like his contemporaries, Chrysostom the exegete believed that it was the Holy Spirit who spoke through the prophets and apostles and guided their pens in the composition of the Scripture.
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He [Chrysostom] also says repeatedly that in the Holy Scripture there is nothing without purpose, not a syllable, not an iota, not the smallest dash. On the basis of these assertions, Chrysostom has been claimed as the defender of verbal inspiration. That is going decidedly too far, if by this a generally authentic principle is to be understood. He occasionally admitted a verbal inspiration by way of exception, but he distinguished it clearly and reasonably from the real inspiration.75

Chrysostom’s commentaries reveal him to be a capable “exponent of Antiochene exegesis,” revealed in his “frequently expressed determination to explain scripture in the plain, historical sense, without resort to the arbitrary allegorising fashioned in much of the contemporary church.”76 He remained a faithful disciple of Diodore of Tarsus, fulfilling of what we know of his master’s methods most effectively from the pulpit. The greatest influence upon Chrysostom in matters of interpreting scripture had to be his great teacher, Diodore of Tarsus. yet not to be underestimated was the life experience that he acquired while working as the pastor of his flock. Chrysostom’s later fame greatly impacted the history and destiny of exegesis, in that “his surpassing authority tipped the scales in favor of the historical-grammatical method of interpretation, rather than the allegorical method.”77

It is often said that Chrysostom did not promote any special dogma; and this may be true, if we consider his times and the historical development of Trinitarian Theology and Christology. Chrysostom did not promote any special speculative dogma, yet he was an adamant defender of the dogmatic teachings, which the orthodox Church had already established. There is one God in three persons, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Each of the persons in the Godhead is equal to each other in nature or οὐσία, but possess individual personalities distinct from each other. Jesus Christ possesses two natures, one divine and the other human, both coexisting in one person. Such was the teaching of the Church, and such were the teachings that Chrysostom defended. “All his life he had been
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convinced that to rack one's brains about the being of God, which in the last resort transcends human comprehension, was one of the most presumptuous sins of heretics. ⁷⁸

It must be remembered that above all else, Chrysostom was an orator, and thus he is to be known more as a pastoral theologian. ⁷⁹ However, it is the task of this discourse to prove, that while preaching and ministering to his congregation, Chrysostom did develop, centuries ahead of his time, a doctrine of salvation that could not be separated from his belief that the image of God in the human being is authority. ⁸⁰

It has already been said that Chrysostom's views of marriage softened, and his championing virginity over all else is not as it was during his years in the diaconate. Such are the man's opinions on the eve of his elevation to Bishop of Constantinople, the newest established Patriarchate in the Byzantine Empire.

The Bishop of Constantinople

In September, 397, Nectarios, the eleventh Bishop and first “Patriarch” of Constantinople, died. ⁸¹ The task of nominating a new Bishop to the Empire’s capital fell upon Eutropios, a courtier and advisor to the weak Emperor Arkadios. His choice was the brilliant and pious preacher of Antioch, John Chrysostom. In mid to late October 397, Chrysostom received from Asterius, the imperial governor of Antioch, an urgent summons to meet him at the Martyrium. ⁸² Suspecting nothing, Chrysostom presented himself as ordered. He was then informed that he had been summoned to journey immediately to Constantinople. It was on route that the governor informed him that he would soon thereafter become its bishop. ⁸³

Regardless of the reasons behind Eutropios’ selection, from this point on, Chrysostom will be the centre of vicious attacks from various camps attempting to
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undermine his authority: an authority that he did not take lightly. His first antagonist was Theophilos of Alexandria who upon hearing of Chrysostom’s nomination attempted to block the synod from electing him. One can only speculate as to the reasons behind Theophilos’ opposition, yet in the end he finally gave Chrysostom, willingly or not, his vote. Theophilos was made to be the presiding bishop at his ordination that took place on the 15 December, 397. Unfortunately for Chrysostom, it was an embarrassment Theophilos was never to forget.

Chrysostom’s enthronement (ἐνθρόνισμα) occurred on the 26 February, 398. Chrysostom wasted no time in putting his house in order. After inquiring after the episcopal and ecclesiastical expenditures, he discovered a great number of redundant or useless expenses and immediately did away with them. Great banquets were abolished, and the bishop’s meals were to be simple and unpretentious. Anything beyond this was viewed as robbing the poor as the bishop used the extra funds to assist his less fortunate flock.

There were certainly enough poor people in Constantinople. For them, Chrysostom wished to save, and it is surely to his great honor that his eyes were not dazzled or deceived by the brilliance of the court, but saw always and before everything the social needs of the common people. The money which he managed to save by his economies he used for the erection of hospitals for the sick and hospices for strangers, which were very badly needed. He not only provided those which already existed with a richer income, but built new ones, and at the head of each he placed two suitable priests, who provided doctors, cooks and nurses for the sick. That showed social sense which was, unfortunately, not prominent in the East.

Under Chrysostom’s predecessor, the clergy had fallen into corruption. many constantly frequenting parties and banquets, others wasting money on luxuries, and still others keeping female housekeepers. Needless to say, the new bishop’s ecclesiastical
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reforms were for the most part not welcome by his clergy who had enjoyed living in leisure.  

Reforms were also made to shorten the service of the Divine Liturgy. Chrysostom also reintroduced the night services with processions in order to counteract the Arian presence in the city. Though the people participated in these events very willingly, many members of the clergy would have rather stayed in bed.  

Chrysostom’s primary task was again to shepherd his flock, and he resumed this task with zeal. He preached every Sunday and feast day, with his sermons carrying the same social and moral tones as those presented in Antioch. His ability to reach out to his congregation soon made him very popular with the capital’s people. Breaking away from the custom of speaking to them from the bishop’s throne, Chrysostom preferred to address his flock from the ambo (a pulpit-like lectern). The crowds often pushed and shoved to position themselves closer to him, often putting themselves at risk of injury, in order to hear him better. Yet despite his charisma and popularity, Chrysostom could not compete with the theatre, circus, or horseracing events. The decline in church attendance on days when “festivities” came to town was scandalous for him, and it is said that he had a hand in the passing of the law (published on 27 August 399) banning such spectacles on the Lord’s day. Above all else Chrysostom revered his God, and honoured His commandments. The Lord’s day was to be kept for the Lord as a day of prayer, and if the masses were not spiritually mature to follow this commandment on their own, then as their shepherd, it was Chrysostom’s responsibility to prevent them from erring.

Though the number of sermons that Chrysostom produced was fewer in Constantinople than in Antioch, they did include a few of a different class. He now had to produce sermons and addresses dealing with state affairs and celebrations. However, as was to be expected the largest number of sermons that Chrysostom produced were scriptural homilies. He wasted no time in resuming the systematic exposition of the
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Pauline epistles, and many from this time have survived. One relevant to our investigation is his twelfth homily on Colossians that addresses the question of how a husband and wife become one flesh. We find here a further expansion of his views of marriage, a topic that he was often dealt with in his pastoral ministry. It is clear that his views have become even more positive than those seen in Antioch. He explains that:

...just as when one takes the purest gold and fuses it with other gold, so in sexual intercourse the woman receives from her husband “the rich, fecund element” 92 nourishes and warms it, and then, when she has contributed something of her own substance, gives back a child, which is a sort of bridge linking the three as one flesh, for their intercourse (μιξίς) accomplishes their union, fusing and commingling their two bodies just as when we pour myrrh into olive oil. Evidently many in his audience were embarrassed by his frank speaking. The reason for this, he retorts, is their own loose, indeed prurient attitude to marriage, only too glaringly betokened by the licentious behaviour they accept at weddings. They should recognise that marriage is the gift of God, the very root of our existence. There is no need to blush when talking openly about marriage, which is an honourable state (Heb. 13.4) and an image [my italics] of the presence of Christ. 93

Chrysostom’s reforms are significant for our investigation as they reveal his consistent and steadfast character. There was no false pride in this man, who assisted and guided his people to greater spiritual heights. He attempted to put the needs, both physical as well as spiritual, of those in his charge first. He did not simply preach to them, but practised what he preached and never expected others to do what he himself had not done. He was an “idealist whose actions were always in harmony with his theories, and an advocate of very severe moral principles.” 94 As I stated above, though he was by nature more so a practical than a dogmatic theologian, he taught his flock how to live like true Christian men and true Christian women in order to obtain the likeness of God.

Chrysostom’s first year and a half as the second Patriarch of Constantinople had gone by quite peacefully, and the bishop was able to preach, write and rule in his
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episcopal office without much distraction. However, things began to change in August of 399 when Eutropios, Chrysostom’s benefactor, fell from favour in the court and sought ecclesiastical sanctuary. Chrysostom delivered a homily that so moved the Emperor and the army that it spared the life of Eutropios,95 who was exiled to Cyprus. However, Eutropios’ enemies finally persuaded the Emperor to a different course of action. Soon after his arrival to Cyprus, Eutropios was taken to Chalcedon, judged, condemned for high treason, and executed.

With Eutropios out of the way, Chrysostom was a man without a friend at court. Those who disliked him now had no obstacles to prevent them from seeing this zealous reformer dethroned. Chrysostom was quickly making enemies of influential people due to the fact that he took his position as “Patriarch” seriously. Men may have selected him, but it was God who had ordained him, and it was inevitably to God that he would be held accountable. His authority was from above, and as bishop it was his calling to do everything in his power to assist the souls in his care on their journey to salvation.

However, Chrysostom’s fiery temperament led him too often into inadvertent, if not blatantly offensive, speech and conduct.96 His reproofs were not welcome especially to the Empress Eudoxia who after the fall of Eutropios reached the zenith of power being elevated to the dignity of “Augusta,” on 9 January, 400. This honour abolished every difference in rank between her and the emperor.97 Those who wished to see Chrysostom deposed had a ready ally in the Augusta. Relations became distant, if not hostile, between the Empress and Chrysostom soon after Chrysostom returned from settling unpleasant church business in Ephesus.98

In his absence the Patriarch had invited Bishop Severian of Gabala, to the capital to help in the celebration of the Liturgy and in the preaching office, and had left his own Archdeacon Serapion to supervise the church. For reasons unknown, Severian betrayed the trust of his host, losing no time in gaining the ear of Empress Eudoxia, and the ladies of the court. He next tried to obtain the ardour of the people. Archdeacon Serapion
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considered it necessary to write to his bishop, informing him of Severian's conduct. Tensions arose between Severian and the Archdeacon, and came to a head one day when the Archdeacon, not seeing the bishop, failed to rise from his seat as was his duty. Severian vowed that he would have Serapion excommunicated. When Chrysostom returned, he called his synod of bishops together to confer over the matter and to bring about reconciliation.

Severian rejected all attempts of reconciliation, at which point Chrysostom through a third party informed the visiting bishop that it was time he go home. Severian complied, however, not before sending word to the palace informing the Empress and her court ladies that he was compelled to leave the city in haste and did not have the time to bid them a proper farewell. So misrepresented were Chrysostom's motives in this affair that Eudoxia was greatly angered against him and demanded that he quickly take Severian back.99

Being already inclined against her bishop, Eudoxia did not need much to misinterpret Chrysostom's well-meant words and actions as affronts to her person. This is what occurred one day when a widow came before Chrysostom complaining that the Empress had taken away her vineyard by force. Chrysostom made representations to the Empress on the widow's behalf. Not having it in his nature to speak in a manner soothing to a Majesty, the orator presented his case with biblical images and figures of speech, quite possibly even referring to the story of the Baal-worshipping Jezebel, who murdered Naboth for his vineyard. The Empress took the bishop's reprimand as a grave insult and never forgave Chrysostom for the affront.100

A circle of persons who for one reason or another felt themselves personally affronted by the Patriarch of Constantinople fanned Empress Eudoxia's fury. His "Golden Mouth" attempting to correct faults was seen as belonging to a proud viper spewing its hateful venom.101 However, none of his enemies had any power of their own, save the influence they had over the Empress, to be of any consequence or threat to

99 For a full account of these affairs see Baur, vol. 2, 155-162.
100 For a full account of these affairs see Baur, vol. 2, 165-168.
This was the situation in the capital when the Patriarch of Alexandria, Theophilos, the man who was opposed to Chrysostom's nomination as bishop, re-entered the city in 402.

The Battle of the Patriarchs

Theophilos was summoned to the capital to answer to charges made against him by the monks of the Nitrian desert. He persecuted them for taking into their protection Isidore, a priest who had fallen out of favour with Theophilos for handling a great sum of money according to the intentions of the donor, and not according to the wishes of the bishop. Theophilos apparently behaved abominably towards the monastic community, and accused them of being Origenists. They were forced to leave their cells, and made their way to Constantinople. There they presented their case, first to the Patriarch, and then to the Imperial Majesties. The result was that by imperial decree, Theophilos was to present himself before a synod presided over by Chrysostom.\textsuperscript{103}

Being summoned to defend himself before Chrysostom was seen by Theophilos as nothing short of a declaration of war. Theophilos began a counterattack to turn the tide in his favour, and to bring about the downfall of his rival. He first attempted to defame Chrysostom's character and defame him as a heretic. These tactics proved ineffective. Theophilos then realized that he had an ally in the powerful Empress Eudoxia, who was displeased with her overly moral and authoritarian bishop. Theophilos planned to push her dissatisfaction with Chrysostom to the limit, in order to have her willingly agree to depose him. With the assistance of Severian of Gabala and his friends, Chrysostom's sermons were falsified so as to appear slanderous against the Empress and her court.\textsuperscript{104} Theophilos' plan succeeded. Eudoxia's existing vexation with Chrysostom escalated into such violent fury that she wished to remove the annoying Patriarch once

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{103} Quasten. vol. 3, 426: and Baur, vol. 2, 192-214.  
\textsuperscript{104} Palladios 6 (PG 47. 21), Baur states that Socrates and Sozomen are in agreement with this. See Baur, vol. 2, 228. Sozomen, \textit{The Ecclesiastical History of Salaminius Hermias Sozomenus} VIII, 17 in \textit{NPNF} 2, ii, 409.
and for all. After hearing this news, Theophilus began his journey to Constantinople, but not to face trial, rather, "to depose Bishop John."105

Theophilus brought along with him a synod of twenty-nine bishops from Egypt, even though he had been told to come alone.106 Upon his arrival, he made it perfectly clear that he had no intention of meeting with Chrysostom or desire to come to any kind of understanding with him. Theophilus quickly began his task of finding false accusers from among Chrysostom's clergy. It became soon apparent to all that Theophilus was there to depose Chrysostom. The Nitrian monks, the synod of bishops called by Chrysostom for the trial of Theophilus, and naturally even Chrysostom himself, were very distraught over the whole affair. The Nitrian monks again pleaded their case to the Emperor, and he, not aware of what was going on, summoned Chrysostom to get the trial underway.

At this point in his life, Chrysostom had to come to a very difficult decision. He could forget everything that he believed in and taught for decades and play the political game to keep his power, or he could stay firm in his convictions and let the world do what it would to him. He held firm to his Christian convictions.

If Chrysostom had been a less distinguished character, had he been a man of the type of a Theophilus or a Severian, he would have cultivated power politics; and as a "diplomat" he would have played off one against the other; he would now, at this last and highest moment, have had it in his power to compass the downfall of the Patriarch and his following, which the latter intended for Chrysostom himself. But it was to the honor of his character and his Christian thought, that he did not do it. Open quarreling between bishops was to him an outrage, on account of the scandal to the people.

He did not yield to the request of the Emperor. With respect to the canons, as well as to the person and the office of the Patriarch, he refused to give judgement on Theophilus. He referred to the letter in which Theophilus himself had protested against having accusations handled outside the church province to which they belonged. Theophilus had, until that time, not been willing to take a judgement from the hand of Chrysostom. He had come to Constantinople now, because the Emperor had commanded it, but much more because he knew that the Empress was inclined toward him—or rather, against Chrysostom.

---
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So the way of justice could not be followed, and it did not lie in the character of Chrysostom to walk in the way of power and appeal to worldly might.

His magnanimity had, humanly speaking, destroyed him.107

One can only admire someone who was so unjustly treated and yet still attempted to do what was right in their own heart. Chrysostom had a certain degree of authority as Bishop of Constantinople. However, he realized his true limits, and was very careful not to overstep his powers. The canons of the Church were clear with regard to bishops being forbidden to interfere with matters occurring in another bishop’s See. Chrysostom ruled his own See with authority, but he lacked ambition. It was ambition for power that he viewed as sinful, and the cause of discord in life, whether it be between rulers, bishops or husband and wife. Each human being has authority being created in the image of God, and harmony reins so long as each person is content with that authority and does not ambitiously seek more power than was intended for them. This is what Chrysostom believed, this is how he lived, and this is what he taught. All evidence supports this assumption.

Though Chrysostom declined acting as judge over Theophilos, the latter did not simply pack his bags and leave for home. He had no intention of leaving until Chrysostom was deposed. After a few weeks Theophilos had gathered his false accusers and witnesses and had his whole entourage assemble at the palace of Rufinus.108 Chrysostom was summoned to present himself to the Synod there assembled as they had received an injunction of accusations against him. Chrysostom replied to the Synod at the Oak that he was willing to appear before any Synod as he had done no wrong, but only after Theophilos and three other bishops had been removed as judges as they were known enemies and thus unable to pass impartial judgement. The irony here is that when accused Theophilos argued that Chrysostom could not sit in judgement of him as he belonged outside his Diocese, yet he had no qualms to sit in judgement of Chrysostom. As Chrysostom was within his legal rights and no one had the power to compel him to appear before the court. Theophilos was never to have the satisfaction of seeing the

108 Also known as The Oak due to the great oak tree that grew near it, which was outside the capital, on the other side of the Bosphorus Sea.
Patriarch of Constantinople stand accused before him. Thus, though absent Chrysostom was condemned.

The Synod came to order and after deliberating on the numerous points of accusation, pronounced its judgement to depose Chrysostom as they found him guilty of various transgressions. They quickly informed the Emperor of their decision and explained:

John is accused of some misdemeanours, but, in consciousness of his faults, refused to appear. On this the canons set the punishment of deposition. This sentence has been passed. But the writ also includes the accusation of treason against the Emperor. So Your Serenity might command that he be deposed against his will, and punished as one guilty of high treason. It is not in our power to judge this crime.\footnote{Palladios 8 (PG 47.30).}

This note to the Emperor was deceptive, as there were no points presented to the Synod that were treasonous to the Majesties.\footnote{For a list of the accusations brought against Chrysostom see Baur, vol. 2, 246-250.} Theophilos’ hatred is obvious as the penalty for treason against the Emperor was death.

**Chrysostom’s Exiles**

Chrysostom was not condemned for any acts of treason, but the Emperor agreed to depose the Patriarch of Constantinople since the Synod of the Oak found him guilty of ecclesiastical improprieties. The simple people caused a riot upon hearing of the events, and began to threaten those involved.\footnote{Sozomen 8. 18 (PG 67.1561).} That night Chrysostom was escorted from the episcopal palace to the city’s harbour, put on a ship and taken to Bithynia.\footnote{Baur, vol. 2, 263.}

Theophilos’ triumph did not last long, for the very next day, the Empress Eudoxia having a change of heart recalled Chrysostom from his exile. Palladios stated, “there occurred a misfortune in the imperial chamber.”\footnote{Palladios 9 (PG 47.30).} Chrysostom’s enemies were now in a state of confusion, and even Theophilos with his entourage from Egypt quickly set sail for home. However, Chrysostom did not return quickly. He first set the condition of an
impartial synod to be assembled to hear his case before returning to Constantinople. After his triumphant re-entry into the city, a synod of sixty bishops assembled in the capital and declared everything that had been decided by the Synod of the Oak to be null and void. However a formal and judicial decision between Chrysostom and his opponents could not be made, as they never appeared.\textsuperscript{114}

Chrysostom's recall was based solely on the Empress' personal fear and anxiety. His enemies still wished to see him gone from their midst, and knew that all that was needed was an opportunity to rekindle Eudoxia's anger towards the Patriarch. The occasion again arose when Simplicius, the city prefect, erected a silver statue of the Empress in the most prominent square in the capital. The day fell on a Sunday, and was full of celebrations, which by imperial decree were to be prohibited on the Lord's Day. In exasperation over the great noise, Chrysostom voiced his displeasure over the happenings in the street. Like lightning his enemies reported to the Empress Eudoxia that the Patriarch had spoken disdainfully in public against the erection of her statue.\textsuperscript{115}

Again the Patriarch found himself out of favour with the Empress, and quickly noted the signs of a changing tide. He appealed to the Emperor and asked for a new synod to be called in order to confront his accusers from the Synod of the Oak and defend his innocence properly against their accusations.\textsuperscript{116} The Emperor was not obliging.

Soon after Chrysostom preached a festival sermon in honour of John the Baptist in which he stated that Herodias again demands the head of John the Baptist!\textsuperscript{117} The Empress was told that this was directed against her. Tensions were high between Chrysostom's friends and his enemies for the following months. The Emperor notified Chrysostom during the Christmas festivities of 403 or the Epiphany festivities of 404 that he would not hold ecclesiastical fellowship with him, until he vindicated himself against the accusations that the Synod of the Oak had brought against him. This was impossible, as his accusers never presented themselves.

\textsuperscript{114} Baur, vol. 2, 270.
\textsuperscript{115} Sozomen 8 (PG 47. 20).
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\textsuperscript{117} Kelly, 230.
During these days, and relevant to our investigation Chrysostom made a comparison between the relationship and bond between a bishop and his flock and the bond between husband and wife, which is inseparable. When the injustice of what was being done to him became too much to bear. Chrysostom angrily asked why his persecutors sought to depose him.

It is because he has refused to indulge in the soft life of luxury himself, and also refused to sanction their gluttony and avarice. ...he takes a swipe at Theophilos without naming him: just as long ago the Egyptian Potiphar tried to seduce Joseph, so an Egyptian today—in vain—seeks to separate John from the flock which is his spiritual bride. Even Arkadios (again not named) is asked to reflect that David, the model king, made no attack on true religion, never made ill-gotten gains his aim, and never allowed himself to be led by his wife.

At this point in Chrysostom’s life, he upholds the view that the bond between a husband and wife is sacred and strong. The husband is the head in the relationship and has authority over the wife, who should never have authority over her husband, yet as the body, assist the husband in all that is just and right. So too, a bishop, is head of his flock, and has authority over them and is responsible for the state of their souls. The bond is also inseparable and as it is God who ordains the bishop to guide his flock no man should remove a bishop from his diocese.

Easter soon approached, and the Majesties were in a dilemma. If they received the Paschal Communion from the hand of Chrysostom they would be in effect recognising his legitimacy as a bishop. The Emperor thus signed a decree with the terse command: “Leave your church!”

Chrysostom complied, yet as the shepherd of his flock, he did not cease to fulfil his duties as bishop. As the Churches were closed to them, on the Eve of Pascha (Easter) he called the three thousand catechumens to the public baths. Chrysostom’s enemies had told Emperor Arcadius that even the masses were against Chrysostom, and that no man would willingly hold fellowship with the deposed bishop. If Arcadius saw the empty churches in the morning, he would realise that this was false, and the ringleaders of the

---
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enemy coalition would be called slanderers for their untruth to the Emperor. They thus sent troops to stop the baptisms from proceeding. The result was a violent attack on the catechumens and clergy assembled at the baths. Forced to disperse, the people reassembled the next day. When the Emperor saw over three thousand people dressed in white assembling, he was told that they were heretics, and ordered them to be dispersed. Again the result was a violent commotion.

Unable to endure the wait any longer, the enemy bishops obtained an audience with the Emperor on 9 June, 404. It was the Thursday after Pentecost. There they implored him to depose Chrysostom and to send him into exile. After a week of persuasion, the Emperor disowned any responsibility for his actions, and washed his hands of the Patriarch. The Emperor’s notary Patricius was commanded to say to Chrysostom: “The bishops, Acacius, Severian, Antiochus, and Cyrius, and their friends, have taken on themselves the responsibility for your banishment. So yield yourself and your cause to God, and leave your church and your diocese.” Thus, on Monday, the 20th of June, 404, under military escort, Chrysostom began the journey of his second banishment.

The Golden Mouth in Exile

Chrysostom was exiled to Cucusus in Armenia, a garrison town on the border without a market or even a shop, in the vicinity of the dreaded Isaurian mountains. His seventy-day journey to Cucusus was most difficult on him. During his days in exile, he wrote numerous letters (seventeen) to Olympias, the superior of the ecclesiastical deaconesses at the Cathedral in Constantinople, as well as to eighteen other women.

---

122 Ibid., 288-290.
123 Palladius, Dialogus de vita S. J. Chrysostomi 10 (PG 47. 35), “Οἱ περὶ Ἀκάκιον καὶ Ἀντιόχου καὶ Σευτριανόν καὶ Κυρίνον τὸ κατὰ σὲ κρίμα ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἔθηκαν κεφαλῆν τὰ κατὰ σ’ αὐτῶν οὖν ἀναθεῖς τῷ Θεῷ, ἔξελθε τῇ Ἐκκλησίας.
124 Chrysostom, Letters 13 and 14 to Olympias (PG 52. 610 ff).
125 Baur, vol. 2, 349.
126 Ibid., 379.
One of the accusations that Chrysostom’s enemies had made against him was his allowing women to visit him without having anyone else present. Baur states that as bishop, “he did not need to have underlings as witnesses and spies on his virtue.”127 The women whom Chrysostom allowed often in his company were the deaconesses of the Cathedral. Whereas in the past, the young Chrysostom avoided the company of women, now they are seen to be not only welcome, but also a comfort to him.

From the beginning of his ministry as Patriarch of Constantinople, Olympias and Chrysostom were joined in a bond of spiritual and sympathetic friendship. This lady from a noble and wealthy family was orphaned at a young age and raised by a relative, Theodosia, who was in turn related to Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus. At the age of eighteen, Olympias married the city prefect of Constantinople, who unfortunately died shortly after the wedding. Like Chrysostom’s mother, she decided not to remarry, and at the age of twenty-five was consecrated as deaconess in the Cathedral of the capital. She gave her vast fortune to the church of Constantinople, and had a cloister built near the Cathedral for about 250 women consecrated to God. Olympias was their first abbess.128

Chrysostom’s relationship with Olympias reveals his true attitude towards women. As this deaconess was not caught up with vanities, like the women at court who rejoiced at his expulsion since they were free at last from his constant lecturing over their vainglory and state of their souls, Chrysostom was free to praise her and treat her on an equal footing. In one of his letters to her he writes:

You have no real sins, and therefore you have no reason to fear. For, although you were married, you now belong to the band of wise virgins, for you were always mindful of the things of God, through almsgiving and patience in suffering, through self-control in eating and sleeping, and in all other things, but especially through modest simplicity in dress. It is in these things that true virginity lies, and that is something infinitely great. God has laid on men many difficult things, but not virginity. Moses, Abraham and Job were great men of God, and they showed heroic virtues: but they did not practice virginity. And yet there are many young women who are strong enough to observe it; but yet they are not prepared to renounce fine clothes. Think therefore on the heavenly
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reward which awaits you, while the scandal-givers and the ravishers of the Church must come to a fearful judgement."

Hearing later of her mistreatment due to her allegiance to him Chrysostom praises her for her courageous spirit and greatness of soul in persecution, "by which she had shamed even men."130

Thus, for Chrysostom it is clear that women are to be praised when they obtain and exhibit divine virtues and qualities, which is what he understood as the likeness of God. Chrysostom never saw acquiring God's likeness as something that is attainable only by men, and not by women. Nor are women to be seen anywhere in his writings as never having been created in the image of God. The image was to be found in the equal authority that each, man and woman, was given in paradise over the created order. After the Fall, woman was punished for exceeding her authority and became a second authority after her husband, not after all men. The man also lost the full authority that was initially granted to him, having now only partial dominion over the world. This is the only explanation that Chrysostom gives for what it means to be male and female created in the image and likeness of God. He does not speculate further. The reason for this can be found in one of his treatises written during his exile:

To all those who were scandalized at the happenings of the years 403 and 404, and who could not understand how God could permit such things to happen.

To inquire minutely into God's decrees, laws and dispositions, says he, has no purpose, because we mere men will never thoroughly understand God our Creator, nor be able to comprehend Him. Not even the angels and archangels can do that. Also among created things there is so much which we do not know or understand, and for man, the greatest riddle is man. Although the world is so full of malice and wickedness, still the love and care of God for us is shown in all things, and His creation shows the most beautiful order. To inquire minutely into the Why and How of all things is unprofitable.131

These were the beliefs of John Chrysostom, the second Patriarch of Constantinople, one of the greatest preachers in the history of the Church, who died on 14
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September. 407\textsuperscript{132} while being forced to journey further into exile from Cucusus to Pityus. Having thus examined the life of the author of our investigation, and studying the possible influences upon him, one is able to reach a better understanding as to why he believed that the image of God in humanity is authority. His being raised and educated in Antioch, and thus exposed to Diodore and the Antiochene school of thought and its method of scriptural interpretation, led him to investigate the Genesis account dealing with the creation of humanity according to the literal rather than allegorical method. Yet beyond the why Chrysostom interpreted the Genesis account as he did, is the remaining question: what assumption is made by such an exegesis on the state of the human being? An examination of Chrysostom’s actual writings will lay open an understanding of humanity, male and female that is balanced, unprejudiced, and relevant to our times.

\textsuperscript{132} Baur, vol. 2, 422.
Chapter 2
Chrysostom’s Exegesis on Genesis 1:26-27

This chapter will examine Chrysostom’s interpretation of Genesis 1:26-27.¹ By examining all of his writings that made reference to this pericope in chronological order, the following assertions can be made. First, Chrysostom consistently believed that the image given to the human being was the image of God. Secondly, he believed that this image of God in the human being was the power of dominion to rule over all of visible creation. Thirdly, Chrysostom consistently believed that the first parents even prior to their “formation” were equally given this power and authority to rule. Fourthly, this image of God’s authority was given to the human being as an honour or a gift. And finally, the image of God marks the human being as the superior of all visible creatures. This view of image as authority is based on Chrysostom’s Antiochene (literal) interpretation of Genesis 1:26 where as soon as the human being is said to be created in God’s image, God grants the human being dominion over all visible creation. Thus, in Chrysostom’s mind, image and dominion are not only directly related, but are one and the same.

Chrysostom from A.D. 388 defended his view of the image as authority to rule by presenting the parallel between the prototype, God, and his image, the human being. Chrysostom taught that before God created the human being, God the Father said, “Let us make,” speaking to his Son. As the Father and the Son are equal in their divine essence and authority, so the two modes of human existence, male and female, were created equal in their human essence and were intended to equally rule all on earth. Thus, the man and the woman were created co-rulers without the one having more authority than the other or over the other. Their rule was complete over all visible creatures without any exception, as the Father and Son rule completely over both the invisible and visible creation.

The human being, male and female, were to be like God in their rule. They were above all to be in control of themselves, rational, logical, in command of their passions,

¹ “And God said, “Let us make the human being in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.” So God created the human being in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.” (My translation from LXX.)
temperate, mild, and gentle, so as to be able to be just stewards of the kingdom with which God blessed them. This is how Chrysostom interpreted "likeness."

This was how Chrysostom viewed the state of the human being prior to the first transgression. It was only as a result of the first sin, that the human being was punished, and had most of his/her power to rule taken away. The image became "amputated." The human being was now in fear of the wild beasts that were once subject to them. The image became diminished to a great degree, yet the human being still had some control over certain animals that were needed. These are the domestic beasts. Woman lost her equality with her husband, and became second in authority due to her transgression, yet Chrysostom believed that she is still to maintain limited rule over the domestic beasts with the man.

The following inquiry, though at times seeming tediously repetitive, is necessary in order to solidify the above views held by Chrysostom, and to establish the foundation necessary for our further investigation. This investigation will attempt to follow the development of Chrysostom's interpretation of image as authority by examining his works in chronological order. Beginning with his writings from Antioch and proceeding to his later ones from Constantinople, it will become clear that Chrysostom was consistent in his interpretation of Genesis 1:26-27 always believing that woman was created equally with the man in the image of God.

Chrysostom's view of post-lapsarian woman, however, changes. In his first exegesis on Genesis, *Sermones 1-9 in Genesin* ii. 2 (PG 54. 587) written in A.D. 386, Chrysostom taught that post-lapsarian woman was no longer in the image of God, as she no longer had total authority being under the headship of her husband. By A.D. 388, Chrysostom changed his position to include post-lapsarian woman in the image of God, by stating in *Homiliae in Genesin* ix. 4 (PG 53. 79) that both man and woman lost the greater portion of their authority over the created world, maintaining authority only over the domestic beasts. Here post-lapsarian woman is said to have maintained a part of the diminished image, though under the headship of her husband. From A.D. 388 until his death, Chrysostom was consistent in proclaiming that post-lapsarian woman did maintain part of the image of God to rule over the created world.
Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum 1-3

When he was still a deacon in Antioch, Chrysostom wrote the three books known as Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum 1-3 (PG 47, 423-494) in which he consoled his despairing and suffering friend, Stagirius the monk. In the first of the three books he made reference to Genesis 1:26, as he began to reason with Stagirius by addressing the benevolence of God in his creating the invisible and visible worlds and the human being.

Here the young Chrysostom tersely explained the meaning behind image and likeness as follows:

For the “Let us make the human being in our image and likeness,” means nothing other than that to him was given the sovereignty (δυνατία) of all that was created on the earth.²

It is evident that for the young Chrysostom no other meaning other than dominion and the authority to rule over the creatures of the earth can be given to “image of God.”

De virginitate

Chrysostom’s text, De virginitate (PG 48, 533-596) is primarily a detailed analysis of the words of St. Paul that marriage is good but virginity better (1 Cor. 7:38). This treatise of Chrysostom’s was written while a young deacon in Antioch in the years 381/2 shortly after his return from the mountains where he attempted to live the life of an ascetic. In his forty-sixth chapter, Chrysostom attempted to answer the question, “If a wife is an impediment to the perfect life, why do the Scriptures call her a helper of her husband?” In the third paragraph Chrysostom addressed the issue of the human being who though at first being created in the image and likeness of God, later lost both the image and the likeness due to sin. He wrote:

How then could God have said to man: “Let us make for him a helper like himself?” For God does not lie. Nor would I assert this, far from it. Although woman did come into being for this purpose and this reason, she did not want to keep to her dignified state, just as her husband did not. God made the human being after his own image and likeness. He says: “Let us make the human being in our own image, after our likeness,” just as he has said: “Let us make a helpmate for him.” Yet once he was created, the human being immediately lost both traits. He did not preserve the “after God’s

² Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum 1-3 1. 2 (PG 47. 423-494). (All translations for Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum 1-3 are mine.)
Taking this paragraph out of context will most certainly mislead the reader as to Chrysostom's view of the present state of the human being. His very bold comment that once the human being was created, the human being "immediately lost both traits," meaning both the image and the likeness, can be easily taken to mean that there is nothing of God's image and likeness in post-lapsarian humanity. However, in the paragraphs immediately following the one quoted above, Chrysostom clarified his position. The image was not fully lost, but "amputated" or "curtailed".

God cut man off from no small share of his power, namely, that of being feared by all as a master, as if God had created him an ungrateful slave who, after giving offence to his master, is despicable to his fellow-slaves. For at the beginning man inspired fear in all the animals, since God turned all over to him. None dared to maltreat him or plot against him, for they saw the kingly image shining in him. When man obscured those characteristics by his sin, God took that power from him.

The fact that man is not in command of all upon the earth but even trembles before and fears some creatures does not make a lie of God's assertion: "And let them be the rulers of the beasts of the earth," for the curtailing [my italics] of man's power has come about not from the donor but from the receiver.4

According to Chrysostom's early views on the subject of image, human beings were given authority over all of creation and this was seen as being the image of God in humanity. This control granted to both the man and the woman was greatly reduced, as a result of their sin, but it was not altogether eliminated.

Sermones 1-9 in Genesin

Chrysostom presented his first series of homilies on Genesis entitled Sermones 9 in Genesin (PG 54. 581-630) in 386. These nine Sermons on Genesis deal with only the first three chapters of the Book of Genesis. In these nine sermons, Genesis 1:26 is referred to and expounded upon in the second, third and fourth homilies. The second homily examines

3 De virginitate xlvi. 3 (PG 48. 568). Shore, 71.
what is to be understood by the verse. "Let us create the human being in our image," focusing on the plural tense in "Let us create." The third homily examines in depth the meaning of "image and likeness", and the fourth homily examines the effects that sin had upon the human being.

Chrysostom began this homiletic series refuting the opinion of those who believed that the plural in "Let us make" referred to the angels, as it was not the angels' work to create but to glorify and serve God. He then explained the plurality of the phrase, "Let us make" as follows:

But to whom is it that he says, "Let us create the human being?" It is to the wondrous councillor, the one with authority, God almighty, the prince of peace, the Father of the age to come, this only-begotten Son of God. It is to him that he says, "Let us create the human being in our image and likeness." He did not say "according to my [image] and your [image]." or "my [image] and all of your [image]." but "according to our image," revealing that the image is one and the same and the likeness is one and the same. For how can the image and likeness of the Lord and his servant be one and the same? From everywhere the Word has proven himself to you. According to what he here declared with these words the image of authority, as he revealed, and the following. For since he said, "according to our image and likeness," he added, "and let them have authority over the fish of the sea." The authority of God and the angels cannot be one and the same. For how can the authority of the servant be the same as that of the Lord (Δεσπότου), that of the one who works with that of the one who commands?6

Before being able to explain what it means for humanity to have been created in the image of God. Chrysostom found it necessary first to establish who the prototype is after whom the human being is modeled. How we understand the prototype has direct implications on how we understand the image. For Chrysostom, the equality of the Father and the Son and the equal authority that they share is paramount. As the human being was created male and female, these two modes of the human being modeled after God were created equal in their human essence, and equal in their authority over the

---

5 According to R. A. Krupp's Scripture Index Genesis 1:26 is quoted four times in Sermones 1-9 in Genesin. The first citation (PG 54. 586), however, is simply a chapter heading. For this reason this particular citation will not be examined. The following three citations will be examined beginning with chapter two section two.

6 Sermones 1-9 in Genesin ii. 2 (PG 54. 587). (All translations for Sermones 1-9 in Genesin are mine.)
created world.

Thus the above passage does not only argue in support of the doctrine of equality between the Father and the Son, it also defends the status of the human being created in the divine image. As they are equal in their divine essence, the authority of God the Father and God the Word is also equal, and subsequently the authority given as a gift of honour to the man and the woman is equal, as they are equal in their human essence. Had God created the human being with the angels who serve him, it would be unclear in whose image, whether God's or the angels', the human being would be created. Such an interpretation could also lead to the opinion that man is in the image of God, and woman in the image of the angels, establishing the latter in a subordinate role from her very creation.

In the third homily, Chrysostom explained the meaning of the terms “image” and “likeness” and revealed his opinion of their difference in meaning as follows:

You have heard that God created the human being in his image. And we have said that the meaning of this “in his image and likeness” does not mean [to be] identically alike in essence, but alike in rule (ἀπαντικός). The said “likeness” means gentle and kind and the ability for us to liken ourselves to God according to the sermon of virtues [the Beatitudes], where Christ says, “Become like my Father who is in Heaven.” For exactly as on this wide and spacious earth some animals are more irrational, and others more wild, so in this way in the breadth of our souls, some of our thoughts are irrational and beastly, and others are savage and wild. Therefore we must rule over them, greatly conquer them, and surrender them to reason.\(^7\)

Chrysostom believed that the image of God in the human being is the resemblance of God in his rule of authority over all the created beasts on this earth. The likeness is the potential to become like God in his attributes. Thus, human beings are called to be logical, rational, and in control over their passions and thoughts. They are to be tempered, mild and peaceful, for if human beings cannot be rulers over themselves, then they will not be able to rule properly over the earthly kingdom that God bequeathed to them.

In the fourth homily in *Sermones 1-9 in Genesin* Chrysostom made reference to Genesis 1:26 when addressing the creation of woman, and the equality of authority that

\(^7\) *Sermones 1-9 in Genesin* iii. 1 (PG 54. 591).
she shared with the man before the first transgression. Chrysostom believed that the beginning of the rule of the man over his wife and the servitude of the woman towards her husband first appeared as a necessary result of the first transgression. Chrysostom wrote:

Before the first transgression, woman was equal with man. For when God created her, the words that he used in the formation of man, these [same words] he used in the formation of woman. For in the exact same manner that he said for him, “Let us create the human being in our image and likeness,” and did not say, “Let there be the human being,” so too for her he did not say, “Let there be woman,” but he also here says, “Let us make a helpmate for him.” [My Italics.] And not simply a helpmate, but “like him,” in order to again show the equality.

Thus, Chrysostom stayed firm in his belief that woman was created by God equal to man, as she was created in the same manner as him, and shared equally with him in the image and likeness of God. Thus, woman was also created to rule and to exercise authority over the created beasts. She was to share this authority and responsibility equally with the man and only as a result of the first transgression was this equality with the man lost. Woman was punished by having her authority diminished and given the position of second in authority, being made to be subject to her one-time equal.

Scholars such as Elizabeth Clark who label John Chrysostom a misogynist have failed to examine carefully his unwavering position on the equality of woman with man at her creation. He defended her possessing the image and the likeness of God equally with the man, and her having the same authority over the beasts in the created world. In none of his writings, as will be shown below, does Chrysostom waver from this view.

_Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum_

Chrysostom’s _Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum_ (PG 49. 15-222), was delivered in Antioch after the great riot of 387, and is said to be among the finest of his rhetoric achievements. _On the Statues_ presents a slight twist to Chrysostom’s earlier presentation of Genesis 1:26-27 in dealing with the issue of image. Here he stated:

---

8 In the Septuagint text that Chrysostom used Genesis 2:18 reads: “Καὶ ἔπει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς, «Ὅκ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον· τοπήσωμεν αὐτῷ θεῷν κατ’ αὐτόν.»

9 _Sermones 1-9 in Genesin iv. 1_ (PG 54. 593).
And again, hear God Himself saying, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” But if you say that man is not of the same substance as God, -what matters that? For neither was the brazen statue of the same substance as the Emperor; yet nevertheless, they who defied it paid the penalty. Thus also with regard to mankind, if men are not of the same substance as God, (as indeed they are not,) still they have been called His image; and it were fitting they should receive honor on account of the appellation.\(^\text{10}\)

No explanation is here given as to Chrysostom’s understanding of what image means. However, he did establish what it does not mean. Being in God’s image does not entail being of the same substance of God. Humanity is not of the same essence or homousios with God. Yet that which human beings were given by God is said to make them in his image and in turn makes them deserving of honor.

In a later homily On the Statues Chrysostom again addressed Genesis 1:26-27. He here spoke of the human being’s authority to rule over all of creation in the beginning.

Chrysostom explained in his seventh homily:

For when you hear that God made ... all things without exception, which you see, for you, ... do you not straightway take comfort and receive this as the strongest proof of the love of God, when you think that He produced such a world as this ... for you. ... And this is, indeed, the most marvelous thing, that He gave us not such a world as this in payment for services done; or as a recompense for good works; but at the very time He formed us, He honored our race with this kingdom. For He said, “Let us make man after our image, and after our likeness.” What is the sense of the, “after our image, and after our likeness?” The image of government is that which is meant; and as there is no one in heaven superior to God, so let there be none upon earth superior to man. This then is one, and the first respect, in which He did him honor, making him after His own image; and secondly, forasmuch as He provided us this principality, not as a payment for service, but made it entirely the gift of His own love toward man; and thirdly, in that He conferred it upon us as a thing of nature.\(^\text{11}\)

Thus, in this homily, Chrysostom clarified his view by first stating that God honored the human being by creating them, male and female in his own image of government, with authority to rule. This image of government was given to the human being as a gift, and Chrysostom then continued to proclaim that this gift of God’s image was to be an intrinsic part of what it meant to be a human being. The image was natural to human beings, or

\(^{10}\) Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum iii. 19 (PG 49.57), NPNF 1, ix, 362.

\(^{11}\) Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum vii. 3 (PG 49.93), NPNF 1, ix, 391.
innate to them. To explain his last point Chrysostom continued in his homily to differentiate between natural authority and elective authority. He began to say that the lion has natural authority over the quadrupeds and the eagle over the birds. "The character of sovereignty is ... constantly allotted to his [the lion's] race; and no lion has ever been seen deprived of it. Such a kind of sovereignty God bestowed upon us from the beginning, and set us over all things."12 The Emperor, however, had elective authority over his people, "for he does not reign over his fellow-servants by any natural authority. Therefore it is that he oftentimes loses his sovereignty. For such are things which do not inhere naturally; they readily admit of change and transposition."13

Thus, in his Homily on the Statues, Chrysostom further explained his view of image by expounding that the image of God as government bestowed upon the human being was natural to him, and unlike the elective authority given to certain people to rule over other people, human beings as a race were to rule over the created order naturally, as the lion race rules over the quadrupeds and the eagle race rules over the birds.

*Homiliae 67 in Genesis*

The most in-depth analysis of Chrysostom's interpretation of image is to be found in his eighth to tenth homilies in his second series of writings on Genesis, *Homiliae 67 in Genesis* (PG 53-54) given in A.D. 388. This second series presents a complete section-by-section analysis of the entire Book of Genesis. It is interesting to note that some of the homilies of the first and second series have passages that are entirely verbatim.

As mentioned in my first chapter, Chrysostom was not familiar with the Hebrew language, and thus depended heavily on the Septuagint text of the Old Testament. Translated from the Greek, Genesis 1:26-27 reads: "God said: 'Let us make a human being in our image and likeness. Let them have control of the fish of the sea and the birds of heaven, the cattle and the wild beasts, all the earth and all the reptiles creeping upon the earth.'"14

---

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 "Gen. 1:26, Chrysostom's text including the wild beasts, not found in other LXX texts"; quoted in Robert C. Hill, *St. John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 1-17 in the Fathers of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press,
Chrysostom began by explaining the importance of the words, “Let us make.” Unlike the whole of creation brought into being in the first five days by a single command or a single word, “Let there be,” human beings were brought into being by a direct act of God, “Let us make.” For Chrysostom, this difference showed that the human being is the creature more important than all the other visible beings. Moreover, he stated that it was for this creature that all the other beasts have been produced.  

Establishing the importance and superiority of the human being, Chrysostom proceeded in his eighth homily of Homiliae 67 in Genesin to give his interpretation of “image”. After refuting those who place the image of God in the human being’s physical appearance, he went on to explain where in truth the image of God is to be found.

You see, in saying, “‘Let us make a human being in our image and likeness,’” he did not stop there, but through the following verse made clear to us what was the reason for choosing the word “image.” What in fact does the text go on to say? “‘Let them have control of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven, and all the reptiles creeping on the earth.”’ So “image” refers to the matter of control, not anything else, in other words, God created the human being as having control of everything on earth, and nothing on earth is greater than the human being, under whose authority everything falls.

As Chrysostom based his exegesis on the LXX text, he interpreted the word ἄρχη as meaning “control,” the term ἄρχον as “the one having control,” and ἐξουσία as 1986), 105. note 1. (All translations of Homiliae 67 in Genesin are taken from this source.) “Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς· οὐκίσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἤμετέραν, καὶ καθ’ ὑμοίωσιν. καὶ ἀρέστωσ的理解 τῶν ἱδρυῶν τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν. καὶ τῶν θηρίων. καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρποτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.” Homiliae 67 in Genesin viii. 1 (PG 53, 69).

15 Homiliae 67 in Genesin viii. 4 (PG 53, 70).
16 “A perennial puzzle for Gn commentators, the meaning of “image and likeness,” generally approached by them (as by Chrysostom here) through the sequence of ideas in the text. Only in recent years has the discovery of the Ebla tablets deciphered the notion of demuth, “likeness,” in ancient Heb. as a deity deity, with responsibility (in this case) for all creation. No wonder the text is so pregnant for conservationists, and “image” is so rich a term for Paul in his Christology.” cited by Robert C. Hill, 110, note 13.
17 Κατὰ τὴν τῆς Ἀρχῆς σύν Εἰκόνα φησίν. οὗ καθ’ ἐτερὸν τι. καὶ γὰρ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἄρχοντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐθημοῦργησεν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστὶ τούτου μείζον. ἀλλὰ πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν τοῦ τυχάνει. Homiliae 67 in Genesin viii. 3 (PG 53, 72). English translation from Robert C. Hill, Sr.
“authority.” G.W.H. Lampe, in his *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* defines ἀρχή generally as “ruler” as well as “governor” of a place such as a province. Thus, Chrysostom found the image of God in the human being in his and her authority and control to rule over all of creation as the divinely appointed stewards. So long as the human being is entrusted with the office of stewardship, exercising full authority over the entire created world, they would be in the image of God, who is the ultimate ruler of all. Their authority as such is not without responsibility, and a call to actively accept the duties of this office.

In his ninth homily in *Homiliae 67 in Genesin*, Chrysostom reinforced his opinion of where the image of God in the human being is to be found, and continued to explain the meaning of “likeness” and the effects the first transgression produced on the human race.

As the word “image” indicated a similitude of command, so too “likeness,” with the result that we become like God to the extent of our human power—that is to say, we resemble him in our gentleness and mildness and in regard to virtue, as Christ also says, “Be like your Father in heaven.”

Again the Greek term ἀρχή is used to denote command. However, where ἔξουσία was used before, here Chrysostom used the term δύναμις to denote not only power but also ability.

Unlike other early Christian authors, such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who did not see a difference in meaning between “image” and “likeness”, Chrysostom interpreted the two terms differently. In his ninth homily he explained the meaning of “likeness,” stating that as there are tame (ἡμερωτέρα) and wild animals (θηριωδέστερα), so too “in the wide spaces” of the human soul, some ideas are “lethargic” and some more “savage.” So Chrysostom believed that there is “need to control and tame them [wild

---

*John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 1-17 in Fathers of the Church*, 110.


19 Ὑπερ «Εἰκόνα» ἐλπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς δηλῶν εἰκόνα, οὕτω καὶ «:"Ομοίωσιν», ὡστε κατὰ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην ὑμῶν ὑπέρ θεου, κατὰ τὸ ἡμερον λέγω καὶ ἔξουσιον ὑποτίθεμαι οὕτω, καὶ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς λόγον, ὑπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς φησί, «Γίνεσθε δύοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τού ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.» in *Genesin* ix. 3 (PG 53.78), Hill, 120.


21 *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* ix. 3 (PG 53.78), Hill, 120-21.
desires] and submit them to the rule of reason.”

Again the term Chrysostom used to denote rule and control is ἄρχη."²³

Thus, where “image” was seen as the control and responsibility that human beings have over the beasts of creation, “likeness” was the inner control that human beings have over their own beastly passions and savage thoughts. Thus, likeness is the way in which one is like God in virtue, gentleness, and mildness. This is how Chrysostom believed human beings were created in the beginning before the first transgression of Adam and Eve. After the first transgression, Chrysostom saw the image of God in humanity as being diminished, with the man and the woman losing most of their control or authority over creation. It is for this reason that human beings no longer have complete control of the wild beasts and why they now fear certain animals whereas in the beginning all animals feared humans.

The fact that now we have fear and dread of the wild animals and have lost control of them, I personally don't dispute; but this doesn't betray a false promise on God's part. From the beginning, you see, things were not like this; instead, the wild beasts were in fear and trembling, and responded to direction. But when through disobedience human beings forfeited their position of trust, their control was also lost.²⁴

This last phrase needs further examination. The Greek text states: “Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς παρατηροῦσας ἐξέτευ αἰ ἄν την παρακοήν, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἁγίας ἡπατηματάσθη.” The term ἡπατηματάσθη does not imply completely lost as is implied by the above English translation. The verb ἡπατηματάσειν means “to main” or “to amputate,” implying that part of the control, or to be more precise an extremity of the control has been lost.²⁵ Chrysostom continued to explain how in the beginning, God brought all the beasts, including the wild, before Adam for him to name, this being a symbol of his authority. “Hence God was wanting to teach him through this the dignity of his authority, so he entrusted to him the giving of names.”²⁶ A second example of humanity’s power over all

---

²² Ibid.
²³ Homiliae 67 in Genesin ix. 3 (PG 53. 78), “Διὰ τῶν ζων κρατεῖν καὶ περιγενεθείν, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἁγίας τούτων παραδόθη.”
²⁴ Homiliae 67 in Genesin ix. 4 (PG 53. 78), Hill, 121-22.
²⁶ Homiliae 67 in Genesin ix. 4 (PG 53. 79), Hill, 122.
creatures can be seen when examining Eve’s courage when confronted by the serpent. She stands her ground, and shows no fear, rather converses with it comfortably. 27

This courage and esteem was taken away from human beings after the first transgression. “But once sin came on the scene, there was evidently loss both of esteem and of authority.” 28 Chrysostom explains that God acted lovingly by this in order to bring humanity to repentance through retribution. “So it is out of his providential care for us that he has removed us from our position of control.” 29

However, Chrysostom did not see the control of human beings over the created order as being totally lost, but rather as maimed. Humanity still preserved partial control.

Consider now, I ask you, dearly beloved, in this instance God’s ineffable love as well. how. on the one hand, Adam infringed the whole commandment and completely broke the law. while, on the other hand, God in his loving kindness proved his goodness superior to our transgressions and did not cancel all our esteem nor remove the human being from all control. Instead, he withdrew from their control only those beings that did not have the greatest contribution to make to their livelihood, whereas the most necessary and useful creatures, which performed great service to our living, he allowed to remain in subjection and servitude. 30

Having established control as the image of God in humanity, Chrysostom proceeded to beseech his audience to strive for the likeness of God, by keeping tight control on their reasoning. 31 As was characteristic of him, Chrysostom concluded his ninth homily by presenting a moral twist to his biblical exegesis.

However. one question arises and is left unanswered in this ninth homily, that of the status of woman. Chrysostom mentioned that the naming of the animals is to be understood as a symbol of Adam’s dominion. At this point in the Genesis account, Eve had yet to be created and thus missed the opportunity given to Adam to name the animals. and thus appears not to share with Adam in his exercise of control over creation. Chrysostom addressed the creation of woman and her equal status with Adam in his tenth homily on Genesis.

27 Ibid.
28 in Genesis ix. 4 (PG 53. 78), Hill, 122.
29 Ibid., Hill, 123.
30 in Genesis ix. 4 (PG 53. 79), Hill, 123.
31 Ibid.
After a quick aside, Chrysostom proceeded in his tenth homily on Genesis to discuss the shaping of the human being.

"God made the human being; in God's image he made them; male and female he made them. God blessed them with the words, 'increase and multiply, fill the earth and gain dominion over it; have control of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven and all the cattle, the whole earth and all the reptiles creeping on the earth.'"\(^{32}\)

The expression "gain dominion" (κατακυριεύων) used in this context denotes more than authority, it means that the human being is to obtain total authority, total lordship, total power and total responsibility over all that the Lord has made. The man and the woman are to rule all responsibly, in wisdom, and have control (ὑπαγεί) over all that the Lord has made.\(^{33}\)

Chrysostom emphasized that the human being, neither the man nor the woman, had yet been created when the Lord spoke. What was imparted and then applied was the divine will of the creator, and the importance given to the being in process of creation. The greatness of control to be entrusted to the new creature was also demonstrated before the human being had yet experienced the breath of life. Once he had established the importance of the human being, and the greatness of control which God entrusted upon the human being, Chrysostom then asked of his auditors:

So why, tell me, after his words, "'Let us make a human being,'" does he now say, "'Let them have control'? Evidently he is already revealing to us at this point some mystery lying hidden. Who are to have control? Quite clearly he has spoken this way to hint at the formation of woman.\(^{34}\)

Interestingly, after making this statement, Chrysostom paused in his sermon to calm the reactions of those in his congregation surprised by his words. He then presented his case first by establishing that the scriptural words spoken of woman are prophetic in nature. He defended his view by explaining that such is the manner in which all biblical authors speak

\(^{32}\) in Genesis x. 3 (PG 53. 84), Gen. 1:27.28, where the Hebrew makes no reference to the cattle; cited in Hill. 132.

\(^{33}\) "Καὶ εὐλογήσαν αὐτούς ὁ Θεός λέγων: αὐξάνεσθε. καὶ πληθύνεσθε. καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν. καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἀρχεῖτε τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς θαλάσσης. καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν. καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς. καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπυτῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς." in Genesis x. 3 (PG 53. 84).
of things yet to happen, referring to Psalm 22:16-18 which prophecies the crucifixion of Christ, as an example. After supporting his claim that Genesis 1:27-28 can be taken prophetically, he continued to expound on the creation of woman in God’s image.

Finally let us see what he is saying in this verse, “God made the human being; in God’s image he made them; male and female he made them.” What he hinted at above when saying, “ ‘Let them have control,’” here he says more clearly, though still teaches us this cryptically, since after all he has not yet taught us about the manner of formation or told us where woman comes from. He says, “Male and female he made them.”

There can be no doubt as to the reference being made in the plural tense, for the Greek states, “Καὶ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἄρσεν καὶ ἥμα τὸποίησεν αὐτοῖς.” First, the human being is said to be in the image of God, and then the human being is referred to in the plural. Finally, the plurality of the human being is immediately explained in its being male and female. Thus, both male and female were created to share in the image of God.

Chrysostom proceeds to reinforce his interpretation of image as control, and to also ensure that his audience also realizes that woman, too, is given the position of authority as a blessing.

Behold the remarkable character of the blessing! I mean, those words, “‘Increase and multiply and fill the earth,’” anyone could see are said of the brute beasts and the reptiles alike, whereas “‘Gain dominion and have control’” are directed to the man and woman. See the Lord’s loving kindness: even before creating her he makes her sharer in this control and bestows on her the blessing. “‘Have control,’” the text says, “‘of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven and all the cattle, the whole earth and all the reptiles creeping on the earth.’” Did you notice the ineffable authority? Did you notice all created things placed under this being’s control? No longer entertain casual impressions of this rational being, but rather realize the extent of the esteem and the Lord’s benignity towards it, and be amazed at his love beyond all telling.

It seems clear from his words, that the men in Chrysostom’s audience entertained casual impressions of women, and did not view them as creatures blessed with control and

---

34 in Genesin x. 3 (PG 53. 85), Hill, 132.
35 in Genesin x. 4 (PG 53. 85).
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 in Genesin x. 4 (PG 53. 86).
authority over the created order. His words were innovative to their way of thinking, and for this reason he reinforced his statement when addressing the nourishment which God provided for all of his creatures. Chrysostom again insisted that the commandments include woman even though she had yet to be created.

"God said," the text reads, "'Lo, I have given you every crop for sowing,"’ as though the remark—even this one—is addressed to two people, despite the fact that woman is not yet produced.39

Thus, according to Chrysostom, in the beginning, woman, too, shared equal control over the created order with the man. Though not yet formed, the blessings that were given to Adam were also directed to her, as was also the commandment given to Adam to not eat of the forbidden fruit.40

However, as Chrysostom stated in his ninth homily On Genesis, as a symbol or sign of his authority over the created beasts. Adam was given the power to give each of them a name, a task that Eve did not share in as she had yet to be formed. Though he never addressed this point in his homily, Chrysostom did make every effort to stress her equal authority with the man over the created order. However, even though Chrysostom made no mention of this, after her formation Eve is also seen to exercise power in naming, as she is the one, and not Adam, to name their offspring.41

Thus, in his eighth, ninth, and tenth homilies in Homiliae 67 in Genesin (PG 53) that deal with human being's creation, John Chrysostom located the image of God in the human being in the authority that humanity was to exercise over the irrational creation. This authority was given equally in the beginning to both the man and woman, but was lost in part when the two disobeyed. For this reason, human beings are now given authority only over the domestic beasts as they are of some benefit to humanity.

In Ioannem Homiliae 1-88

In his Homilies on John (PG 59) written about 391 in Antioch, Chrysostom constantly defended the true Christian teaching of the divinity of Christ against the

39 Ibid.
40 The commandment to not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is cited in Genesis 2:15-16. The creation of woman immediately follows in Genesis 2:17-ff.
41 See Genesis 4:1, and 4:25.
Anomoeans who proclaimed that the Son of God is not even of like substance with the Father. Thus, when he made his first reference to Genesis 1:26-27, Chrysostom did not put the emphasis on the human being as being created in the image of God, but rather stressed the dialogue between the Father and Son prior to creating the human being. Chrysostom stated, “For even in the beginning He revealed the Son. “Let us make the human being in Our Image, after our Likeness.” was said to the Son.”

Thus, the image of God that human beings have is shared equally among the persons or hypostases of the Father and his Son. The Father and the Son both have equal authority, and the two human beings whom God first created, the male and the female also were created equal in authority. Later in his sixty-fourth homily on the Gospel of John, Chrysostom says that the Son has equality of honour with the Father. This stresses the sameness between the Father and the Son, and in a like manner, they who were created in God’s image would share equally in that image, and thus also share equally in the honour of that image.

In epistulam ad Romanos Homiliae 1-32

The 32 homilies on Romans (PG 60, 592-682) are also said to be one of the finest of Chrysostom’s works. As various comments made in the homilies allude to Antioch as the place of origin, it can be safely assumed that they were written between 381 and 398. Quasten suggests that they were written “most probably shortly after [Chrysostom] finished with the Gospel of St. John.”

Homily 23 is the only one in this group of treatises that makes reference to Genesis 1:26. It is an excellent and concise treatise on Christian political thought, distinguishing between the power, which is of God, and the office, which is of human invention. As it expounds very well on a point made in the beginning of this chapter with regards to power, it will do well to take a small aside to investigate Chrysostom’s position on this topic a little further.

42 In Johannem Homiliae 1-88 xxxiii. 2 (PG 59. 190). NPNF 1, xiv, 116.
43 Krupp makes a mistake in his Scripture index as he sights homily lxiv, and not homily lxiv, as making reference to Genesis 1:26.
44 In Johannem Homiliae 1-88 lxiv. 2 (PG 59. 356). NPNF 1, xiv, 238.
45 Quasten, vol 3, 443.
“For there is no power,” he says, “but of God.”… It may be said, is every ruler elected by God? I do not say this, he [St. Paul] answers. I am now not speaking about individual rulers, but about the thing in itself. For that there should be rulers, and some rule and others be ruled, and that all things should not be carried on in confusion, the people swaying like waves this direction and that, this, I say, is the work of God's wisdom. Hence he does not say “there is no ruler but from God”; but it is the thing he speaks of, and says: “There is no power but from God. And the powers that be, are ordained from God.”47

Thus, while it is the people who assign from among their own, who it is to rule over them, the authority given to the ruler, the power the ruler is to exert is divinely given. To clarify his point, Chrysostom provides the following example, saying that God instituted marriage, however, God does not join together every man that comes to be with a woman, as there are those who come together outside of marriage, and this type of union should not be ascribed to God.

Thus, to reinforce a point made earlier, the authority given to the human being in the beginning was given as a gift by God, as all power and authority are given from above. Yet, Chrysostom did not make reference to Genesis 1:26 in this homily to make this point. Genesis 1:26 is not referred to in this context to explain the meaning of image, rather, it is referred to in order to expound on the greatness of God’s love.

Chrysostom continued in this homily to address Romans 13, verse 10, “Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law,” and made reference to Genesis 1:26 when he expounded on the meaning of love.

Let us then love one another, as since in this manner we shall also love God, who loves us. For in the case of men, if you love a man who is beloved, he that loves him is contentious at it. But here He deems you worthy to share His love, and hates you when you do not share in it. For man’s love is full of envy and grudging, but God is free from all passion, from where also He seeks for those to share His love. For He says, love you me, and then yourself also will I love more. You see the words of a fervent lover! If you love my beloved, then will I also reckon myself to be greatly loved of you. For he fervently desires our salvation and this He shows from of old. Now hear what He said when He was forming the human being, “Let us make the

46 Ibid.
47 In epistulam ad Romanos Homiliae 1-32 xxiii. 4 (13:10) (PG 60.619). NPNF 1. xi, 511.
human being in Our Image” and again. “Let us make a help mate for him. It is not good for him to be alone.”

Therefore, Chrysostom saw the creation of the human being in the image of God as being solely an act of divine love as God had no need to create the world or the human being. All that he did, all that he bestowed upon his apex creature was done as an outpouring of his abounding love. Thus, in this homily, Chrysostom did not explain what the image of God is, but answered the question, why the image was given.

Likewise, the image and likeness in the human being was intended to be manifest in the human being’s love for its creator. As noted earlier in this chapter, the image in the human being is dependent upon the relationship between the creator and the creature. The creator entrusted his apex creature with power and authority to manage and rule the created world, yet this authority was not to be exercised apart from God, as it is God and God alone who gives all power.

_In epistulam I ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18_

It is believed that Chrysostom’s Homilies on the First Epistle to Timothy, _PG 62_. 501-662), were written in Antioch. Here one very short reference is made to Genesis 1:26. Yet in this small aside, Chrysostom while addressing slavery and servitude reinforced his position on natural authority as being the image of God in all human beings. He stated:

[May we] serve our God with as much zeal as servants do their master; our Maker, as faithfully as our fellow human beings serve us, from whom they have received no such gift. For they too are free by nature. To them also it was said, “Let them have dominion over the fishes.” For this slavery is not from nature: it is the result of some particular cause, or circumstances.

While saying that slavery is not natural to the human condition, the gift of God’s image to have authority, dominion, over the created order is. Unlike slavery that is the result of sin, the image of God in humanity is given equally to all human beings, regardless of their condition or situation in life. Thus, all humanity shares in this natural authority given

---

48 _In epistulam ad Romanos Homiliae 1-32_ xxiii. 4 (13:10) (_PG 60_. 619). _NPNF_ 1, xi. 515.
49 _In epistulam I ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18_ xvi. 2 (6:2) (_PG 62_. 590). _NPNF_ 1, xiii, 466.
by God. So whereas the slaves and servants obtained no gift of honour from their earthly masters, from God all have obtained the gift of his image.

In epistulam ad Titum Homiliae 1-6

In his third homily on the *Epistle to Titus* (PG 62. 663-700), presented in Antioch, Chrysostom made a very quick reference to Genesis 1:27, when explaining what it is that is unclean or sinful. While addressing the sin of fornication and adultery, Chrysostom stated that it is not the act of sexual intercourse which is sinful, but rather the act of injury each partner commits against the other, which is “subverting the laws of nature. For she ought to be the wife of one man, since it is said, “Male and female created He them.” And “the two shall be one flesh.” Not ‘those many,’ but “the two shall be one flesh.”

Chrysostom does not contradict in this passage his view that the image of God was given to both the male and female. What he does say, which will be of great importance to later chapters, is that first, the bond between a husband and wife is tight and steadfast, and second, that the spousal bond is natural.

Expositiones in psalmos 1-12, 41, 43-49, 103-106, 106-117, 119, 150

The majority of Chrysostom scholars date the addresses on these 58 selected homilies on the Psalms after Chrysostom’s ordination to the priesthood and before his move to Constantinople in 398. Interestingly, Chrysostom’s commentary on the Psalms differs from all of his other Old Testament commentaries in that he often referred to the translations of “others” rather than limiting himself to the Septuagint text. There is no question of the authenticity of *Expositiones in psalmos* (PG 55), however, as R.C. Hill explains it, “we may have to allow for the employment of a range of different stenographers on the different occasions of delivery of the commentary on individual psalms.”

Regardless of the liberties taken by his stenographers, Chrysostom’s views and opinions relating to Genesis 1:26 remained consistent. In his homily on Psalm 4,

---
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Chrysostom made reference to the creation text while reproaching those who were unjust to others. He explained to his audience that they whom they cheat are their equals, as they share in the same human essence.

Now, this stems from no other source than injustice. For proof that it is in fact injustice, think on this. God made both you and that other person, and gave you everything in common and in equal measure with them. How then do you spurn them and rob them of the regard given by God, not allowing it to be in common but making it all yours, rendering them bereft not only of money but of good name? God granted every person one nature; he regaled them with the same position of eminence, the same process of creation. That statement, “Let us make the human being,” is shared by the whole human race. How then do you deprive people of their inherited being, consigning them to utter insignificance, and appropriating to yourself what is common to all?  

Chrysostom used Genesis 1:26 to defend his belief in the equality of all human beings, and to establish that the human being’s nature is regal, as he was put in a position of authority (eminence) over all other creatures.

In his homily on Psalm 8, Chrysostom again made reference to the control given to the human being to rule over creation, as a gift of honour and glory.

*With glory and honor you have crowned them.* Another version: “With glory and dignity you will crown them.” This can be taken in both a literal and a spiritual sense. He is referring in fact to the control entrusted to human beings when they were created; he is referring also to the later benefits they enjoyed following the coming of Christ. In the beginning, remember, they heard the words, “Your ways and the dread you inspire will affect every beast on earth;” [Gen. 9:2] also, “Let them have control of the fish of the sea;” [Gen. 1:26] and later, “Walk on snakes and scorpions” [Lk.10:19].

Later in this same homily, Chrysostom made reference to Genesis 1:26 in order to prove his point that the creators of the human being are the Father and his Son. While making this point, Chrysostom indirectly made reference again to the control given to the human being.

So too the words spoken previously by Moses were spoken about the Son, namely, “In the beginning God made heaven and earth” and “Let them have

55 *in psalmos* viii. 7 (PG 55. 116-17), Hill, vol. 1, 167.
control over the fish of the sea.” [Gen. 1:26] The one, you see, who brought forth perfect praise from the mouth of infants and babes at the breast is the very one who visited the human being.56

In his homily on Psalm 12 Chrysostom referred to the status of the human being as the greatest of all creatures. He stated:

Now, what is the meaning of in your eminence? By way of saying, You made them like you, in so far as it is possible for you to be like a human being. “Let us make the human being in your image and likeness,” Scripture says, remember. In other words, what he is in heaven that we are on earth; and as no one is superior to him on high, so no one on earth is like this living being in virtue. “Be like your Father in heaven,” Scripture says.59

In his homily on Psalm 49 Chrysostom remained faithful to his interpretation of Genesis 1:26. Here the image given to the human being was again interpreted as being an honour to him and a sign of his superiority over all other creation. However, Chrysostom went further to explain that it is the human being’s intellect and rational soul that marks him as superior.

Then in explanation of this honor he adds. “You put everything under his feet, sheep and all oxen, even the flocks of the fields, the birds of the heavens and the fish of the sea, whatever passes along the paths of the sea.” [Ps. 8:5-8] This, after all, is the highest dignity, conferring on them control of all visible things, even though they had never done anything right. Without having yet made them, remember, he said, “Let us make the human being in our image and likeness.” [Gen. 1:26] Then by way of explaining “in our image,” he added, “Let them have control over the fish of the sea and the wild beasts of the earth and the birds of heaven.” This puny, three-cubit creature, so much inferior to the brute beasts in bodily strength, he made superior to them in affinity of intellect, granting them a rational soul, which is a preeminent mark of honor.61

---

56 in psalmos viii. 8 (PG 55. 116-17), Hill, vol. 1. 172.
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In his homily on Psalm 110\textsuperscript{62}, Chrysostom makes reference to Genesis 1:26 to show again how God is one by stressing the \textit{us} in “Let us make the human being in our image and likeness.”\textsuperscript{63}

Chrysostom made only one reference to Genesis 1:27 in his \textit{Expositiones in psalmos}, in his homily on Psalm 144.\textsuperscript{64} Here he again stayed true to his previous views and stated that the image of God is the “authority” given to them “over the whole of creation.”\textsuperscript{65} On this point R. C. Hill in the text \textit{St. John Chrysostom Commentary on the Psalms} also notes that Chrysostom remained consistent with his interpretation of Genesis 1:26-27 as revealed in his Homily 8 on Genesis.\textsuperscript{66}

\textit{In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum}

Chrysostom’s twenty-four homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians were most probably written in Antioch.\textsuperscript{67} The twentieth homily, which makes reference to Genesis 1:27, is Chrysostom’s moral code for married couples, and deals in depth with Chrysostom’s interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33, which will be examined in length in a subsequent chapter. What needs to be examined here is the use of the Genesis account.

... And indeed from the beginning, God appears to have made special provision for this union, and discoursing of the two as one, He said thus, “Male and female created He them;” and again, “There is neither male nor female.” For there is no relationship between man and man so close as that between man and wife, if they be joined together as they should be. ... For there is a certain love deeply seated in our nature, which imperceptibly to ourselves knits together these bodies of ours. Thus even from the very beginning, from man sprang woman, and afterwards from man and woman sprang both man and woman.\textsuperscript{68}

As in his homily on the \textit{Epistle to Titus}, so here, Chrysostom made reference to the Genesis account to stress the great unity, love, and harmony between a husband and wife.

\textsuperscript{62}Krupp in his Scripture Index numbers this particular Psalm as Psalm 109, which is consistent with \textit{PG}.
\textsuperscript{63}\textit{in psalmos} cix. 1 (PG 55. 266), Hill, vol. 2, 14 (Hill refers to this as Psalm 110).
\textsuperscript{64}Krupp in his Scripture Index numbers this particular Psalm as Psalm 143, which is consistent with \textit{PG}.
\textsuperscript{65}\textit{in psalmos} cxliii. 2 (PG 55. 458), Hill, vol. 2, 323 (Hill refers to this as Psalm 144).
\textsuperscript{66}Hill, vol. 2, 331, note 13.
\textsuperscript{67}Quasten, 447.
\textsuperscript{68}\textit{In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum} xx. 1 (PG 62. 136). \textit{NPNF} 1, xiii, 143.
Thus, if there is no relationship greater than that between a husband and wife, as Chrysostom stated, and there is no union tighter, no bond more harmonious, then the honour given to the one is also shared by the other. The image given to the one is also bestowed to the other, and the two share in the same nature, share in the same authority that was given at their formation.

Again there is no contradiction portrayed in Chrysostom’s homily On Ephesians of his understanding of image as authority, and in men and women having shared in that image at their creation.

*In Colossenses homiliae 1-12*

*The 12 Homilies on the Epistle to the Colossians (PG 62, 299-392)* were written at Constantinople in 399. The fifth and sixth homilies make reference to Genesis 1:26. The fifth homily addresses the limitation of the human intellect. While explaining how the human mind is unable to grasp the divine mysteries and is limited in its ability for comprehending things above the natural world, Chrysostom again made reference to the human being as the best creature of all of creation. He stated:

Christ is above ruling over all things: it was necessary this should be believed. The same takes place in the earth with respect to the human being. For, said He, “Let us make man after our image and likeness,” and he is appointed to the dominion of all the brutes. Thus, he instructed us, not by words, but by actions.

Christ is above ruling over all things in his divinity. Chrysostom said that Christ is with impassibility, as he alone is the Only-Begotten Son of God the Father. There is no being greater or above Christ, as there is nothing greater than God. Christ is ruler over all things due to his divine essence. And the human being created in the divine image was appointed to exercise dominion over all the brutes. As the ability to rule is not outside of the divine essence, so to it is not outside of the human condition. To have dominion is part of the human being’s nature and is innate to all human beings.

---

69 Quasten, vol. 3, 448.
The sixth homily addresses the bond upon the human being that was destroyed by Christ’s death and resurrection. Here Genesis 1:26 is compared to John 1:12-13. Chrysostom first referred to humanity’s honourable creation in the image of God, and then compared it to the even higher state given to humanity by Christ. Through Christ the human being who was so honoured in the beginning is transformed and made superior to the original state being now “sons of God.” Thus, according to Chrysostom’s views, that which was created in the beginning was good, but that which Christ’s economy brought about was better. The reference here made to Genesis 1:26 remains consistent with Chrysostom’s other accounts dealing with these verses.

In his twelfth homily on Colossians, Chrysostom dealt with the Christian marriage, condemning wedding-feasts, and showing Christ and His angels present at the marriage Sacrament.

Do you see the mystery of marriage? He made of the one, one other, and again, having made these two, one, he so makes one, so that now also man is produced of one. For man and wife are not two men, but one human being. And this may be confirmed from many sources; for instance, ... from the words, “He made them male and female.” If he is the head, and she the body, how are they two? Therefore the one holds the rank of a disciple, the other of a master, the one of a ruler, the other of a subject. Moreover, from the very fashioning of her body, one may see that they are one, for she was made from his side, and they are, as it were, two halves.

Chrysostom clearly asserted that the human being is not the man alone, or the woman alone, but as stated in Genesis 1:27, the two united together. He then alluded to Ephesians 5:21-33 where St. Paul the Apostle declared that the husband is the head of the wife and the wife is the body, and as such the two are one human being, and not two beings. It is in this sense that Chrysostom continued to refer to the head as being the master and ruler, and the body as being the disciple and subject. This title of ruler given here to the male does not negate the image of God in woman, for if the head and the body are one flesh, then the honour is given and shared by both equally.

However, in his twelfth homily on Colossians, Chrysostom made reference to the mystery of marriage after the first transgression. When speaking of the image as authority before the first transgression, Chrysostom saw both the male and the female as being equal.

---

in authority, and honor. Only after sin entered the first parents, did God punish them by taking much of the authority away from the man over the created world, and by taking the equal status that the woman once shared with her husband from her, making the woman second in authority over all. This teaching of Chrysostom’s will be examined in greater depth in later chapters. Nonetheless, even after sin entered the world, and the image of God in man and woman became maimed, the two remained one flesh, one human being, and were as Chrysostom put it “two halves.”

In Isaiah 1, 1-8, 10

John Chrysostom delivered some of his Homilies on Isaias (PG 56,97-142) in Antioch and others in Constantinople. He made reference to Genesis 1:26 in his homily On Isaiah 1, 1-8, 10, i. 2, while attempting to explain to his audience the words of the Lord spoken through the prophet. “Sons have I reared (Υἱοὺς ἐγέννησα) and brought up (καὶ ὑψωσα), but they have rebelled against me.”73 Even though this homily cannot be dated with accuracy,74 he did not contradict his early understanding of what it means for human beings to be in the image of God.

In this homily, Chrysostom emphasized the immense kindness shown by God when he bestowed upon the human race at its creation the honour of his image and likeness. However, this honoured creature fell from grace, and God, again in his kindness, elevated those who accepted his Son through baptism to become his sons by adoption (νικηθεοσα). It is in this sense that he interpreted God referring to his creation as “Sons.” “Sons” is an honourary title that should not be confused with the sonship of his only-begotten Son. The Word made flesh in the person of Jesus Christ. Chrysostom wrote:

He does not mention to them the common goodness towards all of humanity, which is birth, but the exalted goodness set aside, which is that he begot sons. For God begins everything with goodness, and as he precisely

72 In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 xii. 5 (4:18) (PG 62. 387). NPNF 1, xiii, 318-319.
73 Isaiah 1:2b. RSV
74 "Six homilies on Isaias 6 have survived in their Greek original (MG 56, 97-142). Some of them were delivered at Antioch, others at Constantinople. A complete commentary on Isaias is extant in an Armenian version and seems to be genuine. The one on Isaias 1, 1-8, 10, preserved in Greek, is probably nothing but an excerpt from homilies which the compiler stripped of their oratorical garb." Quasten, 436.
fashioned the human being, before he was even fashioned, he honored him with a distinct honor saying, “Let us create a human being in our image and likeness.” However, in the time of the New Testament he honored them with something much greater; for he honored them with the font (λουτροῦ) of re-birth not only they who did not do anything [worthy to deserve it], but they who had committed boundless evils.\footnote{In Isaiah 1, 1-8, 10 i. 2 (PG 56, 15). (All translations for In Isaiah are mine.)}

Thus, Chrysostom again interpreted the image of God in the human being as an honor bestowed upon all of humanity, at the beginning of our human existence. It was a gift intended for the human being even before his coming into existence, as God planned for the creation of humanity in advance. Also worth noting is Chrysostom’s mentioning of the goodness of God’s creations. Thus, humanity was created innately good and remained good so long as they partook of the image of God. Even after the first transgression human beings still had the image, though distorted, and thus were still viewed by Chrysostom as being good by nature.

\textit{Contra Anomoeos}

This series of twelve homilies though listed by Migne as \textit{Contra Anomoeos} (PG 48, 701-812) is in fact two separate works. The first six homilies titled \textit{On the Incomprehensible Nature of God} were written in Antioch in the fall of 386.\footnote{\textit{Ελευθ. Γ. Μερετάκης, Ἐλλνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (Θεσσαλονίκη: Γρηγόριος δ Πιλαμάς, 1984) 35, 5. Quasten states that the first five homilies comprise the first series, 451.} Of the last six homilies, \textit{On the Same Essence} (Περὶ Ὀμοούσιον), the first four were written in Antioch in 387, and the last two were written in Constantinople.\footnote{The Anomoeans were the most radical of the Arian parties who maintained that the Son’s nature was totally different and unequal to that of the Father.} It is in his eleventh homily, one of the two written in Constantinople that Chrysostom made reference to Genesis 1:26.

The writings in \textit{Contra Anomoeos} are very dogmatic and deal with the Trinitarian doctrine. Thus when referring to Genesis 1:26, Chrysostom did not attempt to expound on the honor given to the human being, rather on the nature of the giver. Chrysostom wrote:
Therefore, God wanting to form the human being said, “Let us create the human being in our image and likeness.” To whom does he speak? It is clear that he speaks to his only-begotten son. And he did not say, “You create,” in order for you not to think that it is a commandment given to a servant, but “Let us create,” so that in this manner of speaking, they reveal their one-mindedness, in order to reveal their equality.  

Chrysostom’s view of the equality between the Father and the Word is very important, as he believed the husband/wife relationship to be created after this model. As stated in our introduction, this opinion of Chrysostom’s will be expounded upon in our later chapters.

Remaining Texts

According to Krupp’s Scriptural Index, Chrysostom made reference to Genesis 1:26 in five other writings. De prophetiarum obscuritate homiliae 1-2, Fragmenta in Job, In illud: Domine non est in homine (Jer 10:23), In illud: Ne timueritis cum diues factus fuerit homo (Ps 48:17) homiliae 1-2, and In quattuoruanum Lazarum. These texts have been examined and have been found also to be consistent with Chrysostom’s other exegeses of Genesis 1:26.

Conclusions

I can conclude this section of my investigation by stating that Chrysostom remained unwaveringly consistent throughout his writings in his exegesis of Genesis 1:26-27. He faithfully believed that the image given to the human being was the image of God, and not the image of angels or other powers. He believed that this image was the power of dominion to rule over all of visible creation, and that the first parents even prior to their formation were equally given this power and authority to rule. He believed this image of God’s authority was given to the human being as an honour, or a gift. And finally, 

79 Contra Anomoeos xi. 2 (PG 48. 798). (All translations for Contra Anomoeos are mine.)
80 De prophetiarum obscuritate homiliae 1-2 ii. 5 (PG 56. 183).
81 Fragmenta in Beatum Job (PG 64. 516).
82 In illud: Domine non est in homine (Jer 10:23) 3 (PG 56. 159).
83 In illud: Ne timueritis cum diues factus fuerit homo (Ps 48:17) homiliae 1-2 i. 1 (PG 55. 501).
Chrysostom consistently believed that the image of God marks the human being as the superior or king of all visible creatures. For this reason it can thus be said that in Chrysostom’s mind image and dominion are one and the same.

Because the image was given as an innate part of the human being’s nature, the man and the woman were created to be equal co-rulers without the one having more authority than the other or over the other. Their rule was intended to be complete over all visible creatures without any exception, as the Father and Son rule completely over all.

Chrysostom consistently taught that both the male and female were to be like God in their rule. They were above all to be in control of themselves, rational, logical, in command of their passions, temperate, mild, and gentle, so as to be able to be just stewards of the kingdom that God blessed them with.

It was only as a result of the first transgression that the first man and woman had most of their power to rule taken away. The image of God in them became “amputated.” The human being from that point on was to be in fear of the wild beasts that were once subject to them. Their control to rule became diminished to a great degree, yet the human being still had some control over the domestic beasts. It is here that woman lost her equality with her husband, and became second in authority due to her transgression. However, as was noted above, Chrysostom never stated that the woman lost all her authority, but rather claimed that she is second in authority only after her husband. He consistently maintained that the woman also possessed equal rule over the domestic beasts with the man.

Having established Chrysostom’s understanding of image, we are now able to proceed to the main task at hand, which is to examine how Chrysostom dealt with the seeming controversy over gender status as revealed in three pericopes of the Pauline epistles, Galatians 3:28, which appears to be liberating, with 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Ephesians 5:21-33, which appear discriminatory.

---
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Chrysostom believed that in the beginning of the human being’s creation, both man and woman were created equal. Due to the first transgression woman lost her equal status with the man and has been subject to him ever since. Yet, Chrysostom in his first homily, *On Isaiah 2* (PG 56. 15) also taught that for those who believed and were baptized in Christ, Christ did not merely elevate them back to the original place of honour, but elevated them even higher as children of God.  

Thus, those who have put on Christ through baptism have obtained the honourable status of son/daughtership through adoption before the Father.

He does not mention to them the common goodness towards all of humanity, which is birth. but the exalted goodness set aside, which is that he begot sons. For God begins everything with goodness, and as he precisely fashioned the human being, before he was even fashioned, he honored him with a distinct honor saying, “Let us create a human being in our image and likeness.” However, in the time of the New Testament he honored them with something much greater; for he honored them with the font (λουσού) of re-birth not only they who did not do anything [worthy to deserve it], but they who had committed boundless evils.

Chrysostom stated that the greater honour given to the human being was with the coming of Christ, who made it possible for those who believed to become the adoptive children of God. Where Isaiah spoke of this prophetically, Paul in his epistle to the Galatians 3:26-28 spoke of this as a present reality. He wrote:

For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, were clothed in Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

---

1 See Chapter 2, 80, note 75.
2 *In Isaiah 1*, 1-8, 10 i. 2 (PG 56. 15). (All translations for *In Isaiah* are mine.)

Πάντες γάρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Ὀσοὶ γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεύσασθε. Οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (All New Testament translations in this chapter are mine unless otherwise stated.)
This profound statement in Paul’s letter to the Galatians raises a serious question. If Christ has elevated the human being to a position greater than that honored position given in the beginning and if those who have been baptized have the status of son/daughtership before God, then in Chrysostom’s opinion, has the original image of God in these human beings also been fully restored? Has the human being, in addition to obtaining the greater honor of son/daughtership also re-obtained the fullness of the original gift of God, the authority to rule once again all of creation? If the answer is yes, then does he also believe that baptized women are equal in this power of authority with baptized men? Did Chrysostom understand Paul’s “there is neither male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus” to mean that the balance of authority that once existed between men and women has been restored? Did Chrysostom believe that Paul taught that gender distinctions no longer exist in Christ?

As I will show, Chrysostom did not believe that baptism restored the original image of God in the human being to its pre-fallen state. That first gift given to humanity was damaged and remained in its damaged state. However, he believed that what was given at baptism was a new and better gift. He believed that what was given was a new “image,” that of the son/daughtership of Christ. Where the original image made the human beings stewards with power to govern God’s earthly creation, baptism made the human beings children of God the Father, and co-heirs with Christ for his spiritual kingdom. Thus, in this world, men and women still had limited power to rule over the beasts, and woman still remained second in authority. However, in the spiritual world, both were equal in honor and standing before their Father in Heaven. Both have the same probability for obtaining salvation. The old world with its evils and distortions will someday fall away, but the new world, the spiritual world, which is promised to all who are baptized, will live on forever. Baptism is the means through which entrance may be obtained to this new and better place. and it is a place to which all, whether they be “Jew or Greek, free or slave, male and female” are invited.

Chrysostom interpreted Galatians 3:28 as referring to the new world, the spiritual world. He did not interpret Paul referring to a change in the social condition in the earthly realm, but describing the condition in the spiritual one. Thus, people were still to be identified in their cultural differences, in their social condition, and in their particular
gender. These would not change. however. Chrysostom did believe, that for those who were
baptized and co-heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven, these social-economic and gender
distinctions were not to be considered as barriers to their relationships. Greek Christians
were as blessed as Jewish Christian. Christian masters must treat their Christian slaves and
servants with brotherly love and respect. Christian men must be considerate to their wives
and vice versa. The distinctions remained yet for Chrysostom the attitude that society had
towards these subservient groups was not to remain.

However, before any investigation of Chrysostom’s homilies expressing these views
can begin. Paul’s pericope in Galatians needs to be examined first in context in order to
establish a foundation of understanding. As modern contemporary scholarship has used
this pericope of Paul’s to argue both for and against the abolition of gender distinction. I
have selected opinions that I believe are relevant for this investigation. This chapter will
then proceed to examine Chrysostom’s exegesis of Galatians 3:28. Interestingly he avoids
using this pericope to make a statement on gender. This chapter will then conclude by
examining all of Chrysostom’s references to Galatians 3:28 to see if Chrysostom remained
consistent in his views relating to this pericope.

Paul’s Teaching of a New Creation through Baptism

Paul’s letter to the Galatians asserts that a Gentile can be a full Christian through
baptism without first becoming a Jew through circumcision. This letter was prompted by
the arrival of Jewish-Christians in the community founded by Paul in Galatia. These Jewish
Christians insisted that Christianity was intricately connected with Judaism, and as such was
also under Jewish Law. They also advocated that baptism in the name of Christ and the gift
of the Holy Spirit were insufficient for salvation, a teaching that directly contradicted the
gospel preached by Paul. Interpreting this position as an open attack not only upon the

---

4 It was at the strong recommendation of the Late Rev. Dr. John Egan, who was initially
on my thesis committee, that contemporary examinations of the biblical pericopes
examined in this thesis precede any examination of Chrysostom’s commentaries upon
them.

5 The selection of contemporary scholars used in this chapter was based in part on the
direction of Professor L. E. Vaage while I was a student attending his Liberating Paul
course in 1993.

gospel but also upon his apostolic authority, Paul wrote the epistle which Alice Parmelee has described as "the Magna Carta of Christian freedom."7

Within this context, this dispute over the rite of initiation into the Christian community, and the role of the Mosaic Law, Paul made his profound statement regarding the status of baptized human beings regardless of race, social position or gender.

Paul viewed the establishment of a relationship of son/daughtership with God as necessary for salvation. The purpose of the Law according to Galatians 3:248, was to prepare the young children of God for the coming of the Messiah and their inheritance. Thus, Paul compared the law to a "παιδευτής" a "schoolmaster" (KJV), a "custodian" (RSV), or to "one put in charge" (NIV) who leads us to Christ.

In Greco-Roman society, the young son of a wealthy father would often be entrusted to a pedagogue for his schooling. During this time, the student would be under his pedagogue’s authority until he reached maturity. Ready to act as a mature son, he would at this time be under his father’s authority. For Jews and Greeks in the ancient world, the mature son, and not the young boy, possessed a full relationship of sonship with the father. for the mature son would act on behalf of his father and assume his father’s responsibility. "Becoming a full son, then, meant entering into a position of maturity."9

According to Paul, the Law as pedagogue is no longer in authority over Christians, as the Messiah has come and has brought the human race to the age of maturity. For Christians now established in a relationship of son/daughtership with God, returning to the Law, the pedagogue, is viewed by Paul as a step back to a life of immaturity. The issue, therefore, is the spiritual growth of the individual as a mature child of God, the relationship with God that this maturity imparts, and how this affects each and every individual.

Thus, Paul began by first establishing the maturity of believers in Christ who "are no longer under a custodian." which is "the Law" since "in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God through faith."10 He then proceeded to address what occurs to one who undergoes baptism:

7 Parmelee. 62.
8 "Therefore the law has become our tutor [schoolmaster] leading us to Christ, so that we might be justified by faith."
10 Galatians 3:23-26. Προ τού δὲ ἐλθεῖ τὴν πίστιν. ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα, συγκέκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀτοκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. Ὡστε ὁ
“For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”

To “put on Christ” is then explained as having all the various forms of restrictions to one’s relationship with God taken away. For this reason, Paul stated that there is “neither Jew nor Greek, ... slave nor free, ... male and female” since “you are all one in Christ Jesus.”

Paul then concluded by portraying the contradistinction between the baptized Christian’s relationship with God, and the relationship that existed while the law was in force.

For Paul, the rite of initiation into son/daughtership with God, and therefore into a relationship with God, is the rite of baptism. A Christian becomes a mature son/daughter through baptism, while a Jew becomes placed under the pedagogical law through circumcision. Paul asserts that as far as relationship with God is concerned, baptism in Christ provides the same as circumcision and observance of the Mosaic Law. He stated that if the Galatians allowed themselves to be circumcised, then they would have to observe the whole law, and Christ would be of no value to them. “Look. I Paul say to you that if you get circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing.” Paul even accused his opponents of not observing the law in its totality. “For not even the circumcised ones themselves keep the law, but they wish you to be circumcised so that they may boast in your flesh.”

In other words, only baptized Gentiles and circumcised Jews—who observe the whole law—obtain the same status with God. However, it is humanly impossible for one to observe the Mosaic Law in its totality. It is inevitable that those circumcised under the law will always

---

νόμος παιδαγωγός ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθήμεν. Ἔλθον δὲ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἔσμεν. Πάντες γὰρ υἱὸι Θεοῦ ἐστίν ἐκάθεν τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσραήλ.

Galatians 3:27. Ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτισθήτε, Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε.


Ὅτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις οὐδὲ Ἑλληνικ οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἁρσεὰν καὶ θηλυκὰ πάντες γὰρ υἱόι εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσραήλ.


14 Galatians 5:2-3.

Τὁδε, ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέω γιὰ ὑμᾶν ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οἰκεῖτε ὑφελήσει. Μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτέμνομένω ὅτι ὅφειλήτες ἐστίν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι.


Ὀδεῖ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνημένοι αὐτῷ νόμον φυλάσσοντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις υἱόσι τοῦ νόμου ποιῆσαι.


Clark, 141.
fall short. Thus, the circumcised could never reach the same status before God as those baptized in Christ. It is this issue of status that makes verse 28 the crux of Paul’s liberation, for it is only through baptism and faith in Christ Jesus, that this mature son/daughtership and the status it gives is attainable. Paul’s principal assertion is in his statement: “For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.”

This new status is obtained not by adhering to the pedagogical law, but through baptism where Paul states: all are one with Christ, have entered into union with Christ, and have entered into Christ (my italics). “What Christ is (the mature son of God), you have now become in virtue of belonging to his body.” Observing the law as the means to right standing before God is seen by Paul as a form of committing oneself to servitude or slavery. Paul stated: “Therefore you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, [then] also an heir of God through Christ.”

Paul did not profess that circumcision or the law is in any way evil or opposed to the promises of God; rather, its purpose of preparing for the Messiah had been fulfilled with the coming of Christ, and adhering to it after the fulfillment is to bind oneself in sin and slavery. “Therefore is the Law against the promises of God? Let it not be! For if a law was given which was able to give life, truly by the law, righteousness would have been given.”

Paul’s argument, therefore, was that circumcision and the law must no longer be seen as the means of obtaining right standing before God and salvation. To emphasize the certainty that circumcision for the baptized Christian is null and void, Paul concluded his letter to the Galatians stating: “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision means anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creation.”

17 Galatians 3:26. Πάντες γὰρ νῦν Θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
18 Clark, 142.
19 Galatians 4:7. Ὑπὸ οὐκετί εἶ δοῦλος ἄλλος νῦν, εἰ δὲ νῦν, καὶ κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ.
22 Galatians 6:15. Ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτω περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὕτω ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καὶ κόσμῳ κτίσεως.
This new creation brought about by baptism is the liberating component of Paul's Christian message. Becoming a new creation is not only for those bound to the law, but also for those who under the law are not permitted or unable to obtain right standing before God. Such were the Gentiles (heathen), slaves, and women. The special significance of baptism over circumcision is that baptism is an initiation rite that all may participate in directly.

Circumcision and participation in the covenant of Israel is directly open only to Jewish free males. Women participate indirectly in this covenant through these circumcised men.\textsuperscript{23} Such circumstances naturally put women in a status lower than these men. The status of mature son/daughtership in the new creation, however, is open to all regardless of race, social status or gender, through baptism and faith in Christ Jesus. "The woman, then, comes into the covenant relation of God's people through her own faith and baptism, and is fully part of the covenant relationship with God."\textsuperscript{24}

The Christian Judaizers who were causing dissension in Galatia not only advocated circumcision but the Jewish observance of special days, months, seasons and years.\textsuperscript{25} which also had direct implications upon the status of women within the Christian community, as the observances of these periodic times would reinforce women's secondary and inferior position. Under such regulations not only could women not participate directly in the covenant as they were not circumcised, but menstruation could and often would render them unclean at an inopportune moment. If circumcision and observance of the law in its totality were required for salvation, then how could women be saved when they were prevented from adhering to these requirements due to their biological make-up? "The answer may have been the one offered in rabbinic Judaism – they must marry and bear children and thus by their connection to a circumcised husband (or son) assume a place in the covenant community."\textsuperscript{26}

It is no wonder then, that circumcised Jewish men recite this morning prayer which can be dated back to the first century and possibly even earlier:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe.
who hast not made me a Gentile (heathen).
Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe.

\textsuperscript{23} Hopko, 176; Clark. 141.
\textsuperscript{24} Clark, 141.
\textsuperscript{25} Galatians 4:10.
\textsuperscript{26} Witherington, 595.
who hast not made me a slave.
Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe,
who hast not made me a woman.\textsuperscript{27}

This prayer, which appears to be extremely prejudiced, arrogant, and misogynistic, needs to be understood within the context of the Mosaic Law. To clarify any misinterpretations of this prayer, a comment found in the Tosefta on the above prayer by a second-century rabbi will be examined. It states as follows:

Rabbi Jehuda said. One must speak three praises every day:
Blessed be God that he has not made me a Gentile!
Blessed be God that he has not made me a woman!
Blessed be God that he has not made me a boor!

Blessed be God that he has not made me a Gentile: “because all Gentiles are nothing before him” (Jer. 40:17).
Blessed be God that he has not made me a woman: because woman is not obligated to fulfill the commandments.
Blessed be God that he has not made me a boor: because a boor is not ashamed to sin.\textsuperscript{28}

It can be clearly seen, by examining this comment of Rabbi Jehuda, that the preference to being male over female was not due to any prejudiced feelings towards women, but due to the fact that women were “unable” and thus not required to keep the commandments. The underlying issue is the same with all three of the pairs. Jew/Gentile, free/slave, male/female. One’s status as a full member of the worshipping community of God is directly determined by whether or not one is a born Israelite, free, and male.

This issue of status in the world of Paul becomes quite interesting when one considers those who were not born Israelites but were converts to the faith. These proselytes, though male and free, did not have the same status under the law as the born Israelites, even if they had undergone circumcision. Slaves also were not looked upon as full Israelites, and were not obliged to fulfill all conditions of the law. This was probably due to the restrictive nature of their service. A notable modification in the Tosefta prayer mentioned above is the substitution of “boor” for “slave” in reference to those who did not follow the law according to the Rabbinic rules.\textsuperscript{29} Women, too, as mentioned above, were

\textsuperscript{27} S. Singer, \textit{Authorized Daily Prayer Book} (London, 1939), 5-6, quoted in Clark, 145.
\textsuperscript{28} For a further analysis on this prayer see Clark, 146ff.
\textsuperscript{29} Clark, 147.
not obligated to keep all of the commandments, specifically those concerning worship and public ritual, due to the ritual impurity laws. Thus, the above prayer of the free male Israelite is a prayer of thanksgiving for being qualified and commanded to assume the full set of responsibilities before God.\(^{30}\)

In Galatians, Paul obliterate all such status structures before God. The distinctions that the Law created no longer can be applied in the same way, as they were meant for a time of spiritual immaturity. Full son/daughtership through faith in Christ Jesus means that Jew or Greek, slave or free, male and female are all one people in Christ, through their baptism, and can therefore worship him fully, sharing in the same relationship.\(^{31}\) So strong is Paul’s conviction in humanity’s liberation in Christ, that he made parallel statements using the same pattern in both Col. 3:10-11 and 1 Cor. 12:13. These texts and verses deal with the same theme (being made righteous by grace through faith in Christ), and thus support the interpretation that comes from a reading of the document itself.\(^{32}\) Thus, observing all three passages will emphasize the importance of the “societal-leveling quality of baptism.”\(^{33}\)

**Gal. 3:27-28**

For as many of you as were baptized, into Christ, were clothed in Christ. There is no Jew nor Greek, there is no slave nor free man, there is no male and female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

\[\text{Ὁσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε. Οὐκ ἐν ἰουδαίος οὐδὲ Ἑλλήν, οὐκ ἐν δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἐν ἀρσεν καὶ ἥδη· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἑστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.}\]

**Col. 3:10-11**

and having put on the new [man] the one that is being renewed in full knowledge according to the image of the one having created it, where there is not Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free human being, but Christ is all and in all.

---

\(^{30}\) Clark, 148.

\(^{31}\) Hopko, 176-177.

\(^{32}\) Hopko, 177. Hopko also makes reference to a parallel verse in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

For also by one Spirit we all were baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we were all given to drink into one Spirit.

All three of these parallel passages share three elements in common. They clearly demonstrate the radical change one undergoes through baptism: the destruction of barriers between paired groups, and the proclamation of unity in the one body of Christ. The repetition of these elements is a good indication that they are part of an early Christian baptismal formula that Paul used to emphasize the equality of all human beings before God. The conclusion remains the same. Baptism is the rite that nullifies social distinctions and levels status structures, promoting all Christians to the position of son/daughtership, sharing an equal relationship with God, their Father.

The Contemporary Debate

At this point, another key question needs to be asked: by stressing the leveling of status structures through baptism, did Paul also mean to eliminate the distinctions that exist between the pairs themselves? More specifically, did Paul also advocate that all social expressions and symbols between men and women be removed? Is woman again equal in authority with man? Has the image been restored?

Of the three parallel passages constituting a baptismal formula sighted above, only Galatians 3:28 makes use of the male/female pair in its rhetorical context. However, it is not so much the use of this pair in the baptismal formula that is significant to the issue of gender, as is this pair’s breaking the symmetry of the pairs within the formula by using καί.

34 Scroggs, 292.
rather than the expected η between ἄρσεν and θηλύς. This could very possibly be due to Paul’s making a conscious parallel between the status of men and women after baptism with that which they had before the first transgression. One cannot ignore that Genesis 1:27 in the Septuagint uses the same phrase when referring to the creation of humanity in two distinct modes of existence, male and female, in the image and likeness of God: “And God created the human being, in the image of God he created them, male (ἄρσεν) and female (θηλύ) he created them.”

Hopko states that he is uncertain of the reason for the καί with male and female, however, he does offer the possibility that it “may signify that unlike Jew and Greek, and slave and free, male and female, as ontological categories, can never be considered apart from each other.”

Male and female together compose the human being.

Witherington argues that the very use of the terms ἄρσεν καί θηλύ (male and female) is to emphasize gender distinction. He notes that these terms are more emphatic than the more common ἄνηθορ ἢ ἄνδρος for “man” and γυνή or γυναικός for “woman”.

Clark states that “‘male’ and ‘female’ refer to human beings precisely in their sexual differentiation, not to their social roles as the equivalent words ‘man’ and ‘woman’ more readily would in Greek and Hebrew.” Had it been truly Paul’s intention to obliterate sexual distinctions, it would be highly unlikely that he would have used the emphatic terms in reference to men and women. Even so, there are those who would argue that the emphasis is on the obliteration, rather than the distinction. Thus, one must go beyond “there is no male and female” in order to clarify this issue.

In none of his epistles did Paul claim that gender distinctions are obliterated in Christ; however, Paul did make numerous references to the necessity and importance of gender distinction. So emphatic was he on this point that Paul provided symbols in the

---

35 Scroggs. 292; and Witherington. 597.
36 Genesis 1:27. και έποίησεν ο θεός τον άθρωπον και έίκόνα θεού έποίησεν αυτόν άρσεν και θηλύ έποίησεν αυτούς.
37 Hopko. 169, note 1.
39 Clark. 159.
community which represent such distinctions, such as the head covering of women in 1 Cor. 11:2-16.41

As Robin Scroggs remarks, Paul had written his own commentary on Gal. 3:28, where he left no doubt as to his judgement on the issue of sexual distinctions. Scroggs states:

This is found in 1 Cor. 7:17-27, where he discusses the pairs in precisely the same order as they appear in Galatians. In verses 17-19 the issue is the physical distinction of circumcision (Greek/Jew). In verses 19-21 the question is the slave and his freedom (slave-free). In verse 27 the subject is marriage (male-female). In all cases, Paul's answer is, in effect, that the distinctions should remain. The marks of circumcision or uncircumcision should be left unchanged: the slave should accept his servitude; the marriage relation should remain as it is. Just here Paul enters an explicit qualification: if a person wishes to marry, he may. The end of male dominance in no way brings with it the end of sexuality.42

Scroggs examines the male/female pair in Gal. 3:28 together with the other two pairs. Scroggs believes that if it can be shown that Paul advocated not only the obliteration of gender distinctions, but also of national and social distinctions within the same context, then one could validly argue for the obliteration of gender distinctions on the basis of consistency within Paul's argument. Scroggs believes that in this way he can successfully argue against the obliteration of sexual distinctions.

S. Clark agrees with Scroggs that Paul does not advocate the obliteration of sexual distinctions. However, he emphatically points out that one cannot use this line of argument, as these three relationship pairs have only one thing in common: the status distinctions in one's relationship with God according to the Mosaic Law. If one takes these three-paired relationships and examines them beyond the scope of the Gal. 3:28 context, one will be able to find both strengths and weaknesses for both sides of the argument.43 Clark states that on the one hand Paul "insists that Jews and Gentiles live together in spiritual communion in daily life (From. 14:1-15; Gal. 2:11-14)" which supports the abolition of national/ethnic distinctions.44 Yet, on the other hand, "...in the light of modern biblical scholarship it seems clearer that the early Jewish Christians continued to follow the Mosaic Law because they were Jews (Acts 21: 17-26)" which supports the position that Paul intended to uphold the

41 Witherington, 598.
42 Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 293.
43 See Clark, Man and Woman in Christ, 156ff.
distinctions. Paul did not abolish all differences between Jews and Gentiles, yet it could be argued that the abolition of these differences was his long-term goal. On the basis of Acts 21, however, this seems improbable. That which is clear is that Gal. 3:28 advocates that in Christ “there is a spiritual partnership in brotherly love between circumcised Jews and uncircumcised Gentiles.”

The slavery issue is equally complex. Paul did not draw the conclusion from Gal. 3:28 that slavery in society should be abolished, or that the ordered structure in society should be changed. What Gal. 3:28 does state is that Christians living within this order regardless of their social position are equal in the sight of God, and should therefore relate to each other in fellowship and brotherhood. Yet, when examined with other passages regarding slavery, the point must be made that Paul did encourage those under the yoke of slavery to take advantage of any opportunity leading to their freedom (1 Cor. 7:21), supporting heavily the argument for the abolition of slavery. Thus, it can be said that the view which Gal. 3:28 presents in regard to slavery does give adequate support for its abolition. Nonetheless, Clark does not see any logical connection between the abolition of slavery, a humanly created institution, and that of gender (male/female) an innate mode of existence created by God in the beginning. He argues that the very use of the word καί between ἁγνότης and θηλάτιν不同类型 breaks the parallelism that would otherwise go beyond that of religious equality that is the only parallel that does exist between the three pairs.

Witherington argues that the distinction that Paul does reject is that of cleanliness and uncleanness in one’s relationship before God. This rejection does have social implications: “namely that women, [slaves] and Gentiles could not be excluded from the worship and practices of the community at any time because of ritual uncleanness. The fact that social, racial and sexual distinctions should not be used as an excuse to keep one from Christ does not mean that they should not exist. Thus, Gal. 3:28 cannot be used to argue for the obliteration of gender distinctions.

44 Ibid., 156.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid., 159.
48 Hopko, 169, note 1; 180-81. note 13.
49 Witherington. 601.
50 Ibid.
Hopko also agrees that Paul did not intend to obliterate gender distinctions. In his article he states:

In the context of the letter, and of the Pauline corpus and the apostolic scriptures generally, the statement that "there is no male and female; for you are all one in Christ" can hardly be understood as teaching that grace, faith, baptism and unity in Christ have removed all distinctions between male and female and have rendered their differences irrelevant to all aspects of spiritual life and service.\(^{51}\)

That which Gal. 3:28 does is uphold that men and women are equals in dignity, as both through baptism obtain the status of son/daughtership before God. However, this gift of becoming adoptive children of God through baptism in Christ does not negate the fact that in the beginning the human being created in the image and likeness of God transgressed and had the gift of the image diminished. Baptism does not provide humanity with an improved or greater power to govern the created earthly world. Baptism gives a different gift, a greater honor surpassing that first gift that gave humanity power to rule an earthly realm. Baptism does not make the human being a ruler, but an adopted child of God. Baptized human beings become members of a new creation, and their new gift is spiritual, and though they continue to live in this fallen material world, they are no longer of it. It is for this reason that even after the resurrection of Christ the world on earth remained the same: human beings still had limited authority over the beasts, and woman was still subject to man. The original gift of the image given to all human beings still remained in its diminished form. However, there is a new image for baptized men and women are equal before God their Father. In the new creation, there is no distinction in status, for all are one in Christ Jesus. The Christian wife is called to willingly subject herself to her husband, as Christ willingly in his freedom is obedient to his Father.

Chrysostom's exegesis of Paul's Letter to the Galatians concurs with modern Christian scholarship in that Chrysostom understood Galatians 3:28 as referring to the gift of the new creation in Christ. As will be examined below, Chrysostom did not analyze the male and female pairing in this verse to support the position that "neither male and female" advocates for the abolition of gender distinctions. Chrysostom interpreted Paul to mean that

\(^{51}\) Hopko, 180.
gender distinctions were to remain in tact. However, the relationship between baptized males and females was now viewed as being equal before God.

**Chrysostom's Exegesis of Gal. 3:28**

Chrysostom presented his homilies on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians while still in Antioch. In his third homily Chrysostom addressed the differences between being a follower of the Law, and being a child of God through adoption. He clarified Galatians 3:25-26 for his auditors, saying:

The Law then, as it was our schoolmaster, and we were kept shut up under it, is not the adversary but the fellow-worker of grace; but if when grace is come, it continues to confine us, it becomes its adversary, and by confining those who ought to go forward to grace, then it is the destruction of our salvation. If a candle which gave light by night, kept us, when it became day, from the sun, it would injure and not benefit us; and so doth the Law, if it stands between us and greater benefits. Those then are the greatest traducers of the Law, who still keep it, just as a schoolmaster makes a youth ridiculous, by retaining him with himself, when time calls for his departure. Hence Paul says, *But after faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster*. We are then no longer under a schoolmaster, *for you are all the children of God*. Wonderful! See how mighty is the power of Faith, and how he unfolds as he proceeds! Before, he showed that it made them sons of the Patriarch, *Know you therefore, says he, the children of God by faith, which is in Christ Jesus*: by Faith, not by the Law. Then in regard of its great and wonderful nature, he names also the mode of their adoption.  

Chrysostom therefore, believed that something new, better and different was to occur to human beings once they were baptized in Christ, for the power of faith made human beings children of God the Father through adoption. The power of authority to rule over creation had only made human beings stewards in the image of their Creator. The relationship therefore that existed in the beginning, though an honorable one, was not to be compared to the greater relationship of son/daughtership that was made possible through baptism.

---

52 *Commentarius in Epist. ad Galatas* (PG 61. 611-682).  
53 Quasten, vol. 3. 446.  
54 *Commentarius in Epist. ad Galatas* 3 (PG 61. 611-682), translation taken from "Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. and Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians" *LFC* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1840), 60 with some adjustments.
It can be seen through numerous of his writings that Chrysostom did not dispute that men and women are equals in dignity and honor,\(^5\) for he maintained the absolute ontological sameness of the two, since both share in the identical human nature. He stated that woman is "of the same substance as man."\(^6\) He referred to the creation of humanity and further stated, "For man and wife are not two men \(\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\tau\omicron\omicron\), but one Man \(\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\)."\(^7\) Chrysostom on commenting on Galatians 3:28, further emphasized the human nature that is shared equally by both men and women is also equally shared by Christ.

*You are all One in Christ Jesus,* that is, you all have one form \(\mu\omicron\omicron\rho\omicron\phi\iota\eta\nu\) and one \(\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\) mold \(\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\), that of Christ.\(^8\)

Significantly, though Chrysostom did address in other homilies the equality shared not only by men and women but of all peoples,\(^9\) in his commentary on Galatians 3:28, he made no direct reference to the new status in which male and female were to share equally before God. The male and female pair is completely omitted.

See what an ardent soul! For having said, *We are all made children of God through Faith,* he does not stop there, but tries to find something more exact, which may serve to convey a still closer oneness with Christ. Having said, *you have put on Christ,* even this does not suffice Him. But by way of penetrating more deeply into this union, he comments on it thus: *You are all One in Christ Jesus,* that is, you have all one form and one mould, even Christ’s. What can be more awful than these words! He that was a Greek, or Jew, or bond-man yesterday, carries about with him the form, not of an Angel or Archangel, but of the Lord of all, yes displays in his own person the Christ.\(^10\)

---

\(^5\) See *Homiliae in 2 Epist. ad Corinthios,* xxvi (PG 61. 215), for translation of this text see NPNF 1. xii. 150: *In Epist. ad Ephesios,* xx (PG 62. 142), NPNF 1. xiii. 148: and *In Epist. ad Ephesios* x (PG 62. 75), NPNF 1. xiii. 99.

\(^6\) *In Epist. ad Ephesios* xxxiv (PG 61. 290), NPNF 1. xii. 204.

\(^7\) *In Epist. ad Colossenses* xii (PG 62. 387-388), NPNF 1. xiii. 318.

\(^8\) *Commentarius in Epist. ad Galatas* III (PG 61. 656), NPNF 1. xiii. 30.

\(^9\) *Whether bond or free, whether Greeks or barbarians or Scythians, unlearned or learned, female or male, children or old men, in honor or dishonor, rich or poor, rulers or private persons, all. He says. are deemed worthy of the same privilege. For faith and the grace of the Spirit, removing the inequality caused by worldly kings, has molded them all into one form, and stamped them with one impress, the King’s.* In *Iohannem Homiliae 1-88,* x (PG 59. 75), translation by NPNF 1. xiv. 36.

\(^10\) *Commentarius in Epist. ad Galatas* III (PG 61. 656-658), NPNF 1. xiii. 30 with some adjustments.
Chrysostom’s omission of the male and female pair could be misunderstood, and lead to his being accused of not recognizing the spiritual regeneration of women. However, after close examination, one will note that though the male and female pair is not mentioned in this commentary, the actual complete text of Paul is recited prior to Chrysostom’s analysis of it. Also of significance is his omission of the free-man, leaving the bond/free pairing incomplete. The fact that Chrysostom passed over the male/female pairing in this context does not necessarily mean that it was an intentional omission. The fact that Chrysostom did include and analyze the male/female pairing in other homilies, as noted above, confirms that Chrysostom is not deliberately shying away from the issue at hand. Rather, this omission should be understood that the free-man, the male and the female are also included in his argument, and their inclusion is to be understood. To make certain, however, that this is indeed the case, it is important to examine at this point all of Chrysostom’s references to Galatians 3:28.61

In Colossenses homiliae 1-12

As stated in the second chapter, Chrysostom’s In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 (PG 62, 299-392) were composed in Constantinople in 399. Chrysostom made reference to Galatians 3:28 as well as to Genesis 1:26 in his sixth homily.62 In his twelfth homily, he referred to Galatians 3:28 and Genesis 1:27.63 A connection exists between the creation account in Genesis of the human being, male and female, and the new creation account through baptism in Galatians. It is for this reason, that I will examine Chrysostom’s homilies on Colossians first.

In his sixth homily, Chrysostom described the difference between these two types of creation. He stated:

For he comes not to be instructed merely: but to wrestle, and to be exercised: he is advanced to another creation. For when he confessed (his belief) in the life everlasting, he confessed a second creation. He took dust from the earth, and formed man: but now, dust no longer, by the Holy Spirit: with this he is formed, with this harmonized, even as Himself was in the womb of the

61 See Appendix B for all of Chrysostom’s references to Galatians 3:28 as cited by Krupp in his Scripture Index.
62 In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 vi. 4 (PG 62. 343).
63 In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 xii. 5 (PG 62. 387).
Virgin. He said not in Paradise, but ‘in Heaven.’ For deem not that, because
the subject is earth, it is done on earth; he is removed thither, to Heaven.
there these things are transacted, in the midst of Angels: God takes up your
soul above, above He harmonizes it anew. He places you near to the Kingly
Throne. He is formed in the water, he receives spirit instead of a soul. And
after he is formed He brings to him not beasts, but devils, and their prince.
and says, Tread upon serpents and scorpions. He said not. Let Us make man
in our image, and after our likeness, [Gen. 1:26] but what? He gives them to
become the sons of God, who were born, he said, not of blood, but of God.
... The plain falls not on your sight, you see not tree, nor fountain, but
straightway you take into you the Lord Himself. you are mingled with His
Body, you are intermixed with that Body that lies above, whither the devil
cannot approach. No woman is there, for him to approach, and deceive as
the weaker; for it is said, there is neither female, nor male. [Gal. 3:28] If you
go not down to him, he will not have power to come up where you are: for
you are in Heaven, and Heaven is unapproachable by the devil.64

Chrysostom made it very clear that the two creations were in effect two very distinct
and different worlds. The new creation was not a restoration of the old, but something
different and set apart. The first creation remains as it is. The image of God remains in its
“amputated” state. Paradise remains forever lost, but heaven is now gained. The new gift
given to the human being is the gift of the Spirit making both men and women children of
God. Woman remains on earth second in authority, but through the gift of baptism. she is
placed in heaven where there are no distinctions: where there is no weaker sex, and the devil
has no power over her or the man.

In this homily, Chrysostom did make reference to the male/female pair in Gal. 3:28.
However, he made it clear that there is no male and female in heaven. He made no
reference to any changes on earth abolishing the distinctions between men and women.

In his twelfth homily On Colossians. Chrysostom condemned the abuses that
occurred at marriage festivities. He proclaimed that at a Christian marriage Christ himself
with his angels were present. He made reference to Galatians 3:28 while defending the life
of modesty. He asked his audience:

Why disgrace you the virgin estate? For if you are such as this, the same
will the bridegroom suspect her to be. If you wish to have men in love with
you, this is the part of saleswomen, green-grocers, and handicrafts-people. Is
not this a shame? To act unseemly is a shame even though it is a king’s

64 In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 vi. 4 (PG 62. 343). LFC vol. 14, 253-254 with some
adjustments.
daughter. For does her poverty stand in the way? or her course of life? Even if a virgin is a slave, let her abide in modesty. *For in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free.*

What Chrysostom was defending was the call of all people regardless of wealth, or stature to live a moral life becoming a Christian. As all who were baptized in Christ were considered princes and princesses of the heavenly kingdom, they were called to live an honorable life regardless of their position on earth. Both men and women were to live moral, virginal lives prior to their marriage, and at their wedding celebration, conduct themselves in a modest and shameless manner.

Chrysostom did not mention the male/female pairing in this homily even though he addressed the issue of marriage. The reference to Galatians 3:28 was to make a point regarding one’s status as a Christian belonging to heaven, not regarding one’s position as a man or woman on this earth.

In the next paragraph in this homily, Chrysostom explained that marriage for the Christian was not a theatre, but a mystery. He then referred to Genesis 1:27 and expounded on the oneness of they who were created in the beginning, male and female.

Thus, in his two homilies *On Colossians* where Chrysostom made reference to Galatians 3:28, he in no way advocated that the distinctions between men and women be relinquished. On the contrary, he kept the state of being in the world of the divine and the world on earth distinct.

*Catecheses ad illuminandos*

During his years in Antioch, Chrysostom was responsible for preparing the catechumens (adult baptismal candidates) for the reception of the sacrament of Baptism, as well as instructing them in Christian doctrine and morality immediately after their illumination. It was during this time that he wrote *Catecheses ad illuminandos.* In his

---


66 Up until the twentieth century, only two *Catecheses ad illuminandos* existed in Migne (*PG* 49. 223-240). According to Quasten, these homilies were delivered during Lent in 388. “In 1909 A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus edited for the first time a series of four sermons addressed to candidates of baptism from *Codex Mosqu.* 216 saec. X and *Codex Petrop.* 76 saec. X. The first of these is identical with Migne’s first. …it is evident that all
eleventh instruction. Chrysostom presented baptism to his catechumens as a spiritual marriage where Christ is the bridegroom who ignores all the social distinctions of His bride, whom he takes to himself. In the twenty-first verse of the eleventh instruction Chrysostom made direct reference to Galatians 3:28. He stated:

Furthermore, when you have all entered [the church], then must you all together—for you must observe this, that all these gifts are given to all of you in common, so that the rich man may not look down on the poor man, nor the poor man consider that he has any less than the rich man; for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, there is no Scythian, no barbarian, no Jew no Greek; not only is there no difference of age or nature, but even every difference of honor is canceled out; there is one esteem for all, one gift, one brotherhood binding us together, the same grace—so then, when you have all been led into [the church], then must you all together bend your knee and not stand erect; you must stretch your hands to heaven and thank God for this gift.

Chrysostom referred to Galatians 3:28 here in order to show his catechumens that baptism is not an honorary gift intended for those who are honored in this world, but for all people regardless of status, race, gender or age. There is, as he put it, one gift for all: the adoption into the heavenly kingdom that makes all its members brothers and sisters in Christ. It is a gift given to all who believe equally. It is a gift that brings one into a new world, a new state of being. Chrysostom made no reference to any changes in the status quo on this earth. Children are still to be subject to their parents: wives to their husband: and

four were delivered at Antioch, most probably during Lent 388.

A. Wenger had the good fortune to discover in 1955 a series of eight baptismal catecheses in a manuscript (Codex 6) of the monastery of Stavronikita on Mount Athos. He edited them in 1957 and thus greatly enriched our knowledge of the baptismal liturgy of Antioch at the end of the fourth century. They were given shortly after 388, and one of them, the third, is identical with the fourth of Papadopoulos-Kerameus, and with the Latin sermon Ad neophytos in the appendix of the second volume of Fronton’s edition (Paris 1609 f.), to which Savile, Montfaucon and Migne paid no attention.” Quasten. Patrology vol. 3. 451-452. For a more detailed account of the newly discovered Baptismal catecheses see the introduction of Paul W. Harkins, trans., St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions, No. 31 of Ancient Christian Writers (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1963), 3-19.

67 According to Harkens, the “Greek text for this Instruction is preserved only in Moscow codex graecus 129 of the tenth century.” 313, note 1. For this reason, I base myself only on this English translation of the text.

slaves to their masters. However, those in these earthly relationships must realize that before God they are equal, and treat each other with the love and respect that is expected of one born anew in Christ.

In Matthaew homiliae 1-89

Chrysostom’s homilies on Matthew In Matthaew homiliae 1-89 represent the oldest surviving complete commentary on that Gospel from the Golden Age of the patristic period. They were most probably delivered in 390 in Antioch. Chrysostom made reference to Galatians 3:28 in his seventy-third homily, while admonishing men who attended services in the church for the purpose of “gazing about at the beauty of women” or being “curious about the blooming youth of boys.” He rebuked those who behaved in this way, saying that they were committing “whoredom” and “adultery.” He then addressed the lack of inner self-control and the need for outer aid to assist those weak in the flesh by saying:

It were meet indeed that you had within you the wall to part you from the women; but since you are not so minded, our fathers thought it necessary by these boards (οὐνομ) to wall you off; since I hear from the elder ones, that of old there were not so much as these partitions. For in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female. And in the Apostle’s time also both men and women were together. Because the men were men, and the women women, but now altogether the contrary: the women have urged themselves into the manners of courtesans, but the men are in no better state than frantic horses.

Heard you not, that the men and women were gathered together in the upper room, and that congregation was worthy of the heavens? And very reasonably. For even women then practised much self-denial, and the men gravity and chastity.

Interestingly, Chrysostom stated that actual physical barriers existed in his church building to separate women and men during worship. He stated that the elders said that in times past, such things were not necessary as “there is neither male nor female in Christ.” He did not mean here that gender distinctions were once done away with, but now have

69 In Matthaew homiliae 1-89 (MG 57-58).
70 Quasten. vol. 3, 437.
71 In Matthaew homiliae 1-89 (MG 58, 671). NPNF 1, x, 443.
72 Homiliae in Matthaew lxxiii. 3 (PG 58, 671). NPNF 1, x, 443.
returned, but rather in those earlier days, men were behaving as Christian men should with gravity and chastity, and women were behaving as Christian women should with self-denial. Both men and women understood their status as children of God and the code of behavior that was expected of them. Chrysostom clearly believed in keeping the distinctions between the men and women. Gender distinctions are not to be blurred or obliterated, but rather the selfish sexual desires are to be overcome. Chrysostom continued to compare the women who served Christ with those of his own day, and commented how they were as far removed as the men in the time of Christ from the men in his day.

Thus, that which Chrysostom was saying was not that we cease being men and women before God, but that before God, men and women cease allowing themselves to be influenced by the sins of this world, which those of this world consider normative. Again, what is indirectly being compared is the fallen world in which all dwell with the spiritual world into which those who are baptized enter.

*Expositiones in psalmos* 4-12, 41, 43-49, 103-106, 106-117, 119, 150

Chrysostom, as I have noted, wrote his exposition on the Psalms while in Antioch. In his seventh homily dealing with the seventh Psalm, he led his listeners through an examination of conscience with a detailed account of the dire consequences for provoking God's anger. Chrysostom first admonished those who pray with indifference and great distraction, and then reverted to more serious offences provoking divine wrath. He said:

Now, who is there who has not insulted his brother for no reason? Don't tell me it was his servant he insulted; after all, "in Christ there is no male or female, no slave or free." Again, who has not made accusations that are false? Who has not looked on a woman with lustful glances? Who has not been envious? Who has not sought vainglory? Who has not been guilty of idle gossip? Now, all these faults are liable to punishment. If we failed to be zealous about worldly things and were not zealous about spiritual things either, we would deserve pardon, but as it is we are bereft of this excuse. I mean, we are active about the former, but listless about the latter.  

---

Chrysostom made reference here to Galatians 3:28 to make his point that there is no excuse for thinking nothing of insulting one's servant. His use of adding "there is no male or female" into his argument also presented an underlying statement, though not explicitly made, that insulting a woman is also inexcusable. Thus, respect is owing to one's servant, whether male or female, as all baptized servants are equal to their baptized masters before God. Insulting them for no reason, simply because they were socially inferior, was seen as a sinful act by Chrysostom.

Chrysostom consistently saw a distinction between "worldly things" and "spiritual things". Where the gift of the image of God in the human being was a worldly gift, bestowing upon the human being power to rule and govern the created world, the gift of son/daughtership bestowed at baptism was a spiritual gift leading to not only equality before God, but to eternal salvation.

*In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum*

The 24 homilies on Ephesians. *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum.* were written during Chrysostom's years in Antioch. Here he made reference to Galatians 3:28 once, in his twentieth homily which expounds upon his views of marriage. This homily presents Chrysostom's views of how those in a Christian marriage should conduct themselves. It deals extensively with the idea of the husband's headship, and I will comment on this at greater length in a later chapter. For my purposes here, I will examine Chrysostom's use of Galatians 3:28 in his twentieth homily on Ephesians to see if in it he is consistent with his view that gender distinctions, though no longer a barrier before God, are still to be maintained.

Chrysostom connected three of the pericopes with which this investigation deals. While discussing marriage and headship in Ephesians 5:22-24, he made reference to Genesis 1:27, as well as Galatians 3:28. Chrysostom began his twentieth homily thus:

A certain wise man. setting down a number of things in the rank of blessings. set down this also in the rank of a blessing. "A wife agreeing with her husband." (Ecclus. xxv. 1.) And elsewhere again he sets it down among blessings, that a woman should dwell in harmony with her husband. (Ecclus. xl. 23.) And indeed from the beginning, God appears to have made special provision for this union; and discourse of the two as one. He said this.

---

74 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum (PG 62. 9-176).
"Male and female created He them" (Gen. i. 27); and again, "There is neither male nor female." (Gal. iii. 28.) For there is no relationship between man and man so close as that between man and wife, as they are joined together as they should be.\(^{75}\)

In this homily, Chrysostom refers to Genesis 1:27 and Galatians 3:28 first to show the tight and inseparable bond that God intended to exist between a husband and wife. Before the first transgression, when God created them male and female in his image, the first couple lived in harmony, each knowing their role and position. Chrysostom believed that the first man and the first woman were equal in authority, and it was only when woman erred and exerted her authority over her husband, and he submitted to the persuasion of his wife that the original balance existing between spouses became distorted. The relationship between husbands and wives was intended in the beginning to be equal and harmonious.

Likewise, the relationship between men and women in the new creation, in the spiritual realm is also to be equal and harmonious, as the social inequalities that exist on earth between the two genders do not exist in heaven. Men and women are once again equal before God. However, even in heaven, Chrysostom did not believe that equality meant sameness. Otherwise he would have not stated: "For there is no relationship between man and man so close as that between man and wife, as they be joined together as they should be."\(^{76}\) There is a distinction kept and maintained even in heaven. Man and woman are not the same beings before God. they are still two distinct modes of the human being, but they are equal before God.

Chrysostom realized that the close and harmonious tie that should exist between a husband and wife does not necessarily exist in this world. He said that this is how the married relationship should be rather than what it actually is. He was setting a goal for married couples to strive for rather than describing what marriage on earth is.

Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent in his views that what Paul was describing in Galatians 3:28 was a state of being not to be found on this earth, but rather in heaven. The gender distinctions that exist between men and women in this world, for Chrysostom, are to remain, even though he did constantly call for men and women to strive for the heavenly

\(^{75}\) In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 1 (5:22-24) (PG 62. 135). NPNF vol. xiii. 143 with some adjustments.

\(^{76}\) In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 1 (5:22-24) (PG 62. 135). NPNF vol. xiii.
state of being even while on this earth. He encouraged those who were baptized and had put
on Christ to live as close as possible to a Christlike life while still living in this world. As
will be seen with the case of slavery, Chrysostom did not allow the conditions of this world
to be used as an excuse for improper Christian behavior.

*In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32*

Chrysostom wrote his 32 homilies on the Epistle to the Romans (*In epistulam ad
Romanos homiliae 1-32*) during his time in Antioch. In his thirtieth homily he commented
on Romans chapter 16 verse 4 where Paul sent thanks and greetings to Priscilla and Aquila,
and made reference to Galatians 3:28 saying:

*Unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the Churches of the Gentiles.*

Here he hints at their hospitality, pecuniary assistance, holding them in
admiration because they had both poured forth their blood, and had made
their whole property open to all. You see there were noble women, hindered
no way by their sex in the course of virtue. And this is as might be expected.
*For in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.* And what he had said
of the former, that he said also of this. For of her also he had said, *she hath
been a succourer of many, and of myself also.* So too of this woman *not only
I give thanks, but also all the Churches of the Gentiles.* Now that in this he
might not seem to be a flatterer, he also adduces a good many more
witnesses to these women.  

Here Chrysostom revealed his truest convictions about women. They were, he felt,
as capable as men to practice virtue, and their gender was a hindrance to their salvation only
if they allow it to be so. For Chrysostom, being a woman was no excuse for not striving to
obtain the likeness of God. If baptism is the way to obtain spiritual equality before God,
then it also allows women to reach the same spiritual heights as men. There are no
constraints upon baptized women striving to obtain salvation, as they are no longer of this
world even though they still reside in it. Again Chrysostom remained consistent in his
beliefs, preserving the distinction between men and women, though they are equals in the
spiritual world.

143.

77 *In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32 (PG 60. 391-682).*
Chrysostom most probably wrote his three homilies on the Epistle to Philemon, *In epistulam ad Philemonem argumentum et homiliae 1-3*, while still in Antioch. These three homilies shed great light on Chrysostom’s views on slavery. Though he acknowledged it as something characteristic of his world, he refused to accept it as a law of nature, insisting that it was a result of sin. He taught that before God there is no distinction between masters and slaves, and appealed to Christian masters to remember that those who serve them are their brethren in Christ, are to be treated as brethren, and are to be granted manumission.

In his first of the three homilies, Chrysostom made reference to Galatians 3:28 saying:

> For the name of the Church does not suffer masters to be angry, even though they are reckoned together with their servants. For the Church knows not the distinction of master and servant. By good actions and by sins she defines the one and the other. If then it is a Church, be not displeased that your slave is saluted with thee. *For in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free.*

Slavery was an established institution of his society, and Chrysostom accepted it as such. He did not champion its abolition. However, he did not see it right for Christians to have slaves wait on them. Chrysostom expected those who were Christian masters to remember that they were not of this world, and to behave accordingly to those brethren under their authority.

Thus we can see from his writings on slavery, that Chrysostom did not believe in abolishing or doing away with social distinctions that existed in the world. He believed that sin was a constant presence on the earth that human beings inhabited. Yet he also believed that this sinful condition could be overcome by imitating Christ, and by striving to live as much as possible away from earthly vanities.

---

78 *In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32 xxx. 3 (PG 664), LFC vol. 7, 479.*
79 *In epistulam ad Philemonem argumentum et homiliae 1-3 (PG 62, 701-720).*
80 *In epistulam ad Philemonem argumentum et homiliae 1-3 i. 1 (PG 62, 705), LFC vol. 14, 339 with some adjustments.*
Chrysostom wrote his homilies on Paul’s epistles to the Corinthians at Antioch. However, there is some uncertainty regarding the exact time of his writing them. In all of his 44 homilies on First Corinthians he only made reference to Galatians 3:28 twice: the first time in the twelfth verse of the twelfth homily, and the second time in the sixth verse of the fortieth homily. In both cases, the reference is to the slave/free pair mentioned in the pericope.

In his twelfth homily, Chrysostom reprimanded masters for making their female servants commit improper and immoral acts. He insisted that Christian masters must show respect for their slaves and servants, as they are their kinsmen, equal to them in Christ.

In his fortieth homily, Chrysostom again reproached masters for having an abundance of servants when the most they need is one or two for assistance. He explained that even that is a sign of the sinful state in which we dwell, for had slaves been necessary God would have created one for Adam in the beginning. Slavery, Chrysostom stated, "is the penalty of sin and the punishment of disobedience. But when Christ came. He put an end also to this. ‘For in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free.’ So it is not necessary to have a slave: or if it be at all necessary. let it be about one only. or at the most two." Chrysostom did not seek to abolish slavery. The distinction between the earthly realm and the heavenly realm continues to be maintained in Chrysostom’s writings.

In Acta apostolorum homiliae 1-55

Chrysostom wrote his fifty-five homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. In Acta apostolorum homiliae 1-55 in Constantinople during the third year of his term as Patriarch, in 400 A. D. He referred to Galatians 3:28 in his fifth homily while attempting to explain the words of the Prophet Joel as cited by Peter in his sermon in Acts 2:20-21. This particular pericope in Acts treats the events of the Second Coming of Christ. also

81 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xii. 12 (PG 61. 105).
82 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xl. 6 (PG 61. 354).
83 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xl. 6 (PG 61. 354). NPNF 1. xii. 248.
84 In Acta apostolorum homiliae 1-55 (PG 60).
85 Joel 2:28-32.
86 Acts 2:20-21. "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the coming of the great and notable day of the Lord. And it shall come to pass that
known as the end times, and most importantly deals with the question, "Who will be saved?" The answer given is "Everyone who calls upon the Lord." Of this Chrysostom said:

"And it shall come to pass, every one who shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. Everyone," he says: though he be priest (but he does not yet reveal the meaning), though bond, though free. For there is no male nor female in Christ Jesus, no bond, no free. (Gal iii. 28.) Well may it be so, for all these are but shadow. For if in king's palaces there is no high-born nor low-born, but each appears according to his deeds; and in art, each is shown by his works; much more in that school of wisdom (φιλοσοφία).\(^8\)

Chrysostom explained that there were no social distinctions of any type that could hinder a human being from obtaining salvation. That which would be examined is not one's social position in life, but rather the works that are produced as a result of their faith. Those who live in this world but are of the spiritual world are those who will be saved. Chrysostom later in his career remained consistent in his views that what Galatians 3:28 is really proclaiming is a new world, a world belonging to a different realm not to be found on this earth. Therefore, the liberating message of Galatians 3:28 is not that social and gender distinctions no longer exist, but rather these distinctions that do exist and remain have no effect on one's ability to obtain salvation as was believed by the Jews in the post-lapsarian era.

Remaining Texts

According to Krupp's Scripture Index, Chrysostom also made reference to Galatians 3:28 in four other writings: Ad Demetrium de compunctione libre i.,\(^8\) In dictum Pauli: Nolo vos ignorare (1Cor 10:1),\(^9\) In s. Ignatiun martyrem,\(^9\) and Sermo post reditum a priore exsilio.\(^9\) I have examined them and found them consistent with Chrysostom's other exegesis on Galatians 3:28.

\(^8\) _In Acta apostolorum homiliae_ 1-55 v. 2 (PG 60. 52). _NPNF_ 1. xi. 34.
\(^9\) _Ad Demetrium de compunctione libre_ i. 3 (PG 47. 397).
\(^9\) _In dictum Pauli: Nolo vos ignorare_ (1Cor 10:1) 3 (PG 51. 246).
\(^9\) _In s. Ignatiun martyrem_ 1 (PG 50. 587).
\(^9\) _Sermo post reditum a priore exsilio_ i. 1 (PG 52. 440).
Conclusion

Thus it can be said that Chrysostom believed that all baptized human beings, male and female, have the "one form" and the "one mold" of Christ. All baptized human beings regardless of race, rank or gender are equal before God and have the same opportunity to obtain salvation and the Kingdom of Heaven. Chrysostom also maintained that equality before God does not mean sameness. Society still had different cultures, still had different economic groups, and still consisted of men and women. Chrysostom did not maintain that equality obliterates these differences since they belong to this world and not the next world.

Chrysostom’s views of the relationship between a husband and wife are complex, and appear to conflict with his teachings on Galatians 3:28. With regard to marriage, Chrysostom said:

[The] laws which [God] appoints are in every case common, although he seems to address Himself to men only. For in discoursing with the head, he makes his admonition common to the whole body also. For the woman and the man he knows as one living creature, and nowhere distinguishes their kind. 92

Chrysostom presents us here with both sides of a paradox. On the one hand the man and the woman are so intimately united that they are espoused to be "one living creature." On the other hand, they are simultaneously recognized to be so different that the man is identified as "the head" and the woman as "the body." 93 How did he reconcile these seemingly conflicting views? If Chrysostom identified the equality of the sexes to belong to the spiritual world and the distinctions to the physical one the paradox could be easily explained. But for Chrysostom the headship of the male also belongs to the spiritual realm. I will now proceed to examine the issue of headship in greater depth.

92 Homiliae in Matthaeum xvii (PG 57. 257). NPNF 1. x. 117 with some adjustments.

93 Elizabeth Clark views these terms "head" and "body" as images of dominance and submission in Chrysostom. She states: "Chrysostom was fond of employing these images of dominance and submission to describe the relation of man and woman. Male and female are compared to ruler and subject, head and body (to use Paul’s image), teacher and disciple, master and slave—they are even like the strong-willed charioteer and his unruly horses!" Elizabeth Clark, "Sexual Politics in the Writings of John Chrysostom," Anglican Theological Review. 59 (1977), 5.
Chapter 4
The Meaning of Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16

In my second chapter I have shown that Chrysostom believed that the image of God given to the human being in Genesis 1:26 was the authority to govern and rule the created world, and that this image was diminished due to sin. Woman was given a secondary position of authority after man. I have also shown that Chrysostom believed that Galatians 3:28 speaks of a new gift, of a new image, that of the son/daughtership of Jesus Christ. This gift is given to all who have faith and who have been baptized regardless of their position in society, their race or their gender. This gift belongs not to this physical world but to the spiritual Kingdom of God.

Chrysostom's writings thus far present a clear and consistent position with regard to the state of the human being and the relationship between the male and female genders. However, questions arise once Chrysostom begins to explain the meaning of male headship (Κεφαλή) in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. If Chrysostom viewed the subordination of woman to her male head as a result of the first transgression, and if he advocated that male headship does not exist in the spiritual world where there is "no male and female," then all would be clear. However, Chrysostom quoting Paul, maintained that Κεφαλή, "headship", existed in the spiritual world as well, with God being the head of Christ. If "headship" exists in the spiritual world within the Godhead, then the image, the male headship over woman can be seen as a natural thing. Yet, upon close examination of Chrysostom's writings, it is clear that he interpreted Κεφαλή differently when speaking of things divine and things human, as he realized that the human image exists in a sinful and fallen state.

Chrysostom did believe that there is male domination in the fallen order of human society. However, he believed it incorrect to define the term Κεφαλή, in the same manner when addressing things divine and things human. Chrysostom saw the headship of man over woman as tainted by transgression and imperfection, and the headship of God over Christ as harmonious and perfect. Κεφαλή was understood differently in the two situations, and thus Chrysostom was able to maintain that Κεφαλή, when addressing the human relationship, could not be seen as ontological to the human condition. Yet even though
tainted by sin, the human being in Chrysostom’s view was able to find positive aspects to the domination of men in the present order of society, as it was instituted by God to better a distorted human condition and relationship. The divine rule imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, as man would have resented woman’s role in the first transgression.¹ Chrysostom’s explanation of “image” based on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 constituted a preeminence of honour for man, but did not support an ontological male superiority.

Though Chrysostom did advocate that man is the head of woman, he still believed that both were ontologically equal, as God is the head of Christ, and all the persons of the Trinity are equal in essence. In his fifteenth homily On Genesis Chrysostom stated that woman is ὁμοούσιος [of the same essence] and ὁμογενής [of the same race] to the man.² With regards to the headship of the male, Chrysostom viewed it as a model taken after the perfect relationships existing among the three hypostases in the Trinity. Chrysostom never agreed to an understanding of κεφαλή that understood Christ as being subordinate or inferior to the Father. He firmly believed that the Son and the Father shared the same essence.³ He consistently defended the Nicene formula homoousios (ὁμοοούσιος) to characterize the relation of the Son to the Father.⁴ Thus, though he did interpret κεφαλή as meaning a type of ranking, he never interpreted it as meaning inferior. Rather, he saw it as an honour for all human beings as they were intended to have the type of relationship that exists among the three persons in the Trinity. He did not see the image of the male head and the female body demeaning women in any way. Nor did he interpret κεφαλή to mean that the head was to dominate and the body subordinate. Such human conditions were due to sin and were not seen as being natural.

The primary purpose of this chapter is to present Chrysostom’s understanding of Paul’s usage of the term κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16. In order to provide a foundation

² Homiliae 67 in Genesin xv. 3 (PG 53. 121-122).
³ (PG 57. 17; 59. 290).
⁴ Contra Anomoeos vii. 2 (PG 48. 758); in Joh. lii. 3. liv. 1 (PG59. 290 and 298); in Matth. liv. 2 (PG 58. 534); in I Cor., xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 214).
on which to examine Chrysostom’s exegesis of this pericope, this chapter will begin by briefly presenting the views of contemporary scholars, and the varying opinions and dilemmas that they have in regard to this pericope. This is not an attempt to provide an in-depth analysis of contemporary biblical scholarship on the pericope. Rather, this is a brief presentation of some contemporary biblical scholars’ views of Paul’s pericope in order to provide a springboard from which an analysis of Chrysostom’s views may be better understood and appreciated. This chapter will then deal with Chrysostom’s interpretation of verse 3, focusing on his understanding of the term “κεφαλή”, followed by his exegesis of verses 4 to 16. Lastly, an examination will be made of all of Chrysostom’s works making reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 in order to verify consistency of argument.

Contemporary interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16

Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians was written not long after that to the Galatians. While absent from the Corinthian Church which he had founded, it was reported to him that dissident factions were undermining the work that he had done there. The congregation’s moral standard of living was deteriorating with immoral acts and law suits among the Christians. After hearing of the situation in Corinth, Paul received a letter from the Church there asking for his advice on a variety of questions. One of these was regarding the veiling of women in worship. Though many similarities exist, Paul’s instructions regarding this issue have no precise parallel in either the Jewish or Greco-Roman sources of that time. He responded to this question in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as follows:

Now I praise you, brothers, because in all things you remember me, and just as I handed down to you, you hold on fast to the traditions. But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ. Every man praying or prophesying, having some covering on his head dishonors his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with the head uncovered dishonors her own head, for it is one and the same thing with the head shaved. For if a woman is not covered let her also have her hair cut. But if it is shameful for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be covered. For a man ought not to cover the head, being the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. For man is not from woman but woman is from man. For also man was not created for the sake of the women, but woman for the sake of the

---

6 See Clark, Man and Woman in Christ, 168ff.
man. Because of this the woman ought to have upon the head [a sign of] authority because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is man independent of woman, nor woman independent of man, in the Lord. For as the woman is from the man, so also the man is by the woman, but all [things] are from God. Judge among you yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered? Or does not nature itself teach you that if a man should wear long hair, it is a dishonour to him? But if a woman should wear long hair, it is a glory for her; because the long hair has been given to her in place of a covering. But if anyone seems to be contentious we do not have such a custom, nor do the churches of God.7

It is obvious by Paul's response to the question on the veiling of women, that there is no doubt as to his position regarding the importance of gender distinctions. While worshipping and prophesying, women should be veiled, while men should not. Though claiming that they are equal, Paul stressed that men and women are not one and the same. Yet, much more is being stated here in Paul's answer than the simple reply of "yes" or "no" to the question of veiled or unveiled women in worship for the purpose of gender distinction. Paul's reasons for emphasizing this distinction seems to shake the very "equality" foundation that is at the heart of the liberating message that he fought so hard to establish and preserve in Galatians 3:28.

The key to understanding 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 is in deciphering Paul's play upon the word κεφαλή (head). He wrote in 1 Corinthians 11:3:

But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ.

The term κεφαλή is used in a variety of ways, which makes it difficult for the reader to be certain as to its meaning. Before addressing the issue of head-covering for women, Paul in verse three stated that the head of every man is Christ, that the head of woman is the man and that the head of Christ is God. He established with these three parallel relationships what at first appears to be an order of ranking. However, many contemporary scholars such as Karras and Jervis, view Paul as presenting with this parallel of relationships the origin of being. Following Jervis's reasoning, the woman was made from the side of Adam. Thus, the man is her source of being. The Son of God, Christ, is eternally begotten from God the Father, who is His source of being. Christ was involved with the creation of

---

7 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. Bible translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.
the world, and human kind, and is thus the world’s source of being. However, Paul himself, did not clearly state how one is to interpret and understand this term “head.” Is it a headship of “origin” or “source of being”? Or is it a headship of superiority? Or is it a headship of authority? This lack of clarity has resulted in numerous explanations and interpretations throughout history.

Biblical scholars disagree today about how κεφαλή is to be understood. Some scholars state that the word “head” should not be interpreted “in the sense of ruler, but in the sense of origin, of the beginning of something.” Man has his origin in Christ, woman has her origin in man, and Christ has his origin in God. In early Christian times, many Christian factions understood order as a system or ranking and subordinating; however, if one upholds this interpretation too rigidly, serious questions arise regarding the relationship among the three persons of the Trinity. If God is the head of Christ, then Christ, it could be argued, is not equal to the Father, but subordinate to him. According to Bedale, in order to grasp a clear understanding of κεφαλή, one must refer to the Hebrew term υπόστασις. Though Chrysostom was not familiar with Hebrew, the translation of υπόστασις into the Greek that he used is most important. This Hebrew word itself has two main meanings, the connection between the two not being obvious.

There is first the literal, anatomical, meaning which is presumably fundamental. Derived from this primary meaning we find the word used for the “top” of anything, e.g. of a mountain, or the head of the corner. It is also used, on the principle of the part for the whole, to signify their person in reckoning, e.g. Jud. v. 30 (cf. “a head”. per capita. and the classical use of κεφαλή). Occasionally it is used for “sum” or “total”, e.g. Num. i. 2 (cf. κεφάλαιον).

The other main meaning would seem to be that of “first”. In relation to time this signifies “beginning”, e.g. of the night-watch (Jud. vii. 10) or “from the beginning” (Prov. viii. 23 “I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was”: cf. Isa. xl. 21). The word is used also of the “beginning” of things, e.g. of the dust of the earth (Prov. viii. 26).

---


10 Bedale, 212.
Gen. ii. 16 the river of Eden is described as dividing and becoming four "heads", i.e. the beginning, or starting-point, of four rivers.\textsuperscript{11}

Bedale notes that in the feminine form of the noun ὥρη the sense of "beginning" or "first" is dominant. This form is "used of the first step in a process, e.g. the beginning of sin; of knowledge and, in effect, for the source of being, or origin, of the world."\textsuperscript{12} Quite frequently, ὥρη has the meaning "chief among" or "head over" men; but this is connected with the idea of priority. The idea of authority or leadership is often connected to ὥρη, but according to Bedale, "a chieftain's authority in social relationships is largely dependant upon his "seniority". in the order of being."\textsuperscript{13}

In the sense of "chief" or "ruler", ὥρη is interpreted at some times by κεφαλή and at other times by ἀρχή. Bedale notes that the two Greek terms κεφαλή and ἀρχή have apparently become interchangeable as renderings of ὥρη. Bedale states:

It seems a fair inference that St. Paul, when using κεφαλή in any but its literal sense, would have in mind the enlarged and metaphorical uses of the term 'head' familiar to him from the Old Testament; and these, as we have seen include the meaning of the 'beginning' of something. Consequently, in St. Paul's usage, κεφαλή may very well approximate in meaning to ἀρχή.\textsuperscript{14}

Thus, the term κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3 could be understood in the sense of ἀρχή. However, one must be cautious when examining the term ἀρχή, for even though it can be interpreted to mean the beginning of something, or source of being, it cannot be separated or interpreted apart from authority.

In 1 Corinthians 11:4-6, Paul continued to make a play on words, with the term κεφαλή in providing the first reason why a man should worship with his head (κεφαλή) uncovered and a woman with her head (κεφαλή) covered. He wrote:

Every man praying or prophesying, having some covering on his head dishonors his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with the head uncovered dishonors her own head, for it is one and the same thing with the head being shaved. For if a woman is not covered, let her also have her hair cut. But if it is a shameful thing for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be covered.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 213.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
Paul stated that if men and women do not worship as mentioned above, they shame, or dishonour their head (κεφαλή). In this section, the term κεφαλή is given a number of uses. The first use obviously refers to the man's or the woman's head. The term could be taken metaphorically to refer to the person from whom one has obtained his/her beginnings or origin. In other words, does a man dishonour his own head by worshipping with it covered, or does he dishonour Christ, who is his head in relationship? Likewise with the woman, does she dishonour her own head by worshipping with it covered, or the man who is her origin of being? This latter use remains for the contemporary scholar unclear in meaning.

M.D. Hooker states that probably both uses occur, with the primary point being that the shame falls upon the one who is head in relationship. It is this explanation, according to Hooker, that makes verse three relevant to Paul's argument. The "man or woman who dishonours his or her own head in the literal sense brings dishonour also on his or her metaphorical head."

L. Ann Jervis agrees with Hooker and states:

In vv. 4-6 Paul makes explicit reference to the issue that concerns him: men and women are praying and prophesying in ways he considers to be shameful. The word κεφαλή [κεφαλή] in these verses, occurring as it does in the context of v. 3, refers both to the physical heads of the men and women, and to the basis on which Paul gives his directives. Men who pray with their heads covered shame their "head." that is. their physical head and Christ. Women who pray and prophesy with their heads uncovered or with their hair unbound shame their own physical head and men. The shame of one sex exchanging customary head garb or hairstyles for that of the other sex is such that it disgraces and disappoints the new concord established in Christ. Paul is saying in vv. 4-6 that, when one is praying and prophesying, gender symbols are significant and should be in accordance with God's gift in Christ of a redeemed, dual-gender humanity.

In verse seven, Paul stated that the reason why man must not worship with his head covered is because he is the image and glory of God. Woman must worship with her head covered, as she is the glory of man. Paul wrote:

16 Ibid.
For a man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man.

As in Gal. 3:28, here also, reference is made to the creation account as stated in Genesis 1:27, where God created the human being, male and female, in his image. However, the point being made here is not concerning the image, but the glory. As in verse 3 where Paul wrote that Christ is the head of man, man is the head of woman and God is the head of Christ. In verse 7 he again made use of a parallel.

Man is the image and glory of God.
Woman is the glory of man.

Paul argued in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 that woman is the glory of man because she is of man, and was created because of the man. He wrote:

For man is not from woman, but woman is from man. For also man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man.

It is this contrast in glory (δόξα) between the man and the woman, which is physically expressed through veiling. Paul’s argument was as follows:

Man is the glory of God.
Therefore his head must be bare.
Woman is the glory of man.
Therefore her head must be covered.

How is one to understand and interpret Paul’s meaning of glory? According to Elizabeth Clark, there are two explanations commonly given for the term in this context. The most common of the two explains “woman is the glory of man” as woman reflecting man’s glory, being like him, from him, but not the same as him. Thus, woman has her origin in man and derived her being from him. The second of the two explanations interprets “glory” as that which brings honour to man or glorifies him. If one accepts this interpretation, then woman “would be man’s honour because her relationship to him means

---

18 See Jervis, 235, n. 17: “Several scholars have recognized that Gen 1:27 is a subtext in Ga 3:28, noting particularly that the kai in the male-female pair parallels the LXX of Gen 1:27 and that the words used are “technical terms from Genesis 1:27” [K. Stendahl. The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 32]. See also Meeks, “Image of the Androgyn.” 181; Scroggs, “Paul and the Eschatological Woman,” 292, n. 29; and E. Scussler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 211.”

19 Hooker, 414.
that he is honoured because of her."\textsuperscript{20} Since Paul in verses 8 and 9 stated that woman was made both \textit{from} and also \textit{for} man, both understandings of "glory" apply.

Jervis states that in verses 7-10 of the pericope, "Paul makes clear that the creation stories are the warrant for his injunctions."\textsuperscript{21} She explains that Paul's reason for forbidding men to cover their head is a midrashic recombination of Gen. 1:26-27, and Gen. 2:18-22. In this manner, Paul is able to point out the good and divinely ordained contrast and distinction between male and female, as mentioned in the second creation account. However, while emphasizing that man is indeed the image and glory of God, Paul did not deny that woman, too, was created in God's image, with the omission of the term. The point he was attempting to make was about the distinctions and differences between the two genders, and not the things they shared in common.\textsuperscript{22}

Without a doubt, the most difficult verse in the pericope dealing with headship, is verse 10. Here Paul wrote as follows:

Because of this the woman ought to have upon her head a symbol of authority because of the angels.\textsuperscript{23}

J. A. Fitzmyer notes that the two Greek words \textit{διὰ τοῦτο} indicate that this verse serves as the conclusion to the preceding theological argument. Yet, its function goes beyond that of a concluding statement. The verse introduces into the argument a new term \textit{ἐξουσία} (power), which adds to the perplexities in Paul's line of argument. Lastly, a totally new line of reasoning is introduced with the phrase, \textit{διὰ τούς ἀγγέλους}.\textsuperscript{24} Some contemporary commentators such as S. Clark do not deal with this verse, interpreting it as a mere gloss.\textsuperscript{25}

Part of the difficulty with this verse is due to the term \textit{ἐξουσία} which has a number of meanings including: power, authority, right to do something, ability, dominion, liberty.

\textsuperscript{20} Clark, \textit{Man and Woman in Christ}. 178.
\textsuperscript{21} Jervis, 242.
\textsuperscript{22} Jervis, 242-243.
\textsuperscript{23} 1 Corinthians 11:10. "\textit{διὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἄνδρας ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς} καὶ τὸν άγγέλους."
\textsuperscript{25} Clark, \textit{Man and Woman in Christ}. 174.
license, privilege, prerogative. The question remains, which of these meanings is intended by Paul in verse 10?

According to Fitzmyer, there are four interpretations concerning ἐξουσία. The interpretation most commentators apply to the term today is figurative as a symbol of the power to which the woman is subjected.26 Though this interpretation may fit the context of the verse, it creates linguistic problems, as it attributes to ἐξουσία a passive sense, which is unknown. "Ἐξουσία should indicate a power that the woman possesses or exercises (cf. Rev. xi. 6; xiv. 8; xx. 6), not one to which she is subjected or subordinated."27 Fitzmyer is of the opinion that if Paul had truly intended this interpretation, he created the figurative meaning to suit his context.

Due to the linguistic difficulty mentioned above, other commentators have interpreted the term ἐξουσία as a symbol of the power, the honour and the dignity of the woman. With such an understanding, verse ten can thus be interpreted as saying that a woman who covers her head exerts control over it and does not expose it to indignity, while the one who does not cover it loses her dignity, as everyone exerts control over it. The term possesses an active meaning. Fitzmyer, however, sees it as forcing the context. "since Paul is not speaking of the dignity of woman nor of her dignified actions" but of her "subordination" to man according to the Genesis creation account.28

A third interpretation of ἐξουσία explains the term in "the sense of a magical power that the veiled woman possesses to ward off the attacks of evil spirits."29 As woman was created second in the order of creation, she is said to need additional strength against the fallen angels. Her giving into the temptation of Satan in Paradise in Genesis 3:1-7, and her falling prey to the lustful desires of the "sons of God" in Gen. 6:2 supports the position that she is in need of extra protection in times of prayer and prophecy. However, the major difficulty with this understanding of ἐξουσία is the lack of testimony revealing that a woman's veil ever served such a purpose in history.30

Fitzmyer states that the last interpretation of ἐξουσία was proposed in 1920 by G.

---

26 Fitzmyer, 50.
27 Ibid., 51.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., 52.
30 Ibid.
Kittel, who noted that the Aramaic word *slwnyh*, meaning an "ornament of the head" or a "veil", was to be found in the Jerusalem Talmud.

It is given there as the equivalent of the Hebrew *shys* of Isa. iii.18. Now the root of this word is *sl* and is identical with the common Aramaic verb meaning "to have power, dominion over". Hence, either by a mistranslation or by a popular etymology, the Greek *ezousia* was taken as the equivalent of the Aramaic *slwnyh*. The proponents of this explanation of *ezousia* point out that an ancient variant reading in 1 Cor. xi. 10. is καλυμμα, "a veil", found in Irenaeus (*PG* VII. 524B), which is supported by velamen of Jerome (*PL* XXV. 339A) and a codex of the Vulgate. Origen (*PG* XIII, 119B) combined the two readings, velamen et potestatem. Though we cannot rule out the possibility that the reading καλυμμα or velamen is an interpretation of the text or an attempt to eliminate a difficulty of the original text, nevertheless it does show that the word was understood in antiquity in the sense of "a veil".

Though Fitzmyer realizes that the main difficulty with this last interpretation of *ezousia* is that it is highly unlikely that the Greeks of Corinth would have understood what Paul meant by it, he prefers to adopt Kittel's explanation until in his opinion, a better suggestion is made.

Hooker does not accept any of the above interpretations of *ezousia*. She understands Paul's use of the term *ezousia* in a different way. Following his argument in which the glory of man must be hidden in worship, Hooker sees a connection between the word δόξα in verse 7 and *ezousia* in the concluding statement of verse 10. She states:

Since the words 'glory' and 'worship' are to some extent synonymous, to be the glory of God is in itself to worship him.

According to Paul, however, it is man and not woman, who is the glory of God, and who will therefore naturally play the active role in worship: if now woman also, in contrast to Jewish custom, takes part in prayer and prophecy, this is because a new power [my emphasis] has been given to her. ... now woman, too, speaks to God in prayer and declares his word in prophecy: to do this she needs authority and power from God. The head-covering which symbolizes the effacement of man's glory in the presence of God also serves as the sign of the *ezousia* which is given to the women: with the glory of man hidden she, too, may reflect the glory of God. Far from being a symbol of the woman's subjection to man, therefore, her head-covering is what Paul calls it—authority: in prayer and

---
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prophecy she, like the man, is under the authority of God.  

The final point of difficulty in verse ten has to do with Paul's new line of reasoning, which is introduced with the phrase, διὰ τοῦ ἄγγελους. A common interpretation is that the angels here are referring to the fallen angels of Genesis 6:2. These beings lusted after the daughters of men. Wearing a veil would thus hide the woman's beauty and ward off such evil advances. This explanation of ἄγγελους supports the third interpretation of ἐξουσία mentioned above. However, upholding this opinion is inconsistent with the issue addressed in the pericope. Fallen angels have nothing to do with the worship of God. Neither does the issue of female weakness. Also, nowhere in the New Testament canon are angels thought of as being ‘fallen’.  

Therefore, only one other possibility remains: the angels referred to are ‘good’ ones.

Both Fitzmyer and Hooker are in agreement that these angels have a function and role to play both in the created order and at gatherings of worship. As angels are in charge of the created order, their function during worship is to ensure that the order established at creation is maintained. Thus, the woman ought to have authority over herself in worship, as this is what the order of creation dictates. It is the angels’ task to ensure that this order is maintained.

Thus, verse 10 may be interpreted as follows: Therefore, the woman should wear a veil on her head, which (veil) symbolizes her new authority in the worship of God, which is preserved and maintained by (because of) the angels.

In verses 11-12, Paul reaffirmed his teaching of Galatians 3:26-28 that in the Lord, both man and woman are equal before God. Jervis states that, while Paul had "to recast his basic teaching because of his converts' offensive practice of disregarding gender-specific appearance at worship, he nevertheless [affirmed] that teaching." Jervis continues:

---

32 M. D. Hooker. “Authority on Her Head.” 415-416.
33 See Fitzmyer, “A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. XI. 10.” 54: and Hooker. “Authority on Her Head,” 412.
34 For further analysis see Fitzmyer, 54ff; and Hooker, 412-413.
Paul considers the Corinthians’ misinterpretation to be so serious, however, that directly following his reassertion of his original preaching Paul repeats his point concerning male-female distinctiveness. The unity of man and woman in Christ has not obliterated the distinction between the genders (v. 12a, b). The differentiation of the genders established at creation (γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, v. 12a; cf. v.8) is still clearly seen in the process of reproduction and birth (v. 12b). Paul closes this section of the passage by referring again to God’s role as creator of all (v. 12c), thereby reaffirming his statement of v. 3c.36

In the last three verses of the pericope, verses 13-16, Paul gave his final appeal to the problem at Corinth. Paul wrote:

Judge among you yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered? Or does not nature itself teach you that if a man should wear long hair, it is a dishonour to him? But if a woman should wear long hair, it is a glory for her: because the long hair has been given to her in place of a covering. But if anyone seems to be contentious we do not have such a custom. nor do the churches of God.

Here Paul’s argument shifted to an appeal to nature and cultural custom. These verses break away from Paul’s argument relying on the creation account and are thus not truly relevant to the present inquiry. However, they are important in that they reinforce Paul’s position that equality before God did not mean an obliteration of gender distinctions but rather that gender distinctions and gender-appropriate practices need to remain.37

Having thus addressed what Paul wrote to the Corinthians regarding the veiling of women in worship, and various explanations of biblical scholars with regard to the pericope, as well as the difficulties that these scholars face in interpreting what Paul intended to say, I now turn to the subject at hand: Chrysostom’s exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16.

Chrysostom’s understanding of Καρπάλη in 1 Corinthians 11:3

As I stated in my second chapter dealing with Genesis, Chrysostom interpreted ἄρχη in his exegesis On Genesis as meaning authority. He continued to use this understanding of the term in his exegesis on 1 Corinthians. It was due to this understanding of the

---

35 Jervis, 245.
36 Jervis, 245.
37 Jervis is also of this opinion. See Jervis, 245.
authoritative meaning of the word ἀρχή, that many heretical groups in Chrysostom’s time used this pericope to defend their position of the subordination of Christ to God the Father. For this reason, Chrysostom in his 26th homily on Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians addressed this misinterpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:3. Chrysostom stated:

“But the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” Here the heretics rush upon us, with a certain declaration of inferiority, which out of these words they contrive against the Son. But they stumble against themselves. For if “the man be the head of the woman,” and the head be of the same substance with the body, and “the head of Christ is God,” the Son is of the same substance with the Father. “No,” say they, “it is not His being of another substance, which we intend to show from hence, but that He is under subjection.” What then are we to say to this? In the first place, when any thing lowly is said of him conjoined as He is with the Flesh, there is no disparagement of the Godhead in what is said, the Economy admitting the expression. However, tell me how you intend to prove this from the passage? “Why, as the man governs the wife,” said he, “so also the Father. Christ.” Therefore also as Christ governs the man, so likewise the Father. the Son. “For the head of every man,” we read, “is Christ.” And who could ever admit this? For if the superiority of the Son compared with us, be the measure of the Fathers’ compared with the Son, consider to what meanness you will bring Him.

The heretics argue, if one is the head of another with the understanding that κεφαλή infers authority over the other. then logically, the latter is subject to the former. The example the heretics use to support their position is as follows: “as the man governs the wife. ... so also the Father. Christ.” What is significant is Chrysostom’s handling of the above accusation of Christ’s subordination.

Where contemporary scholars attempt to find the one possible explanation for the term κεφαλή, Chrysostom had no qualms about understanding this one term differently according to the situation. He stated that though the same term, κεφαλή, is used. the meaning of the word is not to be understood in the same way when referring to God and human beings.

38 1 Cor. 11:3, “But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man. and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ.”
39 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae I-44 xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 214). VPNF 1. xii. 150.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid. “According to the Occasion” (Κατά τό αἰτίου).
So that we must not try (ἐξετάστεον) all things by like measure in respect of ourselves and of God, though the language used concerning them be similar; but we must assign to God a certain appropriate excellency, and so great as belongs to God. For should they not grant this, many absurdities will follow. As thus: “the head of Christ is God: and Christ is the head of the man, and he of the woman.” Therefore if we choose to take the term. “head,” in the like sense in all the clauses, the Son will be as far removed from the Father, as we are from Him. No, and the woman will be as far removed from us, as we are from the Word of God. And what the Son is to the Father, this both we are to the Son, and the woman again to the man. And who will endure this?⁴²

Chrysostom argued that if the term κεφαλή is to be understood in the same way for things divine and things human, what would result is a gross distancing between the Father and the Son within the Trinity. and between man and woman on earth. equivalent to that between the divine Son and the human man. Chrysostom argued that as this cannot be the case, the term κεφαλή cannot be understood in the same way, but in a manner befitting things divine when speaking of God. and in a manner befitting humanity when speaking of men and women. To prove his point that κεφαλή can be understood in two different ways, one for things divine and another for things human, he stated:

But do you understand the term “head” differently, in the case of the man and the woman, from what you do in the case of Christ? Therefore in the case of the Father and the Son, must we understand it differently also. “How understand it differently?” said the objector. According to the occasion [τὸ αἰτίαν]. For had Paul meant to speak of rule and subjection, as you say, he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and master. For what if the wife is under subjection to us? It is as a wife, as free, as equal in honor. And the Son also, though He did become obedient to the Father, it was as the Son of God, it was as God. For as the obedience of the Son to the Father is greater than we find in men towards the authors of their being, so also His liberty is greater. Since it will not of course be said that the circumstances of the Son’s relation to the Father are greater and more intimate that among men, and of the Father’s to the Son, less. For if we admire the Son, that He was obedient so as to come even unto death, and the death of the cross, and reckon this the great wonder concerning Him; we ought to admire the Father also, that he begot such a son, not as a slave under command, but as free, yielding obedience and giving counsel. For the counsellor is no slave.⁴³

---

⁴² In epistolam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 214). NPNF 1. xii. 150 with some adjustments.

⁴³ In epistolam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 214-215). NPNF 1, xii. 150 with some adjustments.
Thus, according to Chrysostom the *occasion* dictates the meaning to be given to the term *κεφαλή*. It is to be understood differently when speaking of divine headship as opposed to human headship. God the Father is the head of Christ, yet the obedience which the Son freely gives the Father, is that of God, and greater and more intimate than any human relationship. Chrysostom maintained that there is no subordination of the Son, who is equal to God the Father, yet the Son was obedient to the Father. Christ recognized the Father as his head, as he was first begotten from the Father, and second was under the Father’s authority.

Valerie Karras’s understanding of the *occasion* is, in my view, incorrect. She views Chrysostom as interpreting ἢτὸς σαρκός solely as origin. She does not recognize his understanding the term to also mean authority. She states: “Chrysostom declares this quite explicitly [sic] when, in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11.3, he explains that one must understand “head” in terms of cause or origin (κατὰ τὸ ἀιτίαν).”\(^{44}\) Karras supports her position by making reference to the *occasion*. I disagree in this instance with Karras, for Chrysostom did not mean by saying “according to the occasion” (κατὰ τὸ ἀιτίαν) that “head” is to be interpreted as *authority* in one instance and as *origin* in another. What he did mean by “occasion” is that we are to understand the difference between things divine, and things human. Karras is correct in stating that the term *κεφαλή* refers to the one who is the source or origin, however. she fails to recognize that it also means that the one who is the head also has authority, and must be honoured and recognized as such. Christ, in the divine model, was obedient to the Father. He recognized him as his head, and thus, did not only recognize him as his source of origin, but was obedient to the Father unto death.

When explaining the relationship between the Father and Son. Chrysostom stated that the Son is to be admired for his obedience to the Father; but the Father is to also be admired for begetting such a Son, “not a slave under command, but as free, yielding obedience, and giving counsel.”\(^{45}\) Chrysostom then cautioned his listeners not to understand

---


\(^{45}\) *In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae i–iv* xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 215), *NPNF* 1, xii. 150.
the divine relationship as "though the Father were in need, but that the Son hath the same honour with Him that begat Him."\(^{46}\)

Thus, the subjection that the heretics see existing within the divine relationship of Father and Son is really, according to Chrysostom, a free submission, as the Son has the same honour as the Father, and therefore the freedom either to accept the call of the Father's Economy for humanity or to deny it. Having explained the meaning of κεφαλή as it relates to the divine persons. Chrysostom then proceeded to explain the meaning of κεφαλή in the relationship between man and woman. He reminded his listeners that they should not "strain the example of the man and woman to all particulars."\(^{47}\) meaning, they should not attempt to understand the human relationship between a husband and wife to be exactly parallel to that of the divine relationship between the Father and His Son.

David C. Ford makes an interesting comment when examining the above passage. "he would not have brought forward the example of a wife, but rather of a slave and master." He says that it is evident that "there is no disparagement to the woman to have her husband as her head, since there is no disparagement to the man to have Christ as his head, and no disparagement to Christ to have God as His head."\(^{48}\)

Yet, within a matter of sentences, Chrysostom seemed to contradict himself. Where he first stated that the wife even though under subjection to the man is subjected "as wife, as free, as equal in honor."\(^{49}\) he then said that "the woman is reasonably subjected to the man: since equality of honor causes contention."\(^{50}\) He quickly qualified his statement explaining that the subjection which woman experiences now is not the way she was created in the beginning. Chrysostom said:

Wherefore you see, she was not subjected as soon as she was made: nor, when He brought her to the man, did either she hear any such thing from God, nor did the man say any such word to her: he said indeed that she was "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh:" (Gen. ii. 23.) but of rule or subjection he no where made mention to her. But when she made ill use of her privilege, and she who had been made a helper was found to be an

\(^{46}\) Ibid.

\(^{47}\) Ibid.


\(^{49}\) Ibid. (PG 61. 214-215), NPNF 1, xii, 150.

\(^{50}\) Ibid. (PG 61. 215), NPNF 1, xii, 150 with minor adjustments.
ensnarer, and ruined all, then she is justly told for the future, "your turning shall be to your husband."  

Chrysostom reasoned that the relationship between men and women altered due to that first transgression. It was for this reason and this reason alone that God made woman to have no choice in her obedience to her husband. She was forced to be subordinate to man from that time on in order to avoid contention. Chrysostom argued:  

To account for which; it was likely that this sin would have thrown our race into a state of warfare; (for her having been made out of him, would not have contributed anything to peace, when this had happened, nay, rather this very thing would have made the man even the harsher, that she, made as she was out of him, should not have spared, even him who was member of herself:) wherefore God, considering the malice of the Devil, raised up a bulwark of this word; and what enmity was likely to arise from his evil device. He took away by means of this sentence: and by the desire implanted in us: thus pulling down the partition-wall: i.e. the resentment caused by that sin of hers. But in God and in that undefiled Essence, one must not suppose any such thing.

Do not therefore apply the examples to all, since elsewhere also from this source many grievous errors will occur.  

It is for this reason that the term κτήσεως could not be understood in the same manner for God and humans, as human beings, unlike God, are first and foremost creatures that now exist in a fallen state. Chrysostom’s believed that had not the first woman sinned, κτήσεως could be understood in a more parallel way for things divine and human. As God is the head of Christ, so in the same way man would be the head of woman. As the Father is the origin of the Son. so too, man is the origin of woman. As the Son willingly in his freedom is obedient to his Father, so woman out of her own free will could have been obedient to her husband. As the Son freely submits to the Father (the first among equals)

---

51 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1–44 xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 215). English translation adapted from NPNF vol. 12, 150-151. Chrysostom made reference here to the second creation account, part of the so-called Yahwist tradition: “Then the Lord God said, ‘It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him. . .’” So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said, “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. . .” (Genesis 2:18, 21-23).

52 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1–44 xxvi. 1 (PG 61. 215). NPNF 1. xii, 151.
and gives honour to him, sharing also in the same honour as the Father, so woman, created from the same substance as the man, and being given equal authority over creation with the man in the beginning, could have submitted freely to him as her origin, and would have given not only honour to him but to herself, never seeking to exceed her equal authority. Woman could have submitted to her position freely, in liberty, as Christ submitted freely to the authority of the Father, rather than having her equal authority taken from her, and having submission forced upon her. Yet even in a sinless state the comparison could not be taken to mean exactly the same, for God is always God and perfect, and human beings will always be creatures, regardless of their state.

Chrysostom, to ensure that there was no misunderstanding among his listeners that ἐκφαντάζεται could not be interpreted to mean the same when speaking of God and human beings, whether in the pre-lapsarian or post-lapsarian state, continued and provided the following example:

Are we then to understand in like manner the saying in the text, both this, and all that after this is written to the Ephesians concerning this subject? For although the same words are spoken of God and of men, they do not have the same force in respect to God and to men, but in one way those must be understood, and in another these. Not however on the other hand all things diversely: since contrariwise they will seem to have been introduced at random and in vain, we reaping no benefit from them. But as we must not receive all things alike, so neither must we absolutely reject all.

Now that what I say may become clearer, I will endeavor to make it manifest in an example. Christ is called "the Head of the Church." If I am to take nothing from what is human in the idea, why, I would know, is the expression used at all? On the other hand, if I understand all in that way, extreme absurdity will result. For the head is of like passions with the body and liable to the same things. What then ought we to let go, and what to accept? We should let go these particulars which I have mentioned, but accept the notion of a perfect union, and the first principle: and not even these ideas absolutely, but here also we must form a notion, as we may by ourselves, of that which is too high for us and suitable to the Godhead: for both the union is surer and the beginning more honorable.  

---

53 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 2 (PG 61. 215). NPNF 1. xii. 151. Chrysostom made reference here to Paul's letter to the Ephesians, specifically (Eph. 5:23). This verse will be examined in the following chapter.
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Thus, having established the differences in Chrysostom’s understanding of κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3, we are now able to understand how it is that headship does not mean superiority in the spiritual world and how it does mean superiority in post-lapsarian humanity. Yet, it must be remembered that Chrysostom clearly stated that the superiority of the man over the woman is not natural, and is only due to sin. Having firmly established Chrysostom’s dual understanding of κεφαλή our investigation can proceed to examine how he interpreted the rest of the pericope, 1 Corinthians 11:4-16.

Chrysostom’s exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:4-16

Chrysostom made reference to verse 4 of the pericope twice in his homilies On 1st Corinthians (In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44).55 In his 26th homily which dealt specifically with the pericope at hand, Chrysostom addressed both verses 4 and 5 as follows:

Well then: the man he compels not to be always uncovered, but only when he prays. “For every man,” said he, “praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head.” But the woman he commands to be at all times covered. Wherefore also having said, “Every woman that prays or prophesies with her head unveiled, dishonors her head,” he stayed not at this point only, but also proceeded to say, “for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.” But if to be shaven is always dishonorable, it is plain too that being uncovered is always reproach. And not even with this only was he content, but added again, saying, “The woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels.” He signifies that not at the time of prayer only but also continually, she ought to be covered. But with regard to the man, it is no longer about covering but about wearing long hair, that he so forms his discourse. To be covered he then only forbids, when a man is praying; but the wearing long hair he discourages at all times. Wherefore, as touching the woman, he said, “But if she be not veiled, let her also be shorn;” so likewise touching the man. “If he have long hair, it is a dishonor unto him.” He said not, “if he be covered,” but, “if he have long hair.” Wherefore also he said at the beginning, “Every man praying or prophesying, having any thing on his head dishonors his head.” He said not, “covered,” but “having any thing on his head;” signifying that even though he pray with the head bare, yet if he have long hair, he is like to one covered. “For the hair,” said he, “is given for a covering.”56

55 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 (PG 61. 11-382).
56 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 4 (PG 61. 217), NPNF 1. xii. 152 with some adjustments.
In this passage, Chrysostom made clear that men and women are to reveal their gender through their manner of dress and through the length of their hair, not only during times of worship but always. Men are to worship with their head uncovered though it could be covered at other times. However, men are discouraged to allow their hair to grow long at any time. Chrysostom viewed the long hair on men to mean having something on their heads, which Paul said, was a dishonour to them.

In his twelfth homily On I Cor in homilies Chrysostom briefly referred to I Corinthians 11:4 when admonishing his listeners on the practice of smearing their babies foreheads with mud in order to ward off the evil eye. While preaching against this practice, Chrysostom again taught that a man dishonours himself if he has his head covered. He said:

God has honored you with spiritual anointing; and do you defile your child with mud? God has honored you, and do you dishonor yourself? And when you should inscribe on his forehead the Cross which affords invincible security; do you forego this, and cast yourself into the madness of Satan?

If any look on these things as trifles, let them know that they are the source of great evils: and that not even to Paul did it seem right to overlook the lesser things. For, tell me, what can be less than a man’s covering his head? Yet observe how great a matter he makes of this and with how great earnestness he forbids it: saying, among many things, “He dishonors his head.” (1 Cor. xi. 4.) Now if he that covers himself “dishonors his head”: he that besmears his child with mud, how can it be less than making it abominable?57

Though Chrysostom viewed the long hair as a covering for men, and saw this as dishonour for them, he did not remain consistent in this form of reasoning in regards to women. Women, Chrysostom said, are to worship always with their head covered. however, they are not allowed to go uncovered at other times. Women needed to be covered at all times regardless of the situation.58 Chrysostom did not consider the long hair worn by women to be enough of a covering for them. as Paul decreed that in addition to their long hair, women needed an additional cover on their heads. When addressing verse 6,59 Chrysostom addressed this provision as follows:

57 In epistulam i ad Corinthios i argumentum et homiliae l-44 xii. 7 (PG 61. 106), NPNF 1. xii. 71 with some adjustments.
58 In epistulam i ad Corinthios i argumentum et homiliae l-44 xxvi. 4 (PG 61. 217). NPNF1, xii. 152.
59 1 Corinthians 11:6, “For if a woman is not covered, let her have her hair cut also. But if it is a shameful thing for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be
Thus, in the beginning he [Paul] simply requires that the head be not bare; but as he proceeds he intimates both the continuance of the rule, saying, “for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaved,” and for keeping of it with all care and diligence. For he said not merely covered, but “covered over;” [οὐδὲ γὰρ καλύπτεσθαι, ἀλλὰ κατακαλύπτεσθαι], meaning that she be carefully wrapped up on every side. And by reducing it to an absurdity, he appeals to their shame, saying by way of severe reprimand, “but if she be not covered, let her also be shorn.” As if he had said, “If you cast away the covering appointed by the law of God, cast away likewise that appointed by nature.”

Thus, the inconsistency does not lie with Chrysostom, but with Paul. He taught that long hair on men is to be considered as a covering, however, the long hair on women is not to be considered as adequate covering. Paul reasoned that it is a shameful thing for a woman to not have her head at all times covered. Chrysostom explained this reasoning as follows:

But if any say, “No, how can this be a shame to the woman, if she mount up to the glory of the man?” we might make this answer: “She does not mount up, but rather falls from her own proper honor.” Since not to abide within our own limits and the laws ordained of God, but to go beyond, is not an addition but a diminuation. For as he that desires other men’s goods and seizes what is not his own, has not gained anything more, but is diminished, having lost even that which he had, (which kind of thing also happened in paradise:) so likewise the woman acquires not the man’s dignity, but loses even the woman’s decency which she had. And not from hence only is her shame and reproach, but also on account of her covetousness.

Chrysostom’s argument was based again on the results of the first transgression. Due to the first sin, God gave woman the position of second authority after the man. Thus, her position, even if second in authority, was seen as honourable as it was God ordained. Chrysostom then reasoned that if a woman attempted to uncover her head in order to appear equal to the man who is now her head, she would be behaving as a thief. Thus, rather than being honoured for what is rightfully hers, she would consequently become shamed for attempting to take something that was not hers. Woman would be so shamed without the covered.”

60 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 4 (PG 61. 217). NPNF1, xii. 152 with some adjustments.
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covering, that it would be the same as having her head shaved. However, the cause of this shame is addressed in verse 7 of the pericope. Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians 11:7:

For a man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man.

Chrysostom explained 1 Corinthians 11:7 by using his own interpretation of image as cited in his homilies dealing with Genesis. As was noted in chapter two, image for Chrysostom denoted power and authority. Thus, when explaining verse 7, he stated:

This is again another cause. “Not only,” so he speaks, “because he has Christ to be his Head, ought he not to cover the head, but because also he rules over the woman.” For the ruler, when he comes before the king, ought to have the symbol of his rule. As therefore no ruler, without military girdle and cloak, would venture to appear before him that has the diadem: so neither do you without the symbols of your rule. (one of which is, the not being covered,) pray before God, lest you insult both yourself, and Him that has honored you.

And the same thing likewise one may say regarding the woman. For to her also it is a reproach, the not having the symbols of her subjection. “But the woman is the glory of the man.” Therefore the rule of the man is natural.62

This phrase can and has been misunderstood to mean that from the beginning woman was not equal to man, or that from the beginning she was subject to man. Chrysostom did not mean such a thing by this comment. In all of his writings, Chrysostom never taught that woman was created subject to the man. She was his equal until the first transgression, however, she was from the beginning made from him and for him, and thus for this reason is to honour him. In the prelapsarian state, Chrysostom viewed the man as being “first among equals” as he was created first, and being the source or origin from which woman came into existence. In the postlapsarian state, Chrysostom viewed man as the elective ruler of his wife as she was reassigned by God to a position just under her husband. This elective authority of the husband is natural or “normative” to the post-lapsarian state. Chrysostom explained his statement of “Therefore the rule of the man is natural” by immediately commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:8;63 Chrysostom stated: “But if to

---

62 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 4 (PG 61. 218). NPNF 1, xii. 153 with some adjustments.
63 1 Corinthians 11:8, “For man is not from woman, but woman is from man.”
be of any one. is a glory to him. of whom one is. much more the being like him. Thus. man is the glory of God. but it is more honourable for man to be in God's image. In like manner. woman is the glory of man. but it is more honourable for her to be in the man's image.

On commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:9. Chrysostom cited four reasons for the superiority of man over woman. He stated:

This is again a second superiority. no. rather also a third. and a fourth. the first being. that Christ is the head of us. and we of the woman; a second. that we are the glory of God. but the woman of us. a third. that we are not of the woman. but she of us. a fourth. that we are not for her. but she for us.

Chrysostom did not appear to wrestle with the difficulties that this verse gives to contemporary commentators. He simply proceeded to support his arguments by referring to verse 10 of the pericope as follows:

"For this cause": what cause. tell me? "For all these which have been mentioned." said he: or rather not for these only. but also "because of the angels." "For although you despise your husband." said he. "yet reverence the angels."

It follows that being covered is a mark of subjection and of power. For it induces her to look down. and be ashamed. and preserve entire her proper virtue. For the virtue and honor of the governed is to abide in his obedience.

Chrysostom's argument was that even if the woman does not wish to wear the covering. the symbol of subjection on her head. as she may have no love for her husband. and doubt her subjection to him. still she should wear it because she does have love and honor for the angels. and cannot dispute her subjection to them.

---
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Chrysostom proceeded to say. “Again: the man is not compelled to do this: for he is the image of his Lord: but the woman is: and that reasonably.” In other words, no one on earth has authority over the man. Only he who created him has authority over him, in whose image the man was created. It is for this reason that the man is to worship his Lord with his head uncovered. The woman, on the other hand, though created in the image of God and given dominion over the created world in the beginning, due to the first sin is now under the authority of the man and is second in authority. This is the reason why she should be covered when she prays. What Chrysostom meant here is that woman is under the authority of God and man, as she is subject to them both.

The next two verses in this pericope, 1 Corinthians 11:11-12 dispel any misunderstandings or misinterpreted opinions. Paul wrote:

Nevertheless neither is man apart from woman, nor woman apart from man, in the Lord. For as the woman is from the man, so also the man is by the woman. but all things are from God.

Any view that interpreted 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 as advocating woman’s “subordination” to man in terms of status, runs into difficulty when confronted by these two verses. Such a view loses its ground as the argument presented by Paul loses consistency. If Paul truly teaches woman’s subservience to man in terms of status, then why does he stress their interdependence and their equality before God as His creation? Chrysostom interpreted verse 11 as follows:

Thus, because he had given great superiority to the man, having said that the woman is of him, and for him, and under him; that he might neither lift up the men more than was due, nor depress the women, see how he brings in the correction, saying, “Howbeit neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord.” “Examine not, I pray,” said he, “the first things only, and that creation. Since, if you enquire into what comes after, each one of the two is the cause of the other; or rather not even thus each of the other but God of all. Wherefore he said, “neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord.”

---

70 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 4/ or/ 5 (PG 61. 218). NPNF 1, xii. 153.
71 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xxvi. 5 (PG 61. 218-219). NPNF 1, xii. 153 with some adjustments.
It is obvious that Paul's words in this pericope of 1 Corinthians refer to Genesis 2:21-22, but with a different connotation. Woman is the glory of man because she was made for and from him. However, as Paul stated when addressing the issue of worship, the true matter at hand is not which of the two genders is the origin of the other, but that it is God who is the source of life for both, and it is to God that proper honour and worship are due.

Thus, men are reminded that though they were created first in the beginning, and woman was created for and from the man, men are born of women, and as children are dependent upon their mothers. As this is the manner in which God arranged for the world to be populated, this arrangement serves as a reminder to all that the cycle of life is dependent upon the authority of the Creator. Both men and women are subject to the authority of God. However, since God ordained after the first transgression for woman to be subject to her husband, and for the husband to have authority over his wife, this decree must be respected and obeyed and thus, expressed in the worship of the Creator, with a veil upon her head.

Chrysostom succinctly tied in verse 12 with verse 11 in a rather different manner than what one would expect. Rather than reinforcing the interdependence of men and women in procreation, he used the passage to reinforce the male prerogative. Chrysostom said:

"For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman." He said not "of the woman." but he repeats the expression (from v. 7.) "of the man."

Yet are not these excellencies the property of the man, but of God. Wherefore also he adds. "but all things of God." If therefore all things belong to God, and he commands these things, do you obey and gainsay not.

In this manner, Chrysostom reinforced his belief that the man is due honour and respect and obedience from the woman as it is she who is of him. Since God ordained it to be so. Chrysostom argued, woman must submit to this fact out of respect for her God and Creator if not for her husband.

---

72 Genesis 2:21-22. “So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man.” RSV.
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Chrysostom’s analysis of verses 13 to 16 supported his position of male headship though using Paul’s appeal to nature. Chrysostom remained consistent in his argument and had nothing further to add. For this reason, Chrysostom’s analysis of the last four verses will not be examined.

To summarize, Chrysostom’s explanation of “image” based on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 constitutes a preeminence of honour for the man, but does not appear to support an ontological male domination. For this reason he emphasized in his fifteenth homily On Genesis that woman is ὀμοούσιος [of the same essence] and ὀμογενής [of the same race or kind] to the man.

Accordingly he wants to teach us about the formation of the being about to be brought forth and the fact that this being due for creation is the one he was speaking about. “Let us make him a helpmate like himself,” meaning of his kind, with the same properties as himself, of equal esteem, in no way inferior to him. Hence his words, “For Adam, however, there proved to be no helpmate of his kind,” by which this blessed author shows us that whatever usefulness these irrational animals bring to our service, the help provided for Adam by woman is different and immeasurably superior.

Chrysostom believed and illustrated that there is male domination in the fallen order of human society, and for this reason alone, stated that one cannot define the term κεφαλή, in the same manner when addressing things divine and things human. The divine rule imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, as man would have resented woman’s role in the first transgression.

Chrysostom, faithful to the Genesis account, views male domination as a component of the post-lapsarian human condition. It is woman’s punishment for leading man from God. Thus, because woman abused her equality, she is now relegated to a new subordination, “natural” within the fallen state of Man.

---
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However, in order to make certain that this is indeed Chrysostom’s understanding of κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16, it is important to examine at this point all of his references to this pericope. In his twentieth homily on Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians, Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3, when explaining Ephesians 5:31. However, as the next chapter of my investigation will deal with Ephesians 5:21-33, I will not examine this reference at this time, but proceed to examine the other texts beginning with his earlier works.

Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum libre 1-3

While he was still a deacon in Antioch, Chrysostom wrote the three books known as Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum libre 1-3 (PG 47. 423-494) in which he consoled his despairing and suffering friend, Stagirius the monk. In his first book he explained the loneliness of man and the fact that none among the animals could be of help to him, as none were like him. Chrysostom then made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:9 to show how God honoured the man by making woman him. He said:

And since he taught him with all that, that he consists between the two natures [τὸ μέσον ἑκάτερας τῆς φύσεως], and that he is the most honored of all creatures, and that none could be found among such a great multitude of creatures equal to him, then he created woman. Honoring him with this manner again and making it evident that she was formed for him, as Paul says, “For man was not formed for woman, but woman for the man.”

Chrysostom remained consistent on his position supporting Paul’s teaching that the woman was created after the man, for the man, and thus was considered to be his honour.

Sermones 1-9 in Genesim

In his second homily of his Sermones 1-9 in Genesim dealing with the first three chapters of Genesis, Chrysostom referred to 1 Corinthians 11:7-10. This homily was examined in the second chapter of our investigation, where it was revealed that Chrysostom

---
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interpreted “let us make” as the three persons of the Holy Trinity talking among themselves and not God speaking with the angels. Chrysostom continued to explain that as the Father and Son share in the same divine authority, and are of the same essence, so too, man and woman are equal, sharing the same essence. However, he stated that after the first transgression, woman could no longer be seen as being in God’s image, as she was placed second after the man. Being in the image of God, Chrysostom here taught, meant to have full authority, with no one else above you. To support his claim, that image means authority, Chrysostom appealed to 1 Corinthians 11:7,10 saying:

However, nevertheless, again some others present to us saying, that God has the same image that we have, interpreting badly that which has been said. For he did not call essence image, but authority [ἀρχήν] image as we will show with what has been added next. That is to say, that God is not anthropomorphic, listen to Paul who says, “For a man ought not to be covered, being the image and glory of God: but woman is the glory of man. Hence, she ought” he says, “to have a covering on her head.” (1 Cor. 11:7, 10.) Therefore if he here calls image this, in order to declare the identical aspect [μορφής] of the human being to God, for this reason exactly the human being is called man of God [ἀνθρωπός Θεοῦ] because God has stated it such. Consequently, according to them, man alone should not have been called image, but also woman. For one and the same is the type and characteristic of the woman and the man, and one is the essence.

For what reason then is the man called image of God, and woman not? For image does not mean form, but image means authority [ἀρχήν], of which only the man has, but not also woman. That is to say, on the one hand, the man is subjugate to no one, however, the woman has been put under his authority, as God said, “Your desire shall be to your husband, and he shall rule over you.” For this reason, on the one hand, the man is the image of God, as he has no one greater than himself, as in the same way there is no one greater than God, as he is Lord of all [ἄλλα πάντων ἀρχη]. On the other hand, woman is the glory of man, because she is subject to the man.

It is clear from this early work, that Chrysostom believed that post-lapsarian woman lost the image of God when God said to her, “Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.” Image for Chrysostom at this stage in his life meant not only authority, but total authority, “no one above you.” This view does not allow woman after
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the first transgression to share any longer in the image with her husband. She became subject to man, as did all of creation. Yet, this view runs into difficulty, as post-lapsarian man lost most of his rule over the created world.

That which needs to be stressed when examining this section of Chrysostom’s work is that he was not attempting here to make a gender statement, but rather solidify his argument against the anthropomorphic view of image, held by heretics. By appealing to 1 Corinthians 11:7, 10 and the omission of the word image when referring to woman, Chrysostom was able to make a point in support for his argument: that being in the image meant to have authority, and did not mean having God’s form.

_Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim_

In his seventeenth homily On Genesis (Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim) Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3 while interpreting Genesis 3:12. Adam’s poor excuse for disobeying God’s commandment. Chrysostom said:

While this explanation seems to offer some excuse, it is in fact devoid of all defense. I mean, what defense can you lay claim to, he says, for forgetting my commands and judging the bauble given by your wife more important than words spoken by me? After all, even if your wife did give it to you, still my command and the fear of punishment were sufficient to dispose you to avoid tasting. I mean, surely you were not ignorant? Surely you weren’t unaware? With this in mind, out of care for you, I spoke up with the aim of preventing your falling victim to these faults; and so, even if your wife prepared the way for your transgressing my command, nevertheless you were not without guilt: you should have regarded my command as more worthy of trust, and beyond dissuading yourself alone from eating, you should have demonstrated the gravity of the sin to your wife as well. After all, you are head of your wife. (1 Cor. 11. 3.) and she has been created for your sake; but you have inverted the proper order: not only have you failed to keep her on the straight and narrow but you have been dragged down with her, and whereas the rest of the body should follow the head, the contrary has in fact occurred, the head following the rest of the body, turning things upside down.

It is interesting to note that Chrysostom placed the responsibility of the man’s transgression, not on the woman, as did some early Christian writers, such as Tertullian, but on the man. This is significant in that it weakens the claim of some contemporary

---
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theologians such as Elizabeth Clark who view Chrysostom as a misogynist. Chrysostom stated that the man should have known better as he was aware of God’s commandment.

Another point to note is that Chrysostom remained consistent in his views that even prior to the first transgression, the man was the head of his wife, as he was her source of origin. It must be remembered however, that this headship was to mirror that of the Father’s headship over Christ (the Son). The Father is the head and source of the Son, as the Son is eternally begotten by the Father. The Son, though equal in the Godhead, freely consents to the Father’s will. Similarly, pre-lapsarian woman, though equal to her husband, was called to freely consent to the man’s will. Chrysostom spoke of the natural order of things, the husband being the head of the wife as he was created first, and then of the disaster that resulted when the genders reversed their God given roles.

In his sixty-sixth homily, Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3 when explaining Genesis 47:29-32. He explained to his listeners the exchange that occurred between Israel (Jacob) and his youngest son Joseph, where the old Israel made his son promise him to bury him in the family tomb, saying:

After he gave instructions to his son about his burial, remember: and Joseph replied, “I will do as you say,” he said. “Swear to me.” He swore to him. Israel bowed low to the tip of his staff.” See this venerable old patriarch showing respect for Joseph by the bow and now fulfilling the dream by his behavior. When Joseph recounted the dream to him, remember. “he said,” the text told us, “Do you mean to say that your mother and I will come to bow to the ground before you?” (Gen. 37:10.) But perhaps someone may say, How was the dream fulfilled if the mother had passed on and did not bow down to her son? It is invariably Scripture’s way to offer the explanation of the whole from the principal example. So, since “the man is the head of the woman” (1 Cor. 11:3.) and “the two will come to be one flesh.” (Gen. 2:24.) if the head bowed, obviously the whole body followed it. That is to say, if the father did it, much more would she also have done so. had she not been snatched from this life ahead of time.\footnote{Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim xvi. 13 (PG 53. 130), FC 74. 230-231.}

Chrysostom used 1 Corinthians 11:3 while explaining the absence of Joseph’s mother, Rachel, in the act of bowing down to him. Chrysostom explained that as Joseph’s father and mother were one flesh, with Israel being the head, and Rachel the body, she

\footnote{Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim lxvi. 2 (PG 54. 567-568), FC 87. 258.}
partook in this act of honouring her son through her husband, as she was not living to honour her son on her own.

Chrysostom remained consistent in his belief that the bond between a husband and wife is so close that they function as one flesh, and in so doing are equal. It is because of this closeness, this bond that the husband can act on behalf of the wife, (and vice versa) in matters such as the one mentioned in Genesis 47:29-32. Chrysostom also remained consistent in expressing that the wife “much more would...also have done so”, her desire to follow her husbands example. thus honouring him as her “head”.

In his eighth homily On Genesis Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:7 in order to prove that “image” is not to be understood as “form” but as “control.” Chrysostom said:

Yet if, despite such great precision in terms, there are still those spoiling for a fight who would want to say “image” is used in terms of form, we will say to them: that means he is not only man but also woman, for both have the same form. But this would make no sense. I mean, listen to Paul’s words: “It is not proper for a man to cover his head, being the image and glory of God, whereas the woman is man’s glory.” (1 Cor. 11.7.) One is in command, the other is subordinate, just as God had also said to woman from the beginning, “your yearning will be for your husband, and he will be your master.” (Gen. 3.16.) You see, since it is on the basis of command that the image was received and not on the basis of form, man commands everything whereas woman is subservient—hence Paul’s words about man, that he is constituted God’s image and glory, whereas woman is man’s glory. If, however, he had been speaking about form, he would not have distinguished between them, man and woman being identical in type, after all.

Chrysostom attempted to make those who interpreted “image” as “form” appears ridiculous by pointing out that first of all, if image meant form, it must be remembered that there are two modes of human existence, the male form and the female form, as both share in the same humanity. This being the case, God would thus have both a male and a female body, which is absurd. Chrysostom argued that if “image” was truly “form” Paul would have never distinguished between the two genders in 1 Corinthians 11:7. as the two are the same
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in type. Chrysostom appealed to 1 Corinthians 11:7 and proceeded to argue, that the headship of the man over the woman demonstrates that “image” really means having control and authority. For there is none over the man, save God, but woman is under her husband, being his glory, and thus is subjected to him, as well as to God. Unlike in his earlier work *Sermones 1-9 in Genesim*, Chrysostom did not bluntly say in his second series of homilies *On Genesis* that post-lapsarian woman did not have the image of God. Though it can be argued that it was implied, it is more probable that Chrysostom’s opinion of post-lapsarian woman not being in possession of the image was beginning to change. As was discussed in the second chapter of this investigation, Chrysostom in his *Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim* did not view woman as being devoid of authority, but regarded her as still having dominion over some animals, being a second authority after her husband. This clearly reveals that according to Chrysostom the image of God in woman was not taken fully away.

Chrysostom appealed to Genesis 3:16 to support his argument that “image” means authority by showing that post-lapsarian woman was made subject to her husband for her role in the first transgression. Chrysostom’s referring to this event as “from the beginning”. However, this should not be taken to mean that woman was forced to be subject to her husband from the point of her creation. Rather, he mentioned this to remind his audience that the first transgression occurred in the beginning of human history, and thus all subsequent generations have not known of any other condition. Any other explanation would contradict that which Chrysostom taught about the equality of woman with man, and her sharing equally in this authority over creation from her beginnings, a point which he mentioned in his very next two homilies.91

It must be emphasized that the essential fact that Chrysostom was attempting to firmly establish in the above mentioned passage is that “image” does not mean “form” but “authority.” It is for this reason that he used a post-lapsarian example, so that he could firmly establish his exegesis of the term “image.” The issue being addressed was not that of gender, but that of the misinterpretation of image as “form.” Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent in his argument of the meaning of “image” as well as in his understanding of 1 Corinthians 11:7. Post-lapsarian woman was subject to her husband, and had to honour him as her head.

---
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In his fifteenth homily On Genesis, Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:8, 9, and 11, when explaining Genesis 2:20-22:

For Adam, however, there proved to be no helpermate of his kind. God caused a drowsiness to come upon Adam, and he fell asleep. God took one of Adam's ribs and closed up the flesh in its place. The Lord God fashioned the rib that he had taken from Adam into a woman. 92

Chrysostom in explaining this passage to his audience revealed the true honour and status given to woman by God at her creation. Chrysostom said:

"The Lord God," the text says, "fashioned the rib he had taken from Adam into a woman." See the precision of Scripture. I mean, it no longer said, He formed, but "He fashioned," since he took part of what was already formed and, so to say, made up for what was lacking. Hence it says, "He fashioned:" he didn't perform further shaping, but took some small part of the shaping already done, fashioned this part and made a complete being. How great the power of God, the master craftsman, making a likeness of those limbs from that tiny part, creating such wonderful senses, and preparing a creature complete, entire and perfect, capable both of speaking and of providing much comfort to man by a sharing of her being. For it was for the consolation of this man that this woman was created. Hence Paul also said, "Man was not created for woman, but woman for man." (1 Cor. 11.9.) Do you see how everything is made for him? I mean, after the act of creation, after the brute beasts were brought forth, some suited for eating and some capable of assisting with man's service, the human being that had been formed stood in need of someone to talk to and able to offer him much comfort by a sharing of her being. So, from man's rib God creates this rational being, and in his inventive wisdom he makes it complete and perfect, like man in every detail—rational, capable of rendering him what would be of assistance in times of need and the pressing necessities of life. 93

Chrysostom obviously thought that in God fashioning, as opposed to forming, the woman from the man's rib, 94 that God created woman to share the same "being" with man. In other words, she was created as a consolation for the man as she too was gifted with speech, reason, and the ability relate in every way with the needs and necessities of life with the man. Thus, she was not only made from him. Chrysostom stated referring to 1 Corinthians 11:9, but for him.

92 The LXX text that Chrysostom used read "Adam" instead of "the man."
93 Homiliae 1-67 in Genesis xv. 3 (PG 53. 122), FC 74, 200.
94 The Greek term is "τελειωματις", which can mean either rib or side.
Chrysostom remained consistent in this passage in his understanding of the creation of woman. She was equal to the man in nature, having come from him she was of the same essence as the man, yet was to also recognize from this that she was to honour and respect him as her head, as she was not only created from him, but also for him.

Further on in Homily 15, Chrysostom made reference again to 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 saying:

Now, it is saying, woman has been made from man whereas later it will not be like this; instead, man will come from woman—or rather, not from woman but from the cooperation of the two, as Paul also says, “Man is not from woman, but woman from man; and man was not created for woman, but woman for man.” (1 Cor. 11.8-9.) True, he is saying, but these words indicate that woman was made from man. Still, wait a while and you will see his precise teaching in what follows. He goes on, in fact: “Yet man is not independent of woman nor woman of man.” (1 Cor. 11.11.) teaching us that in the course of things the human being’s composition will derive from both man and woman through their intercourse. Hence Adam, too, said, “Now there is someone, bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh.”

Chrysostom presented here the relationship between pre-lapsarian man and woman. Woman was created from man, and for man, and for this reason she should honour and respect her head, yet she was not created subordinate to man. The two were created from the same essence, and share equally in the human nature. This is what Adam meant when he referred to his wife as being “flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bone.” The two were dependent upon each other, as all future generations were to be brought forth from their cooperation, from their intercourse, from the union of their two bodies. The man in the beginning was not superior, even though he was the head of his wife. The woman was not inferior being the body of her husband. His being her origin gave him honour, and she was to willingly submit to him freely out of respect and not due to coercion.

Chrysostom remained faithful to his position, for though he believed in the equality of genders in the pre-lapsarian world, he did not believe this in the post-lapsarian world. In the world tainted by sin, the man and woman are still interdependent, as again children are brought forth from their intercourse. However, that which the woman was to give freely to her husband is now demanded of her. This is why she is now subordinate to the man.

---
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Ad populum Antiochenum homiliae 1-21

Chrysostom in his Homilies on the Statues. (Ad populum Antiochenum homiliae 1-21), which was delivered in Antioch after the great riot of 387. made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:7 in his third homily. Chrysostom said:

Truly now is the season to proclaim, “Who can utter the mighty acts of the Lord? Who can show forth all His praise?” (Ps. cvi. 3.) How many men have not only cast down, but also trodden under foot the images of God! For when you throttle a debtor, when you strip him, when you drag him away, you trample under foot God’s image. Hear for a certainty Paul saying, that “a man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God.” (1 Cor. xi. 7.) And again, hear God Himself saying, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” (Gen. i. 26.) But if you say that man is not of the same substance as God, --what matters that? For neither was the brazen statue of the same substance as the Emperor; yet nevertheless, they who defied it paid the penalty. Thus also with regard to mankind, if men are not of the same substance as God, (as indeed they are not,) still they have been called His image: and it were fitting they should receive honor on account of the appellation.

Part of this particular passage has already been cited in the second chapter dealing with Genesis 1:26. However, it is cited at greater length here in order to show Chrysostom’s consistency of argument with 1 Corinthians 11:3-16.

I stated in my second chapter that Chrysostom established what “image” does not mean. Being in God’s image does not entail being of the same substance as God. Yet that which human beings were given by God, authority, is said to make them in his image and in turn makes them deserving of honour. Taking this point one step farther. Chrysostom here maintained his position that one cannot understand things divine and things human in
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98 Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum. iii. 19 (PG 49. 57). NPNF 1. ix. 362 with some adjustments.
exactly the same way, even though the one can be used to provide examples for the other or to show a parallel on a different level.

Chrysostom provided the following parallel to make a point to his auditors. He explained that the human being is the image of God, and should be respected and honoured for being in God's image even though he is not of the same substance. Any disrespect to God's image is to be seen as an act of insult to God. Chrysostom then draws a parallel to an earthly example. The statue of the Emperor is an image of the Emperor, and must be respected and honoured because of whom it represents. The statue is not of the same substance as the Emperor, however, any disrespect to his statue is to be seen as an insult to the Emperor's person.

Chrysostom here did not say that statues (images) of the Emperor are to be understood equally to the human being (God's image), but provided the one scenario as an example to clarify a point he intended to make for the other. Thus, Chrysostom again made reference to the limitations of language showing how meanings are deep and rich when referring to things divine, but shallow and insipid when referring to things human.

**In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum**

In his fifteenth homily *On Ephesians (In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum)*\(^\text{99}\) Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:5-15 when admonishing mistresses who uncover the heads of their maidservants and drag them by the hair. He reprimanded such brutal conduct by saying:

Paul said. "Let not a woman be uncovered." (1 Cor. xi. 5-15.) And do you then entirely strip off her headdress? Do you see how thou art doing outrage to yourself? If indeed she makes her appearance to you with her head bare, you call it an insult. And do you say that there is nothing shocking when you bare it yourself?\(^\text{100}\)

Chrysostom remained consistent in his view that a woman without a covering on her head dishonours the one who has authority over her. In this situation, the uncovered maid dishonours her mistress. Thus, Chrysostom told the mistresses who uncovered the heads of

---

\(^99\) *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum* (PG 62. 9-176).

\(^\text{100}\) *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum* xv. 4 (PG 62. 110), *NPNF 1*. xiii. 124 with some adjustments.
their servant-girls that it is even more shocking when they uncover their maids' heads for them.

In epistulam ad Galates commentarius

Chrysostom in his homily On Galatians (In epistulam ad Galates commentarius) made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:14's use of the word natural (φύσις). Here he stated:

And I admit that the flesh is inferior to the soul, yet it too is good, for that which is inferior to what is good may itself be good, but evil is not inferior to good, but opposed to it. Now if you are able to prove to me that evil originates from the body, you are at liberty to accuse it; but if your endeavor is to turn its name into a charge against it, you ought to accuse the soul likewise. For he that is deprived of the truth is called "the natural man." (1 Cor. 11:14) and the race of demons "the spirits of wickedness." (Eph. vi:12)

Chrysostom referred to 1 Corinthians 11:14 in order to defend the goodness of the body. As noted above. Chrysostom viewed φύσις (nature) as a good thing. And in 1 Corinthians 11:14 it was seen as an instrument for instruction, for it was φύσις that was to teach men that long hair was a dishonour to them, and φύσις that was to teach women that long hair was an honour to them.

In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18

In his ninth homily On I Timothy. (In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18). Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:9, while preaching on Paul's commandment that a woman must not teach, or assume authority over the man. Chrysostom described here why such a commandment is valid for his time. He stated:

---

101 In epistulam ad Galates commentarius (PG 61. 611-682).
102 In epistulam ad Galates commentarius v. 5 (PG 61. 671), NPNF 1. xiii. 4, note 1 following reference to 1 Corinthians 11:14 by Rev. Gross Alexander. states: "That is. the "psychical" man, from ψυχή, the soul."
103 In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18 (PG 62. 501-600).
104 1 Timothy 2:11-15. "Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. But I do not permit, a woman to teach, nor to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam first was formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived has come to be in transgression. But she will be saved through childbirth, if they remain in faith and love and sanctification with self-control."
If it be asked, what has this to do with women of the present day? it shows that the male sex enjoyed the higher honor. Man was first formed; and elsewhere he shows their superiority. “Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man.” (1 Cor. xi. 9.) Why then does he say this? He wishes the man to have the preeminence in every way; both for the reason given above, he means, let him have precedence, and on account of what occurred afterwards. For the woman taught the man once, and made him guilty of disobedience, and wrought our ruin. Therefore because she made a bad use of her power over the man, or her equality with him. God made her subject to her husband. “Your desire shall be for your husband.” (Gen. iii. 16.) This had not been said to her before.

Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent in his arguments, saying that before the first transgression, man was the first of equals as he was created first, and as woman came from the man and for the man. After the first transgression, in addition to his honourary status, he was elevated to a superior position, and woman became subject to her once equal husband. Prior to the first sin, man was the “head” of the woman, as God was the “head” of Christ, in that the headship symbolized their being the source of origin for the latter. The authority exercised by the head was not that of superior over inferior, but rather that of one who was honoured. The subjection was freely given, was given to honour the one who was the source of origin. The parallel between the human being on earth and the Trinity in Heaven was perfect. After the first transgression, the parallel became imperfect, for the subjection of woman became imposed upon her, due to her disobedience to God, and to her exceeding her ordained equality with the man.

In epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-10

In his eighth homily On II Timothy, (In epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-10) Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:7, while explaining the various interpretations of the term “form” (μορφή). Chrysostom said:

In the Epistle to the Romans, he says somewhat on this wise. “Having the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law” (Rom. ii. 20), where he speaks in commendation of it: but here he speaks of this sin as an evil beyond all other defects. And why is this? Because he does not use the words in the same signification. For an image is often taken to signify a

---

105 In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18 ix. 1 (PG 62. 541), NPNF l. xiiii. 435 with some adjustments.
106 In epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-10 (PG 62. 599-662).
likelihood: but sometimes a thing without life, and worthless. Thus he says himself in his Epistle to the Corinthians, "A man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." (1 Cor. xi. 7.) But the Prophet says, "Man walks in an image." (Ps. xxxix. 9, Gr.) And the Scripture sometimes to signify rapacity, as "a ravening and a roaring lion." (Ps. xxii. 13.) And we ourselves do the same. For as things are compounded and varied in themselves, they are fitly adduced for various images and emblems. As when we would express our admiration of a beautiful woman, we say, she is like a picture; and when we admire a painting, we say that it speaks, that it breathes. But we do not mean to express the same thing, but in one case to mark likeness, in the other beauty. So here with respect to form, in the one passage, it means a model, or representation, a doctrine, or pattern of godliness: in the other, something that is lifeless, a mere appearance, show, and hypocrisy. 107

Chrysostom in the above passage used the term "image" and "form" interchangeably. When explaining the use of "image" as stated in 1 Corinthians 11:7, Chrysostom is interpreting it as "a model, or representation" or a "pattern of godliness." Thus, when a man (and woman) are said to be in the image of God, he understood that they are patterned after the original. Based on this understanding Chrysostom, as we have seen in the proceeding two chapters, was able to understand image as something modeled after God, whether it was having a type of God's authority to exercise over creation, or having a type of Christ's sonship before the Father.

This passage is very important, for beyond noting that it does not contradict what was before said of Chrysostom's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:2-15, it provides us with a very succinct explanation of his understanding of image.

In Matthaem homiliae 1-89

In his homilies On Matthew (In Matthaem homiliae 1-89), 108 Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:10 109 while speaking about the angels in his fifty-ninth homily, explaining Matthew 18:10:

---

107 In epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-10 viii. 1 (PG 62. 643).
NPNF 1. xiii. 505 with some adjustments.
108 In Matthaem homiliae 1-89 (PG 57-58).
109 Krupp in his Scripture Index states that Chrysostom refers to 1 Corinthians 11:12 in his 32nd homily In Matthaem homiliae 1-89 however, no such reference is made.
Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven."\(^{110}\)

Chrysostom interpreted “these little ones” to refer not only to children, but to the poor, and all those whom the multitudes contempt. He then explained that Jesus taught that those whom society holds in contempt are really objects of reverence, because their angels always behold the face of God. Carrying the theme of angels further, Chrysostom then made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:10 saying:

Hence it is evident, that the saints have angels, or even all men. For the apostle too says of the woman. “That she ought to have power on her head because of the angels.” (1 Cor. xi.10.) And Moses. “He set the bounds of the nations according to the numbers of the angels of God. (Deut. xxxii. 8.) But here He is discoursing not of angels only, but rather of angels that are greater than others. But when He said. “The face of my Father.” He means nothing else than their fuller confidence, and their great honor.\(^{111}\)

Chrysostom remained consistent in his understanding of angels in this passage. He believed that all human beings were created a little lower than the angels, and each human being had his own personal angel. Thus, with regard to the veiling of women, he again believed that out of respect for their personal angels, if not for their husbands, women are to be veiled.

Remaining Texts

According to Krupp’s Scriptural Index, Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3 in Quod regulares feminae uiris cohabitare non debant;\(^{112}\) to 1 Corinthians 11:4 and 5 in Aduerus Judaeos orationes 1-8;\(^{113}\) and to 1 Corinthians 11:10 in In ascensionem d. n. Iesu Christi.\(^{114}\) These text have been examined and have been found to be consistent with Chrysostom’s views presented here on “headship.”

\(^{110}\) In Mattheum homiliae 1-89 lix. 4 (PG 58. 579). NPNF 1. x. 368 with some adjustments.
\(^{111}\) Ibid.
\(^{112}\) Quod regulares feminae uiris cohabitare non debant 6 (PG 47. 5524).
\(^{113}\) Aduerus Judaeos orationes 1-8 3. 2, 2 (PG 48. 863).
Conclusion

As was seen in the second and third chapters of this investigation, Chrysostom was consistent in his position with regard to the state of the human being and the relationship between the two genders, male and female. However, once Chrysostom begins to explain the meaning of male headship (κεφαλή) in Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians, his argument is confronted with apparent inconsistencies. Chrysostom viewed the subordination of woman to her male head as a result of the first transgression. However, he also maintained that κεφαλή “headship” existed in the pre-lapsarian world, in a manner similar to that which exists in the Godhead. Yet Chrysostom was clear that κεφαλή must be interpreted *differently* when speaking of things divine and things human, especially when speaking of κεφαλή in the post-lapsarian world.

In the pre-lapsarian world, the man was the head of the woman as he was her source of origin. Woman was created from the man, and for the man, and because of this, man was honoured because of her. It is in this sense that pre-lapsarian woman is a glory to her husband. Due to her obtaining her source of being from the man, woman is to honour the man and freely submit to her head, in the same manner as Christ submits to the will of God the Father. Chrysostom never agreed to an understanding of κεφαλή that viewed Christ as being subordinate or inferior to the Father. He firmly believed that the Son and the Father shared the same essence. Thus, though he did interpret κεφαλή as meaning a type of ranking, he never interpreted it as meaning inferior. Rather, he saw it as an honour for all human beings as they were intended to have the type of relationship that exists among the three persons in the Trinity. I agree with D. C. Ford that Chrysostom did not see the image of the male head and the female body demeaning women in any way, for before the first transgression, there is no coercion for the woman to submit to her husband. It is done freely, as the two ruled together as equals, the one acting as head, and the other as the body, both interdependent upon the other.

In the post-lapsarian world, Chrysostom believed the meaning of κεφαλή to be even greater removed from the meaning of κεφαλή in the divine model. After the first transgression, sin entered the world, and woman was forced by God to submit to her

---

114 *In ascensionem d.n. Iesu Christi* 1 (PG 50, 443).
115 *In Matthaeum homiliae* 1-89 i. 3 (PG 57, 17); *In Iohanem homiliae* 1-88 lii (li).
husband. Chrysostom saw the headship of man over woman as being tainted by transgression and imperfection, while the headship of God the Father over Christ remained harmonious and perfect. Thus, κεφαλή had to be understood differently in the two situations. By defining headship differently, Chrysostom was able to maintain that κεφαλή when addressing the human relationship between the man and the woman could not be seen as ontological to the human condition. Yet even though tainted by sin, Chrysostom was able to find positive aspects to the domination of men in the present order of society, as it was instituted by God to better a distorted human condition and relationship. The divine rule imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, as man would have resented woman’s role in the first transgression.¹¹⁶ Chrysostom’s explanation of “image” based on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 constituted a preeminence of honour for the man, but did not support an ontological male superiority.

It had been noticed in this chapter that Chrysostom in his early work Sermones 1-9 in Genesim stated that post-lapsarian woman is not in the image of God. He argued that the reason for this position is that she was now subject to her male head, who ruled over her. Image for the young Chrysostom meant to have total authority. However, by the time he wrote his second work On Genesis this view began to change. Chrysostom believed at this stage in his life, that woman though under her husband’s authority still has limited authority over the domestic animals. In his writings on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 there was no mention of woman not being in God’s image, only an emphasis that she is also the glory of man.¹¹⁷ In his exegesis on the Epistle to the Ephesians, which we will investigate in the fifth chapter, Chrysostom clearly stated that woman did have authority, as he referred to the wife as being “a second authority.”¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ Shortly after his comments on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 Chrysostom stated: “If you dishonor her who governs next to yourself, you will in no slight degree mar the honor of your governance”). Homily xxvi on I Corinthians, NPNF 1. xii. 156: cited from Ford. 173, note 19.
¹¹⁸ In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx (PG 62. 140 and 142), NPNF 1. xiii. 146 and 148: also Homily xxi on Ephesians, NPNF 1. xiii. 153.
Thus, this chapter reveals how even in the spiritual world “headship” still exists, and how it can exist without meaning that the head is superior to the body. Those baptized Christians who obtained son/daughtership with Christ and have become coheirs of the kingdom of heaven still retain the distinction of their gender. The Christian males in this world are still called to be the heads of their wives, and the Christian wives are called to be the bodies of their husbands. However, this subjection is not only expressed in the manner in which men and women worship God, but is to be made manifest also within the relationship between husband and wife, as it is to her husband and not to all men that the woman is to be subjected. Thus, Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians will be examined in the next chapter to clarify in what manner a man is to be head of his wife, and a wife subject to her husband. It will be examined in the next chapter that what was given to man to govern his wife and home is elective authority, for the sake of order and harmony, and not natural authority, which is the gift of the image of God to govern all of creation.
Chapter 5

The Profound Mystery in Ephesians 5:21-33

As I noted in chapter 4, Chrysostom held that headship is to be understood differently when speaking about things divine and things human, since sin and disobedience have infected the human condition. Whereas Christ's submission to the Father is wilfully done, woman's submission to man is inflicted upon her as punishment for her disobedience. Chrysostom carried this view that one is to understand differently things divine and things human in his exegesis of Ephesians 5:21-33.

In this pericope the relationship between husbands and wives is compared with the relationship between Christ and his church. However, Chrysostom stressed again that because of sin, the parallel between Christ and the church and husbands and wives is not perfect. In order for the parallel to be didactic, marriage in Ephesians is presented, not as marriage is, but as it was meant to be, namely as a union of man and woman in selfless love for the other.

Chrysostom understood the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, whom he held to be Paul, as teaching that the parallel could become close to perfect if humanity strove to live

---

1 Reference here is made to a wife being subject to her "own" husband, and not to men in general.
2 There is doubt among modern scholars as to the authorship of the letter to the Ephesians, due to the difference in vocabulary, style, and theological concepts from other Pauline epistles. Alice Parmelee in her book Guide to the New Testament (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1980), 64, presents the theory that Ephesians was written by one of Paul's gifted disciples, "who pondered deeply his master's message as expressed in his writings and later developed Paul's religious thought to its ultimate conclusion." Lewis R. Donelson in Colossians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996), 60, agrees with Parmelee and further speculates that Ephesians is largely a commentary on Colossians. Both Donelson and Bonnie Thurston in Reading Colossians, Ephesians & 2 Thessalonians (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1995), 87 make reference to Goodspeed's theory that Ephesians was probably a circular letter. Goodspeed believes that Philemon's runaway slave Onesimus, who later became bishop of Ephesus, was stimulated by the writing of Acts to search for and collect the letters of Paul. For a concise presentation on the authenticity and authorship of Ephesians see Paul J. Kobelski, "The Letter to the Ephesians" in The New Jerome Biblical Commentary (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1990), 883-885. C. Leslie Mitton has dedicated two chapters of her text, one entitled “The Case Against Pauline Authorship” and the other “The Case For Pauline Authorship” See C. Leslie Mitton,
a Christ-like life: a life that strives to live the life of the kingdom of heaven here on earth. Paul refers to the marriage between Christ and his church as a mystery, because as Chrysostom explained, it presents a relationship that is inconceivable.

Christ as head is set before Christian husbands as the model to be imitated. He is the perfect lover, the bridegroom who so loved his bride that he left his divine Father in heaven to take on her human nature in order to unite with her. He is the unrestrained lover who accepted her with all her faults and gave his life up for her in order to perfect her. Christ is the head of his church, and as her head he realized that headship meant more than authority, but also responsibility, duty, servitude and sacrifice. This is the model of a perfect husband.

The sanctified church is set before the Christian women as the model to be imitated. She is the ever-obedient bride who is united to the perfect lover. She is the body of Christ who is sanctified and made holy by his sacrifice. She is the bride who knows that she is one with her bridegroom, who unites her to his Father in heaven. This is the model of a perfect wife.

For Chrysostom, the divine union far surpasses any human bond between a husband and wife. A good marriage is one that attempts to imitate the unattainable, where both husband and wife realize that they are equal in essence, sharing in the same nature, and that they are one flesh, with the husband as the head and the wife as the body.

As I noted in chapter 2, Chrysostom taught that both man and woman were equal in nature, and were granted equally the gift of the image of authority to rule over the created world. After the first transgression God did not alter the equality of nature, but limited the authority that the human being had over the world, and made woman a "second authority" with her husband as her head. Sin distorted the role of headship, and rather than men being good stewards over those in their care, they became despots and some even tyrants. The role of the responsible ruler became distorted, as the image, due to sin, became distorted.

*The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), 7-40. However, for the purpose of this paper it must be noted that regardless whether Ephesians was written by Paul or not, Chrysostom believed it to be so, and thus for consistency and clarity in this paper I will refer to Paul as the author of Ephesians.
As I noted in chapter 3, Chrysostom believed that the coming of Christ brought about a new world with a new image, that of Christ’s son/daughtership. The image of authority as it was given in the beginning was not restored. However, the true headship of the husband over his wife that God instilled after the first transgression and which sin distorted, was revealed. Christ, as bridegroom, revealed that which was hidden from the beginning due to sin, the true meaning of headship, and its inseparability from the body.

From their creation, male and female were understood as being one human being (ἐνός ἄνθρωπος), created equal and being of one nature (Genesis 1:27). This union is again expressed in their membership in the Church that recognizes that before God there is no distinction between male and female (Galatians 3:28.) It is this union that Christ as the bridegroom of the church reveals. The husband is the head of the wife his body, and as the head and body belong to the same flesh and each needs the other in all things, so too, husbands and wives are to cooperate and work together as one unit in all things (Ephesians 5:21-33.)

Chrysostom understood Ephesians 5:21-33, to be closely associated to Genesis 1:27. and Galatians 3:28. In the very beginning of his twentieth homily on the book of Ephesians, Chrysostom made reference to both of these pericopes when he stated:

...indeed from the beginning, God appears to have made special provision for this union; and discoursing of the two as one. He said thus. Male and female he created them: and again. There is neither male nor female. For there is no relationship between man and man so close as that between man and wife, if they are joined together as they should be.⁴

As I did in chapters 3 and 4, this chapter will begin by briefly presenting the views of contemporary scholars on Ephesians 5:22-33. This is done in order to provide a foundation on which to examine Chrysostom’s exegesis of this pericope, and is not to be viewed as an attempt to provide an in-depth analysis of contemporary biblical scholarship on Ephesians 5:22-33. This chapter will then deal with Chrysostom’s interpretation of Ephesians 5:22-33, and will conclude with an examination of all of Chrysostom’s works making reference to this pericope in order to verify consistency of argument.

---

⁴ In epistolam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 1 (PG 62. 136), NPNF 1, xiii. 143 with some adjustments.
Contemporary interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33

The Epistle to the Ephesians can be seen to a large extent as a commentary on Colossians. According to Lewis Donelson, over one third of Colossians is either repeated verbatim, or paraphrased in Ephesians. The text is divided into two main sections: the first is primarily doctrinal (chs. 1 – 3), and the second is hortatory and practical (chs. 4 – 6).

Thus, Ephesians 5 begins by addressing all Christians with regard to the manner in which they are to behave. After dealing in general with all members of the church, Paul then addressed in particular relationships beginning with husbands and wives, (which is the pericope that will be dealt with in this chapter), children and fathers, and then servants and masters. According to the Anchor Bible, Ephesians 5:21 “Subject yourselves to one another in the fear of God” belongs to the preceding verses for grammatical reasons, however, the content of this verse forms a principal element of the following section dealing with husbands and wives. For this reason I include this verse in the passage under investigation. Ephesians 5:21-33 presents marriage, as it should be, a union of selfless love for the other. It reads as follow:

Subject yourselves to one another in the fear of God. Wives, to your own husbands as unto the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as also Christ is the head of the church, and He is the Saviour of the body. But just as the church is subjected to Christ, so also the wives must be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your own wives, just as also Christ loved the church and gave himself for her, in order that he might sanctify her, cleansing her by the washing of water by the word, that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or of any such things, but that she should be holy and blameless. So the husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies. The one who loves his own wife loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh, but

---

7 Some English translations such as KJV and RSV add the word “be subject to” but this does not appear in the original Greek text. (See Bonnie Thurston. Reading Colossians. Ephesians & 2 Thessalonians: A Literary and Theological Commentary (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1995). 140.)
nourishes and cherishes her [ἰκτίνος], just as also the Lord does the church. For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones. “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall be one flesh.” This is a great mystery, but I speak in reference to Christ and to the church. Nevertheless also let each of you individually so love his own wife as himself, and the wife see that she respect her husband.8

Verse 21 presents an egalitarian principle: “Subject yourselves to one another in the fear of God.”9 Lewis R. Donelson notes that the Greek verb “ὑποτάσσομαι” (subject) is normally used when full authority is given to one person by another who is completely obedient.10 Thus, this means that the one Christian is to give full authority and obedience to the other. There is no power held by the “I” as it is always ceded to the “other.” Complete submission is given to the other, who always has power over you, and you in turn over him/her. This commandment for mutual submission is given to all Christians. Thus, it serves as the foundation for all the relationships that Paul subsequently addressed.

Beginning with verses 22-24. Paul presented the married couple as being an image of Christ and the church.

Wives, to your own husbands as unto the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as also Christ is the head of the church, and He is the Saviour of the body. But just as the church is subjected to Christ, so also the wives must be to their own husbands in everything.

The relationship between a husband and wife is hierarchical, paralleling that of the eternal hierarchy between Christ and the church. Again, as in chapter 4 of our investigation, the word κεφαλὴ (head) is used to explain a type of relationship. In this pericope it is used to describe Christ’s role towards the church. He is the head, and the church is the body. As the head of the church, Christ is the source of the church’s being and thus exercises authority over her. Thurston states that as the husband’s authority has its source and origin in the lordship of Christ, it is this type of authority that the husband

8 Ephesians 5:21-33. (Translation is mine.)
9 Ephesians 5:21
is given to exert over his wife. "Any demands of the husband that are inconsistent with Christ’s lordship are outside the scope of this teaching."

Donelson views this exhortation to the wife as a call for complete submission to the husband. He states: "There is no sense here of the wife submitting only as she sees fit or only as it coheres with her faith. ...Balance is achieved only through the exhortation to the husband. Thus the wife falls under the full implication of the initial ethical principle to submit to one another."

Verse 25. "Husbands, love your own wives, just as also Christ loved the church and gave himself for her" presents the duty and responsibility of the one in authority. The husband is to love as Christ loved, being willing to freely give of himself for his wife. This verse sets a divine standard for human behaviour, a call to love without limits, a love that includes self-sacrifice.

Verses 26-27 describe how such a love transforms of the one who is loved, by portraying an image of baptism/purification:

"in order that he might sanctify her, cleansing her by the washing of water by the word, that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or of any such things, but that she should be holy and blameless.

The model presented here is that of the relationship between Christ and the church. As was addressed in the third chapter of this investigation, all human beings that are baptized in Christ are united to Christ who has cleansed them and purified them. It is Christ’s sacrificial love that has cleansed the members of his church, and has enabled them to share in his glory. The unifying and cleansing principle is the love of Christ. By dying for his bride, Christ makes the unclean members of the church pure and holy.

The husband is thus not called to take a pure bride to himself, as there is no real purity other than that which comes from the love of Christ. Rather, the husband is called to sanctify his wife by his love, which was given to him by Christ.

Verse 28. "So the husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies. The one who loves his own wife loves himself." reflects the unity realized by marriage: the

---

12 Donelson. 103.
husband and wife forming one entity. He the head, and she the body. The word "ὀφείλουν" (ought) emphasizes the moral obligation of the husband towards the wife, as the word literally implies that he "owes a debt" to her.

The image of bodily unity continue in verses 29-31, which explain that just as Eve was said by Adam to be flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones (Genesis 2:23), so too all members of the church members of Christ's body, his flesh and bones.

For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes her [αὐτήν], just as also the Lord does the church. For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones. "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall be one flesh."

This tight unity between Christ and the church is the model for Christian marriages. The appeal in verse 31 to Genesis 2:24 reinforces the ideals of closeness and unity. From the beginning of human creation, God intended for husbands and wives to function as a single unit, being of one mind and functioning as one body. However, not until the coming of Christ, whose life and sacrificial death out of love for the church provided us with the model for marriage, has God's ideal intention for marriage been revealed. His true intent remains a "mystery" (Ephesians 5:32) no longer. Though the husband is the head, and the woman is under his authority, this one-mindedness and "one-bodiedness" of the couple could not be achieved without the mutual subjection, mentioned in verse 21. It is this principle that Christ has introduced to the married state. He has simply provided husbands with authority over their wives, but also with the responsibility and duty that goes along with it. They are called to love their wives to the extent of giving their lives if need be for them. The role of ruler is compounded with the role of servant.

The authority given to the first man and woman to rule over the earth also required stewardship and thus was not simply an honoured or an empowered position. As the case with marriage, the one who holds the position of ruler is also required to take the role of a deacon.

The concluding verses (32-33) state:

This is a great mystery, but I speak in reference to Christ and to the church. Nevertheless also let each of you individually so love his own wife as himself, and the wife see that she respect her husband.
Thurston and Barth view verse 32 as the ambiguous verse in the pericope due to its unclear meaning of "μυστήριον" (mystery). Markus Barth in his text Ephesians presents three prominent opinions with regard to the meaning of "μυστήριον" in Ephesians 5:32. The first is that of "sacrament" as it is used and understood in the modern technical-ecclesiastical sense. Marriage is seen as a sacrament in that the grace of God is involved in the lives of the couple. The second meaning is that an actual "mystery" occurs in where the two individuals are in a unique way in Christ joined to become one flesh. The third meaning of the term is to be understood in an allegorical or typological way. Barth stresses the third meaning of mystery to be the most accurate, even though the other two explanations are not thereby excluded.

The mystery, therefore, has been revealed in Christ's relationship to the church. It presents the model for the human couples to follow. The husband remains the head of his wife, but is no longer to be simply her lord and ruler. He is now called to love his wife as himself, and as he cares for himself. and serves himself he is to care for and serve his wife. The wife remains the body and subject to her head, yet she is now called to respect and fear him (φοβήσω τόν ἄνδρα) as she does Christ, who gave himself up for her, in order to make her a daughter of God in the Kingdom.

Having thus examined the pericope of Ephesians 5:21-33 and with a brief examination of the contemporary interpretation of this passage, the foundation has been set to proceed and examine Chrysostom's interpretation of the pericope.

Chrysostom's understanding of Ephesians 5:22-33

Chrysostom wrote his Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians (In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum) while in Antioch. His twentieth homily On Ephesians, which deals with Ephesians 5:22-33 and reads like a moral code for husbands and wives, begins by emphasizing the unity and harmony that exists between a man and his wife, and the order that results when each partner knows their proper role. However, Chrysostom saw a

---

14 Ibid., 643.
15 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum (PG 62, 9-176).
potential danger in verse 22 "Wives, be in subjection unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord" and responded to his listeners as follows:

Yet how strange! for how then is it, Lord, that You say elsewhere, "If one bid not farewell both to wife and to husband, he cannot follow me?" (Luke 14:26.) For if it is their duty to be in subjection, "as unto the Lord," how said He, that they must depart from them for the Lord's sake? Yet their duty indeed it is, their bounden duty. But the word as is not necessarily and universally expressive of exact equality. He either means this, "as knowing that you are servants to the Lord": (which by the way is what he says elsewhere, that, even though they do it not for the husband's sake, yet must they primarily for the Lord's sake;) or else he means, "when you obey your husband, do so as serving the Lord." For if he who resists these external authorities, those of governments, I mean, "resists the ordinance of God," much more does she who submits not herself to her husband. Such was God's will from the beginning.

Let us take as our fundamental position then, that the husband occupies the place of the "head," and the wife the place of the "body"\(^\text{16}\)

Thus. Chrysostom here wished to emphasize that a wife cannot think that serving her husband is equivalent to serving her God. As with the parallel dealing with headship in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 so too here. Chrysostom clarified that one cannot equate things divine with things human. However, he also stressed that this does not negate the importance placed upon wives to submit to their husbands, as the harmony and order of not only their families but of society as a whole depends upon their submissive role. It is for the sake of this harmony and order that God ordained the husband to occupy the place of the head, and the wife that of the body. Chrysostom proceeded to explain verses 23-24 and what is meant by the head and body imagery related in the pericope. He stated:

Then, he [Paul] proceeds with arguments and says that "the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is of the Church, and He is the Saviour of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so also let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."

Then after saying, "The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is of the Church," he further adds, "and He is the Saviour of the body." For indeed the head is the saving health of the body. He had already laid down beforehand for man and wife, the ground and provision of their love, assigning to each their proper place, to the one that of authority and forethought, to the other that of submission. As then "the Church," that is.

\(^{16}\) In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 1 (PG 62. 136), NPNF 1. xiii. 143-144 with some adjustments.
both husbands and wives. "is subject unto Christ, so also you wives submit yourselves to your husbands, as unto God." \(^{17}\)

This type of subjection and submission of which Chrysostom expounded is not to be understood as oppressive or forced. As all are called to be subject to Christ out of their own will and freedom, so too, women are called to submit to their husbands freely. To have their submission inflicted and imposed upon them or to ask them to enter into subjection unthinkingly or unwillingly would negate the freedom of choice that all humans have to follow the will of God or not. The creator of humanity never forces his creation to obey, as this would negate the inviolable free will that was granted to all human beings in the beginning. Thus, when wives are called to "submit yourselves to your husbands, as unto the Lord", it must be understood that it is a call to them to exercise their freedom of choice to either follow God's will with regard to their relationships with their husbands or not. The call for wives to submit to their husbands is to be understood similarly to the call for all humanity to serve the Lord. However, the Lord is a loving and giving God, and not all husbands are tender with their wives. Even though some husbands may be cruel and not be worthy of their wife's submission, the Lord still must always be heeded.\(^{18}\)

Christ, in his incarnation and crucifixion willingly submitted to the will of the Father, and thus forever sanctified and glorified the virtues of humility and obedience. Though all Christians, both male and female are called to live out these virtues which are necessary for entry into the Kingdom of Heaven, women have the distinct calling to exemplify these virtues due to the role woman played in the first transgression. As was discussed in previous chapters, woman overstepped her authority, and broke the relationship ties of equality between her and the man, resulting in the commandment for her to be forever in this world submissive to her husband. Though submission to one's husband could be viewed by some as a form of punishment for woman. Chrysostom viewed submission, especially submission to Christ, as the only true freedom. He reasoned that due to humanity's fallen nature, one not under submission will undoubtedly, to one degree or

\(^{17}\) In epistolam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 1 (PG 62. 136), NPNF 1. xiii. 144 with some adjustments.

\(^{18}\) Though Chrysostom firmly believed in a wife's submission to her husband, he did recognize that due to sin there are limits to her submission. See David C. Ford, Women and Men in the Early Church: The Full Views of St. John Chrysostom (South Canaan: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press. 1996), 180-184.
another. become a slave to one's own passions. whether they be of the grossly sensual kind. or of the more mental kind like resentment, envy, judgementalism. pride and desire for positions of power and authority.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, the unique call given to wives to follow Christ's example of humble submission. by being obedient to their husbands is viewed by Chrysostom as being an additional aid given to women to assist them in living a life in Christ.\textsuperscript{20} The call for submission is therefore, for the "self-interest" of the wife. Chrysostom urged wives to submit. not for their husband's benefit, but for their own--"be subject for God's sake, because this adorns you. ...not them."\textsuperscript{21}

After first addressing how wives are to relate to their husbands. Chrysostom proceeded to comment on verse 25. how husbands are to relate to their wives saying:

You have heard how great the submission: you have extolled and marveled at Paul. how, like an admirable and spiritual man, he tempers together our whole life. You did well. But now hear what he also requires of you husbands: for again he is employing the same pattern.

"Husbands," said he. "love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church."

You have seen the measure of obedience. hear also the measure of love. Would you have your wife obedient unto you, as the Church is to Christ? Take then you the same provident care for her, as Christ takes for the Church. Yes, even if it shall be needful for you to give your life for her. yes, and to be cut into ten thousand pieces. yes, and to endure and undergo any suffering whatever. --refuse it not.\textsuperscript{22}

Chrysostom recognized the depth of the responsibility and the intensity of the call placed upon husbands to love their wives. He took the example given by Paul for husbands to love with the same depth as Christ loves the Church, and explained that this calls for them to be willing and wanting "to be cut into ten thousand pieces" for their wife's sake. As head of the body, and saving health of the body. husbands must risk all for the body. Their authority is not without responsibility. Yet this depth of love with which husbands are called to love their wives is still shallow in comparison with the love that Christ has for the

\textsuperscript{19} Homily on I Timothy xviii (PG 62. 599). NPNF 1. xiii. 472-473.
\textsuperscript{20} Chrysostom notes that "the greatest subjection and obedience is this, that He who is God took the form of a servant." Homiliae in 1 Epist. ad Corinthios argumentum xxxix (PG 61. 341). NPNF 1. xii. 239.
\textsuperscript{21} Homily on Colossians (PG 62. 365.) NPNF 1. xiii. 304.
\textsuperscript{22} In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 2 (PG 62. 136-137). NPNF 1. xiii. 144 with some adjustments.
Church. A husband and wife are bound and knit together, recognizing to some degree their unity, and comradeship. This makes the sacrifice of the husband easier to bear. However, the Church, sinful, spiteful and unsubmitive, often denies her association with Christ, making the divine model far more sacrificial than the human. Chrysostom stated:

Though you should undergo all this, yet will you not, no, not even then, have done anything like Christ. For you indeed are doing it for one to whom you are already knit: but He for one who turned her back on Him and hated Him. In the same way then as He laid at His feet her who turned her back on Him, who hated, and spurned, and disdained Him, not by menaces, nor by violence, nor by terror, nor by any thing else of the kind, but by his unwearied affection: so also do you behave yourself towards your wife. Yes, though you see her looking down upon you, and disdaining, and scorn ing you, yet by your great thoughtfulness for her, by affection, by kindness, you will be able to lay her at your feet. For there is nothing more absolute than these chains, and especially for husband and wife.  

Thus, regardless of how a wife treats her husband, regardless if he sees her to be worthy of his love or not, he is called to love her to the point of giving his life for her. Chrysostom advised husbands that only self-sacrifice and kindness obtain harmony and order in marriage. Harmony and order are never obtained by fear. Chrysostom continued:

[The] partner of one's life, the mother of one's children, the foundation of all one's joy, one ought never to chain down by fear and menaces, but with love and good temper. For what sort of union is that, where the wife trembles at her husband? And what sort of pleasure will the husband himself enjoy, if he dwells with his wife as with a slave, and not as with a free-woman? Yes, though you should suffer any thing on her account, do not upbraid her: for neither did Christ do this.  

As has already been noted, the divine model upon which husbands and wives are to base their relationship is the divine relationship between Christ and his Church. Verse 26 presents the divine relationship, where the bride is so lacking in virtue, is so abhorrent, and repulsive, that no human man would be able to bear such a wife, let alone love her, cherish her and die for her. However, Christ did take such a wife, and through his love, and sacrifice "arrayed her in beauty, and washed her, and refused not even this, to give Himself  

---

23 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 2 (PG 62. 137). NPNF 1. xiii. 144 with some adjustments.  
24 Ibid.
Such is the degree of responsibility that God has assigned to all husbands; and such is the extent of the love that they are to feel and express for their wives.

As head, it is the husband's responsibility to tend to the well being of the body, his wife, to provide for and protect her in the physical sense, and to nurture and uplift her in the spiritual sense. Chrysostom considered the responsibilities of headship and authority to be not only burdensome and difficult but also dangerous. He stated:

For indeed positions of authority persuade men to do many things that are not approved by God; and great vigor of soul is needed, in order to use authority rightly.... Wherefore, authority has induced many, even against their will, to show insolence: it awakens wrath, and removes the bridle from the tongue, and tears off the door of the lips, fanning the soul as with a wind, and sinking the bark in the lowest depths of evils.26

Chrysostom considered that it was better to be among the ruled than among the rulers, for the rulers are weighed down by the tasks of responsibility. Rulership from the beginning was instituted only for the purpose of benefiting those being governed. It was for this reason that God gave humanity authority over the earth, and charged them with the task of being good stewards: "Tell me, what is proper to a ruler? Is it not to help one's subjects, and to do them good?"27 Thus, the benefactor from a materialistic point is not the ruler, but the one being ruled. It is the body that benefits from the leadership given by the head. Thus, for this reason the position of the husband is to be respected because of the great responsibility that he carries.

Christ, as the husband of the church, purified her of imperfections "by the washing of water with the word." as was stated in verse 26. Following her purification, the church (verse 27) is then presented to him in "splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.” Chrysostom turned to the human husbands and beseeched them to help their wives obtain internal beauty and virtue, and not to dwell on external blemishes or deformities. He stated:

But the love having begun on just grounds, still continues ardent, since its object is beauty of soul, and not of body.28 ... Let us seek in a wife affectionateness, modest-mindedness, gentleness: these are the

\[\text{35 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 2 (PG 62. 138). VPNF 1. xiii. 145 with some adjustments.}\]

\[\text{36 Homiliae in Matthaeum xl (PG 57. 444A-B). VPNF 1. 10. 262-263, cited in Ford, 187.}\]

\[\text{37 Homiliae in Acta apostolorum lii (PG 60). VPNF 1. xi. 314, cited in Ford, 190.}\]

\[\text{38 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum. xx. 2 (PG 62. 138). VPNF 1. xiii. 145 with some adjustments.}\]
characteristics of beauty. But loveliness of person let us not seek, nor upbraid her upon these points, over which she has no power, no rather, let us not upbraid at all. (it were rudeness,) nor let us be impatient, nor sullen. Do you not see how many, after living with beautiful wives, have ended their lives pitably, and how many, who have lived with those of no great beauty, have run on to extreme old age with great enjoyment. Let us wipe off the "spot" that is within, let us smooth the "wrinkles" that are within, let us do away the "blemishes" that are on the soul. Such is the beauty God requires. Let us make her fair in God’s sight, not in our own. Let us not look for wealth, nor for that high-birth which is outward, but for that true nobility which is in the soul. Let no one endure to get rich by a wife; for such riches are base and disgraceful: no, by no means let any one seek to get rich from this source.  

Chrysostom described the means by which a husband was to improve his wife. He was to help her become a better Christian. He was to help her obtain salvation, to become an heiress of Christ’s Kingdom, by assisting her in obtaining true virtue, which is inward beauty. He emphasized that a woman’s true value was to be found in her personhood, and not in her wealth or rank. In this manner, Chrysostom presented women in a positive light, bestowing them with respect and honour, which he genuinely believed to be their due. He also stressed repeatedly the degree to which husbands are to love their wives, as their own flesh. This can be seen in his exegesis of verse 28 where he stated:

Ver. 28. “So ought men to love their wives.” said he. “as their own bodies.”

What, again, means this? To how much greater a similitude, and stronger example has he come; and not only so, but also to how much nearer and clearer an one, and to a fresh obligation. For that other one was of no very constraining force. And so, that no one may say, “but He was Christ, and was God, and gave Himself.” he next conducts his argument on a fresh ground, saying, so ought men, because the thing is not a favour, but a debt.  

Chrysostom, after explaining the role of the husband as head and his responsibility to love his wife as his own body, proceeded to explain this analogy by focusing on Paul’s reference to the creation account in verses 29-30.

Ver. 29. “For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it.”

29 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum. xx. 3 (PG 62. 138). NPNF 1. xiii. 145 with some adjustments.
30 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum. xx. 3 (PG 62. 139). NPNF 1. xiii. 145 with some adjustments: similitude=eixówn; so ought men. because the thing is not a favour. but a debt=Οὐτος ὁφειλονται οὖ γὰρ κάρος ἔστι τὸ πράγμα. ἀλλ’ ὁφειλή.
That is. tends it with exceeding care. And how is she his flesh? Listen: "This now is bone of my bone," said Adam, "and flesh of my flesh." (Gen. 2:23.) And not only so, but also, "they shall be," said God. "one flesh." (Gen. 2:24.)

"Even as Christ the Church." Here he returns to the former example. Ver. 30. "For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones."

How so? In that He was made of our substance, as Eve also was made flesh from the flesh of Adam. And well does he make mention of "bones and flesh:" for these are principal things about us, our flesh and bones. The one being laid underneath as a sort of foundation [υπόκειμενα], the other as a superstructure [οἰκοδομία].

Chrysostom presented an architectural example, where the bones function as a type of foundation, and the flesh as a type of superstructure, which together form a solidly built edifice. Thus, husband and wife bring their "materials" together to build their single edifice, which is so intricately constructed, that it is impossible to identify the materials of each.

---

31 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 3 (PG 62. 139), Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians and Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians. of S. John Chrysostom, (Oxford: John Henry Parker. 1840). 319 with some adjustments. (VPNF 1. xiii. 146 omits Chrysostom's exegesis of verse 30.) The second creation account, which chronicles the creation of Eve from the rib of Adam, is used by Chrysostom for what Valerie Karras calls his "derivative" theory of the image of God in woman. However, Chrysostom also used this account "to emphasize that woman is ὅμοιος υἱὸς and ὅμοιος γυνῆς to man. God has not made a new creation in woman. Rather, he has simply constructed another human being--hence, the use of the word οἰκοδομῆ. Adam needed someone with whom to converse (διαλέγομαι), with whom to share. someone who could provide him with human communion, and woman met that need perfectly." Homiliae 67 in Genesin xv. 3. (PG 53. 121-22), cited by Karras. "Male Domination of Woman" in the Greek Orthodox Theological Review 36. No. 2 (1991): 132.

Kenneth Wesche. in his article "Man and Woman in Orthodox Tradition." St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 37. Nos. 2 & 3 (1993): 228-229. explains this further: "Eve came into being from out of the hypostasis of Adam. Like Adam. Eve was brought into being as an hypostasis in her own right. and. like Adam, Eve is taken by the Fathers as a perfect example of an hypostasis: 'Since there are many men, each single man is an hypostasis. For example. Adam is an hypostasis. Eve another hypostasis. Seth another hypostasis.' (John of Damascus. De Institutione Elementarit PG 95. 101 A 4-7.) But she is brought into being as an hypostasis from within the hypostasis of Adam and not from some abstract human nature. This means that Eve derives the whole of her being from within Adam, and cannot be contemplated ontologically apart from him.

... Because Eve comes from out of the innermost depths of Adam and receives from him everything she is--both her existence as hypostasis and her human nature--gender is seen to be a manifestation of the fact that our being is constituted as its very core in an intimate communion of love."
Chrysostom then extended the flesh and bones imagery further, making a transition from things human to things divine. Having established the depth of the marriage union, he proceeded to establish the even deeper mystery of the union between Christ and the Church.

What means, “of His flesh?” It means, really from Him. And how are we thus “members of Christ?” In that we have been begotten after Him. And how “of His flesh?” You know, as many as partake of the Mysteries. For from Him are we at once created anew. And how? ... “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.” Only here He imparts to us, not we to Him. How then are we “of His flesh and of His bones?” Some say that it is “the blood and the water” are meant, but it is not so. But what he means to express is this, that like as, without conjugal union. He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, so also are we begotten in the Laver [font].

Though “some”, as Chrysostom stated, would understand flesh and blood to refer to the consecrated gifts. Chrysostom refuted this interpretation insisting that baptism is here referred to, the means in which one becomes of one flesh with Christ. Reference is again made to the Genesis account as Chrysostom made comparisons between Adam and Christ.

But mark. Adam was created. Christ was born. From Adam’s side entered in corruption. From the side of Christ welled forth life. In Paradise sprang up death, in His Cross was effected its destruction. As then the Son of God is of our nature, so are we of His substance: and as He has us in Himself. so also have we Him in us.

---


33 “In ancient Israel, the bride would bathe and dress and be escorted to the bridegroom by his friends. In the Church, baptism is that bathing and dressing in which we put on Christ (v. 26), and the groom Himself, Christ, escorts us (v. 27). In the Church, the baptized are one humanity, one flesh with Christ. In marriage, husband and wife are one flesh with each other,” cited by Alan Wallerstedt et al., eds. The Orthodox Study Bible. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers. 1993), 450, note 2.

It is interesting how the union between husband and wife is here seen by Chrysostom as being an image of baptism, the union between Christ and the Church, and is presented as such. In his homily on Galatians, where he addresses baptism directly, Chrysostom made no reference to the baptism image, as he made no mention of neither male and female.

As the union between Christ and his Church is inseparable, and indivisible, so is the union between husbands and their wives. For as the Genesis account states, and Paul in the 31st verse of his epistle repeated, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.” Chrysostom saw this as the third ground of obligation or responsibility for the husband, as it shows that a man is to leave those who begot, bore and raised him, and be knit to his wife. Through this image of knitting, two examples are presented. The first shows how two threads of yarn can be brought together, knit together, to make a single garment that is stronger and more durable than one composed of a single thread. The second reveals how two colours can be knit together to produce a garment that is more appealing, and beautiful. Regardless of which example one examines, the image provides an end product that is of better quality and calibre. Chrysostom continued to explain that the one flesh is, father, and mother and the child, from the substance of the two commingled. For indeed by the commingling of their seeds is the child produced, so that the three are one flesh. Thus then are we in relation to Christ; we become one flesh by participation, and we much more than the child.

Chrysostom then proceeded to explain even greater than sharing the same nature with man, woman is of the same flesh. The husband is the head and woman the body. On this point Chrysostom made reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3 “the Head of Christ is God.” In the divine model, God is the Head, and Christ is the Body. Humanity through baptism is born into the divine union in an adoptive sense to become children of God.

This I also say, that as we are one body, so also are Christ and the Father One. And thus then is the Father also found to be our Head. He sets down two examples, that of the natural body and that of Christ’s body. And hence he further adds.

Ver. 32. “This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.”

Why does he call it a great mystery? That it was something great and wonderful, the blessed Moses, or rather God, intimated. For the present, however, said he, I speak regarding Christ, both that He left the Father and

---

35 In epistolam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 4(PG 62. 139). NPNF 1. xiii. 146 with some adjustments.
36 Ibid. (PG 62. 139-140). NPNF 1. xiii. 146 with some adjustments.
37 Ibid. (PG 62. 140). NPNF 1. xiii. 146 with some adjustments.
came down, and came to the Bride, and became one Spirit. "For he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit." (1 Cor. 6:17.)

The divine model presented here is flawless, sinless, and perfect. The human image is called to mimic this perfection. However, as stated above, sin distorts and disfigures the goal to which human beings are called. Perfect love does not exist in human marriages, as it does in the divine model. Not all husbands love their wives, subjecting them instead to a relationship of fear, oppression and even terror through their abusive behaviour. Not all wives respect their husbands, but cause them shame and humiliation due to their poor character. For this reason Chrysostom again emphasized the duties of the husband and wife when explaining the final verse, verse 33 of our pericope.

However not for the husband's sake alone it is thus said, but for the wife's sake also, that "he cherish her as his own flesh, as Christ also the Church, and, that the wife fear her husband." He is no longer setting down the duties of love only, but what? "That she fear her husband." The wife is a second authority [my italics] (ἀρχή δευτέρα); let not her then demand equality, for she is under the head; nor let him despise her as being in subjection, for she is the body; and if the head despise the body, it will itself also perish. But let him bring in love as a counterpoise to obedience: as is the case with the head and the body; the body yielding the hands, the feet, and all the rest of the members for service, the head providing for the body, and containing all feeling in itself. Nothing can be better than this union.

And yet how can there ever be love, one may say, where there is fear? It will exist there, I say, pre-eminently. For she that fears and reverences, loves also; and she that loves, fears and reverences him as being the head, and loves him as being a member, since the head itself is a member of the body at large. Hence he places the one in subjection, and the other in authority, that there may be peace: for where there is equality of ranks there can never be peace: neither where a house is a democracy, nor where all are rulers: but the ruling power must of necessity be one. And this is universally the case with matters referring to the body, inasmuch as when men are spiritual, there will be peace.

---

38 *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum* xx. 4 (*PG* 62. 140). *NPNF* 1. xiii. 146 with some adjustments.

39 *Ephesians* 5:33. "Nevertheless also let each of you individually so love his own wife as himself, and the wife see that she respect her husband." Chrysostom interpreted "νυνὶ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβήσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα," as "and the wife see that she fears her husband."

40 *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum*, xx. 4 (*PG* 62. 140). *NPNF* 1. xiii. 146-147 with some adjustments.
Thus, Chrysostom returned to his understanding of humanity, male and female, being created in God’s image of authority. The paradox again emerges, where husband and wife, being of one substance, of one being, and thus being ontologically equal, with both sharing in the divine son/daughtership of Christ, are at the same time said to not be equal in authority. However, Chrysostom made two very important points in his exegesis of this verse. First, Chrysostom did see woman as having authority even though it is second to the man. He called her “a second authority.” Thus, she does possess in the post-lapsarian era the image of God’s authority to some degree even if it is lesser than the man’s authority. Second, unlike the innate image of God to rule over creation, this authority of the husband over his wife is not innate, as its purpose is purely functional, that of establishing order and harmony. As was stated in the second chapter, this type of authority of the husband over the wife is elective authority rather than natural authority. Men are not the head of all women: rather the man is only head of his wife, who was chosen either for him or by him. For the sake of harmony in the family and for the sake of order. God in his wisdom saw it necessary to appoint the man as ruler of his home.

Thus the wife is a second authority, “possessing indeed an authority, and a considerable equality of dignity: but at the same time the husband has something more.” In Chrysostom’s view, in order for harmony to exist in the household, husbands are to “Guide your wife, and thus will the whole house be in harmony.” And again, “For indeed a house is a little Church.”

For Chrysostom, humanity was never intended to be in the image of God’s essence, of God’s innate being, but rather, humanity was created to mirror God in manner, in the way which God functions, and relates. There is order in the Godhead, a particular ranking among the three ontologically equal divine hypostasis, which leads to the perfect harmony.

---

41 Chrysostom in his Sermones 1-9 in Genesin ii. 2. (PG 54. 587) stated that woman had no authority at all, and was therefore not in God’s image. It is obvious that Chrysostom had developed Diodore’s view of image and how it relates to gender.
42 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 6 (PG 62. 142). NPNF 1. xiii. 148 with some adjustments.
43 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 6 (PG 62. 143). NPNF 1. xiii. 148 with some adjustments. Ράθμιζε τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ οὕτω συγκροτεῖται ἡ οἰκία.
44 Ibid.
peace, unanimity, and oneness that is characteristic of the relationship that exists in the
divine Trinity.

In Chrysostom's day, the Church was faced with the threat of Arian heresy, which
compelled Chrysostom to argue frequently against the doctrine of the Son's ontological
subordination to the Father. However, in spite of his repeated emphasis on the full
ontological equality of the Son with the Father, Chrysostom was careful to not fall into the
error of Sabellianism, the teaching that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are but different
names given to one identical being. Thus, he remained true to the doctrine of Nicaea that
affirms not only the separate entities of the Father and the Son, but also the order of the
Godhead.

Due to his efforts to combat the Arian heresy, however, Chrysostom rarely
commented specifically on the ordering of Father, Son and Holy Spirit within the Godhead.
For the most part he remained silent except for particular instances where he addressed the
ordering and the relationship that this ordering proclaims. One such case occurs in his
commentary on the Gospel of St. John, where Chrysostom specified the Father as the
"cause" of the Son. Another example can be found in his Philippian homilies, where he
stated, "For is not the name of the Father sufficient to show the priority of the Father? ...
And besides, this honour is not capable of passing from the Father to the Son." According
to Ford, though Chrysostom did not emphasize the Father-Son-Spirit ordering within the
Godhead, it is solidly present in his thought. However, this ordering is not understood as
being a strict hierarchy where the Father is over the Son, and the Son over the Spirit but
rather, is understood in the sense that the Father is equally "over" the Son and the Spirit.
Chrysostom was thus able to emphasize this ordering as being the "framework," for the
ineffable harmony of the three members of the Trinity in their willing and acting.

Thus, Chrysostom believed the authority that was given to the man to rule over his
wife is not an innate quality. This type of elective authority is not a necessary element in
human nature, nor is it an ingredient that comprises the human essence. This type of

45 Ford. 151.
48 Ford. 153.
authority was introduced into the world in order to combat the chaos created by sin. Those in positions of authority for the sake of law and order are not any more human than those who are in positions of subjection. This type of authority, therefore, is something external.

Chrysostom’s interpretation of Ephesians 5:22-33 as expressed in his twentieth homily On Ephesians reinforced his interpretation that image is to mean authority to rule and govern. Yet image of God given to the human being in the beginning was a natural authority, a gift necessary to the human being’s composition, as it was something internal to our humanity. However, nowhere in the Bible does it state that the wife after the first transgression was to be in the image of her husband. She is the glory of man, but not his image. Thus, even though the man was given power and authority over his wife after the first transgression, this authority or headship was elective and not innate. Woman did not become less human because of her subjection to her husband. She always remained equal to man in her humanity.

However, in order to make certain that this is indeed Chrysostom’s understanding of headship as it is expressed in Ephesians 5:21-33, it is important to examine at this point all of his references to this pericope.⁴⁰

*Sermones 1-9 in Genesim*

In the fourth homily of his *Sermones 1-9 in Genesim* dealing with the first three chapters of Genesis. Chrysostom referred to Ephesians 5:25 and 33. Here he stated:

I want you to learn what Paul says about this guardianship and how he blends authority with love. Where does he say this? Writing to the Corinthians⁵¹ he says, “Husbands, love your wives.” (Eph. 5:25) see “Your husband shall be your desire.” (Gen. 3:16) “Wives respect your husbands” (Eph. 5:33) see “And he shall rule over you.” (Gen. 3:16) See how the rule of authority (ἀυτοκρατηρία) is gentle when the lord of a maid is a manic lover. when there is respect together with love? For in this manner the burden of servitude disappears. One authority was introduced by disobedience. For surely do you not see this, that God regulated her according to this correct manner, however, sin made her nature that of a servant. This is the second

---

⁴⁹ Ibid.
⁵⁰ See Appendix D for all of Chrysostom’s references to Ephesians 5:21-33 as cited by Krupp in his Scripture Index.
⁵¹ Mistakenly he wrote Corinthians though the quote is from Ephesians.
type of servitude that is more severe than the previous, and this has its beginning and cause in transgression.  

In this early writing of Chrysostom, two types of elective authority are introduced. God instituted the first type after the first transgression, according to which woman was made subject to her husband. This subjection was not intended to be demeaning. As Chrysostom stated, the rule of authority is gentle when he who is in charge is "manically" in love with the one who is subject to him. The second type of elective authority is not gentle, as it was due to a distortion of the first elective authority, a distortion instituted by sin. Selfishness, egotism, hostility, anger, and pride are what have changed the first type of elective authority of man over woman into the second type. This type of authority of man over woman is oppressive and as a product of sin is it not acceptable in God’s eyes.

Even at this early stage in his life, Chrysostom here remains consistent in his views of the husband having authority over his wife as a result of the first transgression.

*Homiliae 1-67 in Genesis*

In his homilies *On Genesis (Homiliae 1-67 in Genesis)*, Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:23 and Ephesians 5:32. In his fourteenth homily, Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:23 in order to show God’s benevolence towards woman. He stated:

Notice in this case as well as others God’s goodness, how much regard he demonstrates also for the woman due to be formed from man. I mean, though she is yet to be created he gives instruction as though to two people in the words, "‘Do not eat from it, [ὠ φάγεσθε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ]’’’ and, ‘‘‘On the day you eat [φάγητε] from it you will truly die, [Θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε]’’’ showing right from the outset that man and woman are one. as Paul also says, “The man is head of the woman.” (Ephesians 5:23.) So he speaks as though to two people for this reason, that when later he has formed the woman from man, he may provide the latter with an excuse for acquainting her with God’s instructions.

---

52 *Sermones 1-9 in Genesim* iv. 2 (PG 54. 595). (All translations for *Sermones 1-9 in Genesim* are mine.)

53 *Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim* (PG 53-54).

54 *Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim* xiv. 4 (PG 53. 115), *FC* 74. 188 with some adjustments.
Chrysostom remained consistent in his opinion that woman and man are ontologically equal, as woman came out of the man's being. He further argued this point by noting that God's commandment to man was given in the plural, thus including woman. This also showed them sharing in the same human essence and being ontologically one. Chrysostom's final point was to refer to Ephesians 5:23 where man was said to be the head of the woman. No head exists nor can exist without a body. This analogy again supports his belief that men and women are equal in their human essence. It is for this reason that the man was to acquaint the woman with God's commandment after her creation.

In his fifty-sixth homily in Genesim, Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:32 while explaining for his auditors the marriage between Jacob and Rachel. He expounded upon the solemnity in which the bride's father, Laban, conducted the wedding. Chrysostom stated:

I mean, how anomalous would it be for us, having the advantage as we do of such sound values and participants in awesome and ineffable mysteries, to prove inferior in this to Laban, who was still worshipping idols? Do you not hear Paul saying that marriage is a mystery, an image of the love Christ showed for the Church? (Ephesians 5:32) Accordingly, let us not bring shame on ourselves nor undermine the holiness of marriage. I mean, if the purpose is commendable and useful, even if not in general practice, let it be done; on the other hand, if what is done by us is harmful and full of mischief, even if it is general practice, get rid of it.  

Chrysostom reinforced the teaching of marriage being a mystery, an image of the love that Christ had for the Church. He argued that such a great and holy event should not be conducted together with shameful practices of the times. Chrysostom remained consistent in this passage with his views of marriage being an image of the divine marriage between Christ and the church, and presented nothing contradicting his position of male headship.

---

55 Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim lvi. 1 (PG 54. 487), FC 87, 121.
Catecheses ad illuminandos

As would be expected, Chrysostom made numerous references to Ephesians 5:22-33 in his baptismal orations in Antioch about the year 390. As it was through baptism that Christ purified his bride the church and united himself with her, the divine model of marriage is intrinsically connected with and thus cannot be separated from the sacrament of baptism.

In his first baptismal instruction Chrysostom explained the contract and gifts of the spiritual marriage between Christ and the church making reference to Ephesians 5:25, 26 and 27. He began as follows:

Just as for a marriage in the sensible order a document covering the dowry is executed and gifts are given, the man bringing the gifts and the prospective bride, the dowry contract, so in the spiritual marriage it is natural that something of that sort must take place. For the understanding must be led from things of the body to those which belong to the spirit, to things which come closer to God. What, then, is the dowry contract in this marriage? Nothing but the obedience and the agreement which will be made with the Bridegroom. And what are the gifts which the Bridegroom brings before the marriage? Hear the blessed Paul. He shows us when he says: "Husbands, love your own wives, just as also Christ loved the church and delivered himself up for her, that He might sanctify her, cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word, in order that He might present to Himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."^57

Thus, the dowry that the church gives to Christ is her obedience. Such a bride who subjects herself to this agreement must first recognize the headship of her groom, must honour, and respect him and accept her position in the relationship as that of the body. Such a bride acknowledges that not only her origin is in her husband, but her betterment and salvation as well. The gift that Christ gives to the church is his saving love. Such a groom would willingly suffer for his bride. Such a groom would willingly endure ridicule, humiliation, and even death for his bride. Such a groom recognizes that it is his responsibility to better his bride. Both bride and groom recognize that if harmony is to exist in the marriage, each of them must respect the other in their place. She needs to respect him

---

as her head, and must refrain from trying to usurp his authority. However, he must also respect her as his body, and not attempt to take on the positions of both head and body, respecting her position as being uniquely her own.

Chrysostom continued to describe the sacred marriage making reference to Ephesians 5:25-27 as follows:

Did you see the magnitude of His gifts? Did you see the ineffable bounty of His love? "Just as Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself up for her." No man would ever have allowed himself to do this, namely, to pour out his blood for the woman who was going to be his bride. But the kindly Master, imitating His own goodness, has accepted this great and marvellous sacrifice because of His solicitude for her, that by His own blood He might sanctify her; that, having cleansed her by the bath of baptism, He might present her to Himself a Church in all her glory. To this end He poured forth His blood and endured the cross, that through this He might freely give sanctification to us too, and might cleanse us through the bath of regeneration, and might present to Himself those who before were in dishonour and unable to speak with confidence, but now are glorious, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. You see how in saying: "That He might cleanse and present to Himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," He teaches us that before this, the Church was in an unclean condition. ... You know well the Master's munificence, the bounty of His grace, the grandeur of His gift. Let all of you who have here been esteemed worthy of being admitted to citizenship show an abundance of good will and come forward!58

It is evident in the above passage that Chrysostom continued to be consistent in his exegesis of Ephesians 5:25-27. He displayed the extent of Christ's love for the church, and how Christ's sacrifice sanctified and purified his bride, making evident the responsibility that goes with headship. Chrysostom again reinforced how all baptized people are called to be equal "citizens" of the church, while still preserving their role in society.

In the eleventh instruction Chrysostom again made reference to Ephesians 5:25-27 in order to show the transformation of the church which was brought about by the love of Christ. Chrysostom stated:

... Do you wish to see her sandals too? They are not sewn from tangible material nor have they been put together from ordinary leather, but they are fashioned from the gospel and peace. He says: "Have your feet shod with the readiness of the gospel of peace." (Eph. 6:16.) Do you wish

57 Catecheses ad illuminandos i. 16; Harkins. 29. See chapter 3, 95, note 64.
58 Catecheses ad illuminandos i. 17-18; Harkins. 29-30.
me to show you the very vision of the bride flashing forth with irresistible beauty, surrounded by a large throng of angels and archangels? Let us take the hand of Paul, who leads the bride to her Bridegroom; he will be able to cut through the throng and lead us to her side. What, then, does Paul say? "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself up for her, that He might sanctify her, cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word." (Eph. 5:25-26.)

Did you see the bride’s body bright and shining? Did you see her beauty, which flashes forth beyond the rays of the sun? And then he goes on to say: "That she might be holy and without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. (Eph. 5:27.) Did you see the very flower of youth, the very peak of life in its prime? Do you wish to know what this bride is called? She is called faithful and a saint. For the Apostle says: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the saints who are at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus. (Eph. 1:1.)"

The beauty of the church is beyond compare with anything found on earth. Thus, Chrysostom presents the divine model of the love between Christ and the church as far beyond any earthly image of marriage. Christ’s love for his bride is far greater than any human groom’s love. The transforming power of his love is greater than any to be found in the hearts of men. It is for this reason that the bride of Christ, who was described by Chrysostom as being the worst possible bride, was transformed into the most radiant of all. Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent in his exegesis of Ephesians 5:25-7.

The issue of marriage as a great mystery (Ephesians 5:31-32) was also addressed by Chrysostom in his first baptismal instruction. He stated:

Did you see the goodness of the Master? It was not then in vain nor without reason that, at the beginning of my discourse, I called what takes place here a spiritual marriage. For in the case of that marriage which can be seen by bodily eyes, it is altogether impossible that the bride be united to a husband, unless she has forgotten her parents and those who reared her, and unless she has given over her will, whole and entire, to him who will be joined to her as her bridegroom. Hence, the blessed Paul, in treating of marriage, called it a mystery. For after he had said: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two

59 Catecheses ad illuminandos xi. 9-10: Harkins, 163-164.
60 In epistolam ad Ephesios argumentum xx. 2 (PG 62. 137), NPNF 1. xiii. 144 with some adjustments.
61 According to Krupp’s Scriptural Index (see appendix D) Chrysostom also made reference to Ephesians 5:27 in Catecheses ad illuminandos iv. 42. however. I can find no such reference.
shall become one flesh.” he pondered on the strength of this bond, and cried out in amazement: “This is a great mystery.” (Eph. 5:31-32.)

Adam, the first-formed man, with prophetic eyes foresaw this very thing and said: “She shall be called woman, because she was taken out of her man. Wherefore, a man shall leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.” (Gen. 2:23-24.) The same thing could be said of the husband, because he too has forgotten his parents and his father’s house to unite himself and cleave to the wife who on that night is jointed to him. Furthermore, to point out the closeness of this union, the Holy Scripture did not say: “He shall be united to a wife.” but: “He shall cleave to his wife.” Nor was Holy Writ content with that, but added: “And they shall be two in one flesh.” For this reason Christ too brought forward this testimony and said: “Therefore, now they are no longer two, but one flesh.” So intimate is this union and adherence that the two of them are one flesh.

Chrysostom remained consistent in his exegesis of Ephesians 5:31-32 in the above passages, by reinforcing the intimacy of the union and bond between a husband and wife. However, he continued to maintain in his eleventh instruction that this human union, though great, pales before the union between Christ and his bride, the church. It is clear that for Chrysostom, divine models will always far surpass their human images. Chrysostom stated:

But in the case of human beings it is not strange that this is so. For even if the difference in rank be considerable, there is no difference in nature: even if the bridegroom be rich and the bride a poor beggar, both have the same nature. But in the case of Christ and the Church the marvel is that, being God and possessed of that blessed and undefiled nature—and you know how great is the distance between God and men—He deigned to come to our nature. He put aside His Father’s home in heaven and, not by passing from one place to another but according to a plan whereby He took to Himself a body. He has hastened to His bride. The blessed Paul himself know this: marveling at the excess of Christ’s care for us and the honor which He bestowed on us. Paul cried aloud and said: “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife. This is a great mystery—I mean in reference to Christ and to the Church.” (Eph. 5:31-32.)

---

62 Catecheses ad illuminandos i. 11; Harkins. 26-27.
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In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum

Chrysostom presented his exegesis on Ephesians 5:21-33 in his twentieth homily On Ephesians, which was examined above. However, he also made references to this pericope in other homilies On Ephesians and these will be examined in turn.

Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:21, “Subject yourselves to one another in the fear of God.” in his twenty-second homily dealing with servants who are called to be obedient to their masters. Though this investigation does not deal with the issue of slavery, it does deal indirectly with the issue of servitude. For this reason Chrysostom’s comments to servants to obey their masters will be quoted in full, as they solidify opinions expressed in the third chapter of this investigation dealing with becoming a son/daughter of God.

Chrysostom stated:

“Servants,” said he, “be obedient to them that, according to the flesh, are your masters.”

Thus at once he raises up, at once soothes the wounded soul. Be not grieved, he seems to say, that you are inferior to the wife and the children. Slavery is nothing but a name. The mastership is “according to the flesh,” brief and temporary; for whatever is of the flesh, is transitory.

“With fear,” he adds, “and trembling.”

You see that he does not require the same fear from slaves as from wives: for in that case he simply said, “and let the wife see that she fear her husband”; whereas in this case he heightens the expression, “with fear.” he said, “and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ.” This is what he constantly says. What do you mean, blessed Paul? He is a brother, or rather he has become a brother, he enjoys the same privileges, he belongs to the same body. Yes, more, he is the brother, not of his own master only, but also of the Son of God, he is partaker of all the same privileges; yet says you, “obey your masters according to the flesh with fear and trembling?” Yes, for this very reason, he would say, I say it. For if I charge free men to submit themselves one to another in the fear of God,—as he said above, “submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ” (Eph. 5:21)—if I charge moreover the wife to fear and reverence her husband, although she is his equal; much more must I so speak to the servant. It is no sign of low birth, rather it is the truest nobility, to understand how to lower ourselves, to be modest and unassuming, and to give way to our neighbour. And the free have served the free with much fear and trembling.

In the above passage, a few key points are again addressed. First, the ranking that exists in human society with some having authority over others, is not an innate quality. It is
something that belongs to this world, and thus is referred to by Chrysostom as being transitory. Second, the status of wife is greater than that of servant, even though the servant may be male. Thus, women are not subject to all men, but only to their husband who is their head. Third, though women may be subject to their husbands, their subjection is not due to any inferior quality as they are equal to their husbands. Fourth, all human beings baptized in Christ are brothers and sisters not only of each other but of Christ as well. For this reason, masters and slaves are called upon to lower themselves in humility, and to submit in Christ to their brothers. Though in Christ all are equal, still, Chrysostom did not abolish social distinctions and roles. What he did advocate was the spiritual equality due to those whom society had labeled and categorized as inferior. Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent in his understanding of an equal humanity before God in Christ, yet a human race existing in the world with some having authority over others.

In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44

Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:25 and 33 in his nineteenth homily On First Corinthians (In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44) where he addresses 1 Corinthians 7:3 and the conjugal rights of the husband and wife. He states:

Ver. 3. “Let the husband pay the wife the honour due to her: in like manner the wife the husband.”

Now what is the meaning of “the due honour? The wife has not power over her own body:” but is both the slave and the mistress of the husband. And if you decline the service which is due, you have offended God. But if you wish to withdraw yourself, it must be with the husband’s permission, though it be but a for a short time. For this is why he calls the matter a debt, to show that no one is master of himself but that they are servants to each other.

When therefore you see a harlot tempting you, say, “My body is not mine, but my wife’s.” The same also let the woman say to those who would undermine her chastity. “My body is not mine, but my husband’s.”

Now if neither husband nor wife has power even over their own body, much less have they over their property. Hear you, all that have husbands and all that have wives: that if you must not count your body your own, much less your money.

65 In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum xxii. 1 (PG 62, 155), NPNF 1. xiii. 157-158 with some adjustments.
66 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 (PG 61. 11-382).
Elsewhere I grant He gives to the husband abundant precedence, both in the New Testament, and the Old saying, (ἡ ἀποστροφὴ σου. LXX. Gen. 3:16.) "Your turning shall be towards your husband, and he shall rule over you." Paul does so too by making a distinction thus, and writing, (Ephesians 5:25. 33.) "Husbands, love your wives; and let the wife see that she reverence her husband." But in this place we hear no more of greater and less, but it is one and the same right. Now why is this? Because his speech was about chastity. "In all other things," says he, "let the husband have the prerogative: but not so where the question is about chastity." "The husband has no power over his own body, neither the wife." There is great equality of honour, and no prerogative.67

According to Chrysostom, the husband is always in a position of authority over his wife except when dealing with chastity issues. The wife has authority over her husband's body, where the husband is obligated to fulfill his duty to his wife. This authority is mutual. The husband has authority over the wife's body, and she in turn is obligated to fulfill her duty to her husband. Only with matters dealing with physical intimacy is there total equality between a husband and wife. At the same time each spouse is both ruler and ruled. Thus, Chrysostom remained consistent to his teachings regarding the husband being the head of the wife, yet went even further to introduce the notion that the husband, though the head, still has responsibilities of servitude and duty towards his wife in matters of physical intimacy. On all other issues, the husband is the head and the wife the body.

However, Chrysostom made an interesting aside. He stated: "You must not count your body your own, much less your money."68 Though the husband is the head and the manager of the household, he must not consider himself to be the sole owner of all that belongs to the household, for it also belongs to his wife. Chrysostom believed that what they own is mutually owned. Both hold what they possess. Thus, Chrysostom tried to make his married listeners see that they are called to have mutual respect and cooperation in all things. Neither head nor body can ever function apart, and must work together if there is to be progress and harmony in a marriage.

67 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1–44 xix. 1 (PG 61. 152). VP:VF 1. xii. 105 with some adjustments.
In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32

While explaining Romans 15:369, Chrysostom referred to Ephesians 5:25 saying:

Ver. 3. “For even Christ pleased not himself.”
And this he always does. For when he was upon the subject of alms, he brought Him forward and said, “You know the grace of the Lord, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor.” (2 Cor. 8:9.) And when he was exhorting to charity, it was from Him that he exhorted in the words “As Christ also loved us.” (Eph. 5:25). And when he was giving advice about bearing shame and dangers, he took refuge in Him, and said, “Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame.” (Heb. 12:2). So in this passage too he shows how He also did this, and how the prophet proclaimed it from of old.70

What Chrysostom emphasized in this passage is the selflessness of Christ, and the excess of his love for the church. The divine model is again presented and is shown to be far superior than any human image of love and sacrifice.

Contra Anomoeos

As I noted in chapter two where I deal with Genesis 1:23, the 12 homilies known as Contra Anomoeos71 (PG 48.701-812) are two separate works. The eleventh homily belonging to the second section. On the Same Essence (Περί Ὁμοούσιος), was written in Constantinople.72 Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:23, in an attempt to increase church attendance. He began explaining how the early church grew in number from eleven (after the loss of Judas), to one hundred twenty, to three thousand, and then five thousand and then to all the inhabited world.73 He called his listeners to imitate the first Christians, for it is a shame for women to show more care for their poor neighbours (though this is good) than for their church. Chrysostom wrote:

Do this therefore also for this church. Let us all hasten from everywhere and let us hide [συγκαλύψωμεν] her poverty, or better yet let us end her poverty

68 In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44 xix. 2 (PG 61. 152). NPNF 1. xii. 105 with some adjustments.
69 Romans 15:3. “For even Christ did not please Himself, but just as it is written. “The reproaches of the those who reproaching You fell on Me.” (My translation.)
70 In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32 xxvii. 2 (15:3) (PG 60. 646). NPNF 1. xi. 535-536 with some adjustments.
71 See Chapter 2. 73, note 77.
72 Μετατάξεις, 5.
73 Contra Anomoeos xi. 4 (PG 48. 801-802).
attending here continuously. "The head of the woman is the man." (Ephesians 5:23) The woman is the help of the man. Therefore, neither the head must tolerate to enter into this holy place without the body, nor the body to present itself here without the head, but the whole person [ἀνθρωπόντας] to enter in here, having the children with you.74

Chrysostom remained consistent in his beliefs and teachings that the husband and wife are one body, and that the husband is the head, and the woman the body, and that both need to constantly work together in all things.

In Colossenses homiliae 1-12

The twelve homilies on the Epistle to the Colossians were written in Constantinople, probably in the year 399.75 In his last of the homilies In Colossenses homiliae 76 Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:32, when condemning the abuses of wedding feasts, and expounding upon the proper manner of celebrating an event at which Christ is present. Following his disapproval of wedding feasts, Chrysostom expounded upon the great mystery of marriage. His views stated in this homily will be presented in full, as this homily was written near the end of his life, and presents a clear picture of the views of men and women that Chrysostom had at the time. He stated:

What? Is marriage a theater? It is a mystery and a type of a mighty thing; and even if you reverence not it, reverence that whose type it is. "This mystery," said he, "is great, but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church." (Ephesians 5:32.) It is a type of the Church, and of Christ, and do you introduce harlots at it? If then, said one, neither virgins dance, nor the married, who is to dance? No one, for what need is there of dancing? In the Grecian mysteries there are dances, but in ours, silence and decency, modesty, and bashfulness. A great mystery is being celebrated: forth with the harlots! Forth with the profane! How is it a mystery? They come together, and the two make one. Wherefore is it that at his entrance indeed, there was no dancing, no cymbals, but great silence, great stillness: but when they come together, making not a lifeless image, nor yet the image of anything upon earth, but of God Himself, and after his likeness, you introduce so great an uproar, and disturb those that are there [τοὺς οὐρανούς] and put the soul to shame, and confound it? They come, about to be made one body. See again a mystery of love! If the two become not one, so long as they continue two, they make not many, but when they are come into

---

74 Contra Anomoeos xi. 4 (PG 48. 802). (All translations for Contra Anomoeos are mine.)
75 Quasten, vol. 3. 448.
76 In Colossenses homiliae 1-12 (PG 62. 299-392).
oneness, they then make many. What do we learn from this? That great is the power of union. The wise counsel of God at the beginning divided the one into two; and being desirous of showing that even after division it remains still one, He suffered not that the one should be of itself enough for procreation. For he is not one who is not yet [united.] but the half of one: and it is evident from this, that he begets no offspring, as was the case also beforetime. See you the mystery of marriage? He made of one, one other: and again, having made these two, one. He so makes one, so that now also man is produced of one. For he is not one who is not united.

This long passage from Chrysostom's homily on Colossians does not contradict any previous teachings as expressed in his twentieth homily on Ephesians. Rather, it presents a more condensed view not only of marriage as an image of the perfect love union between Christ and the church, but of the relationship between man and woman. Chrysostom clearly presented the notion that a man and woman are only half of a human being and do not express the fullness of "humanhood" until they are united in marriage in God. The husband and wife together are the human being, and through their union of love, work with God to procreate another human being. Also, he again presents the idea that the one leads and the other follows. Chrysostom throughout his life did not believe in democracy, and held very strong views that in all situations a leader is needed to rule and all others follow. Thus, near the end of his life he continued to defend the notion of male headship without however understanding it to mean tyrannical rule.

Remaining Texts

According to Krupp's Scriptural Index, Chrysostom also made reference to Ephesians 5:22 in *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum*,78 and in *In Illud: Propter fornicationes uxorem* (1 Cor. 7:2)79 where he remained consistent in his teaching that wives
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are under the headship and authority of their husband. He made reference to Ephesians 5:25 in *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt,*80 in *Quales ducendae sint uxores*81 and *De Christi precibus*82 again reminding husbands that they are to love their wives as themselves. Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 26 in *In Iohanem homiliae 1-88;*83 *Quales ducendae sint uxores,*84 and to Ephesians 5:27 in *In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum,*85 in *De paentintentia homiliae 1-9,*86 in *De sacerdotio libri 1-6,*87 in *Quales ducendae sint uxores,*88 and *Expositioes in psalmos*89 upholding the teaching that it was Christ's sacrifice due to his great love that transformed and sanctified the church, and that husbands who truly love their wives also bring about a transformation in them, resulting in unity and harmony in the household. Further reference to Ephesians 5:28 was also made in *Non esse desperandum*90 where Chrysostom remained consistent in his teaching that the two husband and wife, are in fact one flesh, one human being. Citations were also made from Ephesians 5:28-32 in *Quales ducendae sint uxores,*91 as well as from Ephesians 5:30 in *In Iohanem homiliae 1-88,*92 and *In epistulam ad Hebraeos argumentum et homiliae 1-34*93 where
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Chrysostom stayed true to his teaching that men and women are of the same substance, and are thus equal in essence. He also remained consonant in his teaching that those who are baptized are united to Christ, and become partakers in his Kingdom. Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:32 in *In Matthaeeum homiliae 1-89* to present his position on the divine mystery that occurs when baptized humans unite themselves with Christ, and through Christ to the Father. Lastly, Chrysostom made reference to Ephesians 5:33 in *In Illud: Propter fornicationes uxorem* to make his point that even though the husband is the head of his wife as was decreed in the Old Testament, they are one flesh, and neither one has authority over their own bodies, as they belong to the other. Thus, all of Chrysostom’s references that cite verses from Ephesians 5:21-33 have been found to be consistent with Chrysostom’s exegesis of Ephesians 5:21-33 as taught in his twentieth homily *On Ephesians*.

**Conclusion**

Thus, as I wrote in chapter 4 dealing with 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 so too in Ephesians 5:21-33, authority is seen to be expressed through headship. In both pericopes Chrysostom presents the divine perfect model, and then presents the human image, which is imperfect due to sin. This point is critical when examining Chrysostom’s position on headship and subjection with regards to gender. Men and women were created and remain ontologically equal in Chrysostom’s understanding of gender. The headship of the man was initially intended to be honorary, as he was the source of woman. The husband was to be seen as the first among equals, in a manner first imaging the relationship of the Father and Son in the Godhead, and later in a manner imaging the divine union between Christ and his church. From the moment that sin entered the human condition the human expression of headship became distorted and deviated significantly from the divine model. Thus, when reading about headship and subjection in Chrysostom one must be careful to first examine in what
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context Chrysostom was speaking: was he speaking about how male/female relationships were supposed to be or as they actually were in his fallen society. The profound mystery that is portrayed in Ephesians 5:21-33 is the turning back, the μετάνοια if you will, to the married state as God first intended it to be. Christ and his church provide the example for Christians to follow. The headship or elective authority given to husbands by God is not the same headship that husbands possess in the sinful world.

Chrysostom, from the beginning of his clerical life, understood headship to mean responsibility, duty, sacrifice and love, whether it be the natural authority as seen in the headship of God, the headship of Christ, or that of the human being over the created world or the elective authority as seen in the headship of the emperor, of the bishop or of the husband. The husband who is truly head of his wife is a “manic lover,”96 who recognizes his other as self, and rules and respects her accordingly. Under the authority of such husbands married women know no oppression, and feel no subjection. Yet, such marriages can only exist where there is no sin, and as the state of the world is not sinless, women, whether acutely or mildly, feel oppressed. The married woman often feels the weight of being under the headship of her husband, regardless of the fact that she too has authority, albeit that of second place. Acknowledging this fact, Chrysostom recognized and taught that there was a place where women were allowed to express full authority over their own persons. These women were the consecrated virgins and widows: women who opted to live in the Kingdom of God in this world.

Chrysostom saw both the celibate men and the celibate women of the church as having total authority over their own person. The celibate men had no wife who had claim over their body, and for whom they were responsible, and the celibate women had no husband to honour as their head. The full authority, which Chrysostom saw as being granted to those living in the state of virginity, will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

96 See bottom of page 176.
Chapter 6

Authority Found in Virginity

Throughout his life, Chrysostom always believed the celibate/virginal life was preferable over marriage as the lifestyle of the virgin allows one the freedom to exercise total control and authority over one’s inner self and reason, which is the only way an individual can fully realize the image of God within. He saw female virgins and widows who are not under a husband’s headship and even male celibates who were not responsible for any wife, as expressing and fulfilling their true personhood, created in the image of God. In 381/2 shortly after his return from the mountains where he attempted to live the life of an ascetic, Chrysostom, as a young deacon, wrote his famous treatises On Virginity and Widowhood (De virginitate, (MG 48. 533-596) and Against Remarriage (Ad viduam iuniorem (MG 48. 599-610)). Though these treatises make numerous references to 1 Corinthians 7, they are mostly a detailed interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:38, which states that marriage is good but virginity better.2

These treatises portray a rather negative view of marriage despite the fact that Chrysostom began by defending the state as honorable, and ended by saying that the married man who lives as if he is not married can also reach the same level of spiritual growth as the virgin. However, he held the opinion that though marriage existed in paradise, sexual relations had no part in paradise, but came after the first transgression when God ordained marriage for the procreation of the human race and as a brake on incontinence. In this early text, On Virginity, written in 381/2 there is no appeal to Eph. 5:21-31 in which the union of man and wife is compared to Christ and his Church. This omission of Eph. 5:21-31 is either due to Chrysostom’s youth and lack of experience, or more probably to his desire to advocate celibacy as the preferred lifestyle given his recent return to Antioch after an attempt to become an ascetic.

Even up until the time of his death Chrysostom still viewed virginity as the preferred vocation. In his exile letters to the deaconess Olympias, where he commended her for her
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strength, spirit, and "manliness" (δυναμίας), it can be seen how virginity and widowhood gave one freedom and power to pursue the spiritual life.

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: first, to reveal Chrysostom's consistent preference of virginity over marriage, and second, to prove that his preference is based on his belief that virgins have greater freedom and authority than married persons, and thus live more fully in the image of God. Elizabeth Clark correctly sees Chrysostom as viewing virginity as a woman's escape from the bondage of marriage, and as a means to rise above the curse imposed in Gen. 3:16. Having no husband, the virgin has no head to be subject to, nor children to cause her pain and sorrow in their delivery. However, as Valerie Karras points out, Chrysostom also views the married man to be subject to his wife, and to her care. The husband must concern himself with providing for his household and according to his curse in Gen. 3:17-19 is bound to suffer in a different sense but suffer nonetheless. Thus, Chrysostom viewed both husband and wife as being subject to one another. For this reason virginity, and celibacy, offer an escape not only for women but for men as well, as the vocation that enables all people to exercise full authority over themselves, and thus live lives that greater reflect the image of God.

*De virginitate*

In Paul's lifetime, Christians apparently believed that the eschaton's arrival would occur quickly, probably within their generation. In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul wrote that even though marriage was good and served as a check for sexual immorality, celibacy was preferred. Yet, celibacy as a lifestyle was not very prevalent. By the late fourth century, however, its popularity became widespread and it "was considered the most exalted way of life for Christians. Virginity and widowhood were no longer, as Paul saw
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them, simply conditions in which persons might best preserve their energies for the service of the Lord; they were now ‘professions’ for which a solemn pledge was taken. It is in this context that one must understand virginity and widowhood when reading Chrysostom’s On Virginity. In his time, virginity is a lifestyle that is chosen and committed to through a vow, rather than a predicament in which one finds oneself. Chrysostom said, “For I would call the woman, who has the power to marry but chooses not to, a virgin.”

In his time, virginity is a lifestyle that is chosen and committed to through a vow. Rather than a predicament in which one ends oneself. Chrysostom said: “For I would call the woman, who has the power to many but chooses not to, a virgin.”

The woman who is a virgin yet desires marriage and is waiting for the time when she will be given in marriage is not the woman Chrysostom is referring to in this treatise.

Chrysostom began his treatise On Virginity by first extolling marriage and reprimanding the heretics (Gnostics, Marcionites, Encratites, Manicheans, etc.) who view marriage as an evil thing. Chrysostom argued that if marriage were truly evil, then one would be forced to remain celibate in order to do good. Virginity would become obligatory, and as there would be no choice for that lifestyle it would not merit any prize.

Thus, marriage is always good in Chrysostom’s opinion; however, virginity is better, because he viewed it as the angelic life on earth. Chrysostom stated:

But mankind, inferior in its nature to blessed spirits, strains beyond its capacity and, in so far as it can, vies eagerly to equal the angels. How does it do that? Angels neither marry nor are given in marriage; this is true of the virgin. The angels have stood continuously by God and serve him; so does the virgin. Accordingly, Paul has removed all cares from virgins “to promote what is good, what will help you to devote yourselves entirely (to God.” If they are unable for a time to ascend to heaven as the angels can because their flesh holds them back, even in this world they have much consolation since they receive the Master of the heavens, if they are holy in body and spirit.

Do you grasp the value of virginity? That it makes those who spend time on earth live like the angels dwelling in heaven? It does not allow those endowed with bodies to be inferior to the incorporeal powers and spurs all men to rival the angels.

Chrysostom maintains that virginity parallels here on earth the life of the angels in heaven. Having examined Chrysostom’s interpretations of other parallels in the previous
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two chapters, and his constant insistence that the similarities are not to be understood as "sameness" ontological or otherwise, it is unlikely that he viewed virgins as having acquired what Elizabeth Clark views as "an ontological status that raises them to a semi-divine existence." However, it is not bodily virginity that Chrysostom saw as leading one to the angelic way of life, but rather the purity of heart. David Ford argues against Clark by showing that for Chrysostom, "a virginal body means little without personal virtue and obedience to the True Church." Even married people could live virtuous lives, according to Chrysostom, and could thus become "angels" just as well as monastics. Chrysostom viewed it easier to achieve holiness as a single (celibate) rather than as a married person. Thus, there is no evidence as Clark claims that Chrysostom believed there to be an ontological difference between a virgin and a married person.

The Fetters of Marriage

Chrysostom viewed marriage as being good, blessed and holy, however, it was still a state that belonged to this world, for in the Kingdom of God human beings are like the angels who are not given in marriage. Before the first transgression, the first human beings were seen as being married in paradise: however, Chrysostom believed that this couple did not practice sexual intercourse. They were intended to reproduce in a manner unknown to us, similar to the angels. After the first transgression, God made the human body corruptible and mortal in order to ensure that sin would not live on forever. Thus, reproduction, as we
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know it was introduced after the expulsion from paradise, and marriage from that point on transformed into a state more worldly than divine. Therefore, marriage, now a worldly state, did not provide human beings with as much assistance on the journey to salvation, as did the virginal state that existed in Paradise.

The young Chrysostom believed married people to be constantly weighed down by the cares of the world that distract them from pursuing and achieving spiritual rewards. Not only this, but spouses were subject to one another and therefore not free to pursue the higher good.

Do you perceive the duress and the inexorable bondage, the fetters encircling each of them? For marriage truly is a chain, not only because of the multitude of its anxieties and daily worries, but also because it forces spouses to submit to one another, which is harsher than every other kind of servitude.¹⁷

Husbands are seen as being constantly weighed down with the responsibilities of providing various comforts for their wives and children. Wives in their turn are weighed down by the responsibilities of running a home and raising offspring. Those who belong to the married state and are burdened by cares and responsibilities of home and family do not have the freedom, or time to truly focus on spiritual matters. Chrysostom provided numerous examples for both husbands and wives. For the husbands, he presented the following example:

...even if our spouse has a tolerable disposition, the plethora of cares surrounding us because of her and her children gives us little time to look heavenward, as if our souls were submerged from all sides by a whirling turmoil. Take the case of a man who desires a life of privacy free from danger and the troubles of business and politics: when he sees his children in a bad way and his wife in need of spending money, he unwillingly throws himself into the affairs of state. Once he stumbles in that arena it is impossible to count further how many sins he is forced to commit: he develops a temper, he grows arrogant, he swears, he makes abusive comments, he dissembles, doing much for the sake of a favor, much out of hatred. How is it possible for him, buffeted as he is by so great a storm and wishing to distinguish himself in it, not to be stained by sin?²¹⁸

Thus, life in the world and the responsibilities of family life provide constant distractions for married people. However, this is not the only hindrance. having

¹⁷ De virginitate xli (PG 48.563), Shore. 61.
responsibility for the well being of the other. one’s spouse. as well as oneself was seen as an additional burden. Of this Chrysostom stated:

“He shall be your master” (Genesis 3:16). What is the advantage of this supremacy? For, in turn, God makes the husband her slave. He has designed a strange and surprising exchange of bondage. It is like fugitive slaves who have been bound by their masters first separately, then to one another, each pair fastened at their feet by a short chain: they are unable to walk independently because each must follow the other. Thus, the souls of married couples have both their own private cares and a second constraint arising from the bond between them. It strangles them more fiercely than any chain. It robs them both of freedom by not offering to one alone supremacy but divides the authority between them.\footnote{De virginitate xli. 2 (PG 48. 563), Shore, 61-2.}

Fascinatingly, even the young Chrysostom did not view husbands as having total authority in marriage, as they were subject to their wives in regards to conjugal rights. Chrysostom viewed this as being the greatest obstacle hindering couples from living the angelic life on earth. The married person, whether the husband or the wife, is always subject to their spouse. There is a loss of personal freedom and authority in marriage, as one’s person belongs to the other. On this matter, Chrysostom made reference to Paul’s I Corinthians 7:2-3 and explained it as follows:

What does he say next? “The husband should fulfill his conjugal obligations toward his wife, the wife hers toward her husband.” (1 Corinthians 7:2) Then, to explain and clarify this, he adds: “A wife does not belong to herself but to her husband; a husband does not belong to himself but to his wife.” (1 Corinthians 7:3) This seems to be said in defense of marriage: but, in fact, he is wrapping the hook with familiar bait, and coaxing his disciples to his way of thinking. He desires by these very words about marriage to lead them from it. For when you hear that you will not be your own master after marriage but be subject to the will of your wife, you will quickly aspire not to pass under the yoke at all, since once you have entered into this state, you must be a slave henceforth. so long as it pleases your wife.

...Paul takes away a man’s authority over his own body and surrenders dominion over it to his wife; and he ranks a husband lower than a slave bought with silver. It is often possible for a slave to obtain absolute freedom if he can gain at some time enough money to pay his price to his master. But even if a husband had the most troublesome wife of all, he must

\footnote{De virginitate xlv. 2 (PG 48. 566), Shore, 68.}
bear with his servitude, and he can discover no deliverance or way out of this
despoticm.\textsuperscript{20}

It appears that for the young Chrysostom, worldly cares are not the greatest
hindrance to spiritual excellence. Sexual intercourse is viewed as the greatest obstacle, for
it diverts one's thoughts from God and places them upon the other. Prayer for the Christian
is to be without ceasing. The Second Coming of Christ did not happen in the first
generation of Christians as was first expected; yet it was still viewed as coming soon. Thus,
a Christian needed to devote all his or her energies to being prepared for the coming event,
and not be indifferent to their relationship with God. On this, Chrysostom stated the
following:

This is not the time for embraces or pleasures, but for tears and bitter
moaning, supplication, scrupulous confession, earnest petition and much
prayer. We must be content if by approaching him with so much zeal we
can appease his anger—not that our master is harsh or cruel, in fact he is
very gentle and benevolent. But the excessiveness of our sins does not allow
him to quickly pardon us although he is good-natured, kind and very
merciful.

Therefore Paul says: “to devote yourselves to prayer and fasting.”
What, then, could be more bitter than this bondage? Do you wish, he says,
to advance toward virtue, to fly up to heaven, to wipe clean the stain from
your soul through constant fasting and prayer? If your wife does not wish to
agree to this, you must be subject to her lust. This is why he said at the
beginning: “A man is better off having no relations with a woman.”\textsuperscript{21}

Chrysostom understood fasting to mean abstinence from intercourse as well as from
foods. Thus, married persons could not devote themselves to constant prayer and fasting,
unless they always practiced sexual abstinence. In Eastern Christendom fasting was seen
(and still is today) as a disciplinary exercise to help one acquire command over all of one’s
passions. The spirit dictated to the body how much and what types of food it would eat and
when. This battled against gluttony. The spirit would dictate when the body was to rest and
for how long. This battled against sloth. The spirit would dictate all matters regarding the
passions of the flesh, including controlling one’s sexual desires.

He who prays and fasts as he ought must renounce every human desire,
every care, every kind of wasteful occupation, and in this way with perfect
concentration approach God. This is why fasting is a fine act: it trims cares
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away from the soul, and by keeping neglect of duty from overrunning the mind turns the intellect entirely towards itself. Paul implies this when he diverts us from sexual intercourse. His words are extremely apt. He does not say: so that you not be defiled, but: “to devote yourselves to prayer and fasting,” as if intercourse with a woman does not lead to impurity but to a waste of time.\textsuperscript{22}

Chrysostom reasoned that if the body was occasionally to have control over the spirit, then the passions that weigh the soul down could never be overcome. This was the disadvantage of the married state. It made it difficult, almost impossible, for the spirit of husbands and wives to take full control of their bodily passions as their bodies were subject to their spouses.

The disadvantage, therefore, of the state of marriage, as Chrysostom saw it, is that married persons lack the total freedom and authority over their persons, which is necessary in order to fully grow and develop spiritually. Married persons do not have the power to dedicate their lives fully to God. They are constantly overwrought by worries, duties, obligations and responsibilities, and by marital problems that distract from divine assent. Thus, married persons are hindered by their state from becoming Christlike, or in other words, from obtaining the likeness of God, for marriage “has not the power to make saints, but virginity does.”\textsuperscript{23}

The Power of Virginity

There are different types of power mentioned by Chrysostom when he spoke about virginity. First, virginity, according to Chrysostom, gives one power to obtain sainthood. The virgin dedicates her or his whole self to Christ. In this sense the woman virgin is said to have Christ as her bridegroom. Chrysostom expounded on the easy path of virginity as follows:

The virgin need not make inquiries about her bridegroom, nor fear any deception. For he is God not man, a master not a fellow-slave. The difference between the bridegroom is vast: but observe too the conditions of their marriage bonds. The wedding gifts of this bride are not bondage, parcels of land and just so many talents of gold, but the heavens and its advantages. In addition, the married woman shudders at the thought of death, among other reasons because it separates her from her companion.

\textsuperscript{22} De virginitate xxx. 2 (PG 48. 553), Shore, 42.
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The virgin, however, both yearns for death and is oppressed by life, anxious as she is to see her groom face to face and to enjoy that glory.24

Thus, the state of virginity is seen as being empowering. It is seen as being a means that gives one additional assistance or aid in obtaining salvation. This is not to say that Chrysostom viewed married people as being unable to obtain salvation, but rather he viewed the married state as hindering rather than helping one obtain this goal. He repeatedly asserted that the capacity for spiritual growth is the same for all people regardless of their state in life.

I am advising nothing burdensome. I do not say, "do not marry." I do not say, "Forsake the cities, and withdraw yourself from public affairs": but being engaged in them, show virtue. Indeed, those who are busy in the midst of the cities. I wish to be more approved than those who have occupied the mountains. ...Do not tell me, "I have a wife, and children, and am a master of a household, and therefore cannot duly practice all this." For if you had none of these things, if you are careless, all is lost; while if you are encompassed with all these things, if you are earnest, you will attain to virtue. For there is but one thing which is sought for—the preparation of a noble disposition. With this, neither age, nor poverty, nor riches, nor reverse of fortune, nor anything else will be able to impede you.25

Therefore according to Chrysostom, the advantage in being a virgin is that they have an easier time reaching their spiritual goal as their lifestyle gives them the freedom, and therefore power, to pursue it.

The second benefit of virginity is that it is attainable by all people regardless of gender, race, age, wealth, rank or physical attributes. Anyone who so chooses could be a consecrated virgin. Chrysostom stated:

Living in a state of poverty could not, as with marriage, be disadvantageous for the virgin. Instead it makes her, if she willingly endures it, more desirable to the bridegroom. Likewise, a humble birth, a lack of beauty, and other such traits, they too are not prejudicial to her. Why mention this? Even if she is not free, even this status does not spoil her betrothal. It is enough to display a beautiful soul and to attain the first rank. There is no fear of jealousy there, or distressing envy of another woman who has been united with a more brilliant spouse. No one is similar or equal to him; no one approaches him even a little. But in the case of marriage,

24 *De virginitate* lix (PG 48. 580), Shore, 96.
25 *In Mattheum homiliae* 1-89 xiii (PG 57. 464). *NPNF* 1, x. 278.
although a woman has a very wealthy and powerful husband, nevertheless she could discover another woman having far more. 26

Thus, virginity needs nothing that is not in one's own power. It is a state of being that is open to all people, and can be practiced by all people. As was seen in chapter 3 of this study, where baptism is open to all people regardless of race, rank or gender, so too, virginity is open to all. And just as baptism transforms all people and makes them all co-heirs with Christ, so too virginity enables all equally who practice it to more easily obtain the likeness of God.

Chrysostom notes yet another benefit of virginity that empowers the female virgin. He stated:

Tell me, what does the virgin suffer during her whole life that approaches what the married woman, who is torn apart by birth-pains and loud wailing, endures almost every year? The tyranny of this pain is so great that the holy Scripture whenever it wants to intimate captivity, famine, plague, and intolerable evils calls them all birthpains. God has imposed this upon woman in place of punishment and a curse— I do not mean birth itself but birth accompanied in this way by labor and pain: "...in pain shall you bring forth children." it says. (Genesis 3:16.) The virgin, on the other hand, stands above this travail and curse, since he who has rescinded the curse of the Law has rescinded this curse too. 27

Thus, those women who are living as virgins will never experience the curse of the Law that was given to Eve and subsequently all her daughters, for her role in the first transgression. They have been freed from the pains of childbirth, as well as from having a husband who would rule over them and for whom would be their desire. Virgin women are exempt from the earthly roles that society expects women to fulfill: those of wife, housekeeper and mother. Yet they are not the only ones exempt from the earthly roles. The man who practices virginity is also freed from worldly obligation those of husband, breadwinner and father. It is for this reason that Chrysostom calls virginity a life imaging that of the Angels. "Clipping away all their chains, it permits them to fly to heaven with unimpeded and nimble feet, as if they were winged creatures." 28

26 De virginitate lx. 1 (PG 48.580), Shore, 96-7.
27 De virginitate lxxv (PG 48.583), Shore, 101.
28 De virginitate lxxx (PG 48.592), Shore, 121.
*Ad viduam iuniorem*

Chrysostom in his treatises *Ad viduam iuniorem* (Against Remarriage) provided the same arguments in support of the virgin/celibate lifestyle. He was a strong advocate for one marriage, and one marriage only, though he did not deny second marriages to those widows/widowers who wished to enter that state a second time. He argued that it was very possible for widows to manage their own affairs and at times even better than did their deceased husbands.\(^{29}\) However, his greater argument is again that of greater authority over one's self in the celibate lifestyle. He wrote:

> Is it not much better to have a few things with authority over them than to possess everything in the world under the condition that a woman submit herself together with everything else to the power of another?\(^{30}\)

Thus, Chrysostom advised widows against remarriage in order to free them from its fetters and to allow them more freely to pursue the spiritual life.

**Conclusions of *De Virginitate* and *Ad viduam iuniorem***

Thus, according to Chrysostom, virginity is better than marriage because it primarily frees individuals, male or female, from the cares and responsibilities of the sinful world, which in turn enables them to have greater authority over their own person. In one sense, it empowers them to pursue the spiritual life. "a state in which there is absolutely no distinction between male and female,\(^{31}\) while living in this world. In another sense, the pursuit itself builds a person's character and will, which enable them to have greater control and authority over their inner selves.

As was seen in chapter 3 of this study that dealt with Galatians 3:28.\(^{32}\) Chrysostom maintained that equality before God does not mean sameness. Society continued to consist of different cultures, different economic groups, and men and women. Chrysostom upheld these differences that existed in the world, and did not maintain that equality obliterates these differences as they belong to this world and not to the next. Yet, when men and

---

\(^{29}\) *Ad viduam iuniorem* 4 (PG 48.604), Shore, 136-7.

\(^{30}\) *Ad viduam iuniorem* 5 (PG 48.606), Shore, 140.

\(^{31}\) Ford, 89.

\(^{32}\) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." My translation.
women renounce the world, and free themselves of its obligations and expectations they are no longer subject to its limitations. When they acknowledge that they belong to a race of all people equally created by God, and accept to live in poverty, and renounce their gender roles as husbands or wives, fathers or mothers, then it can be said that they live in the world yet are not of it. This is how the young Chrysostom understood virginity to be a type of angelic life. In his mind it was a spiritual state of existence that though not of this world, was still not completely of the next, but rested somewhere between the two depending on the virgin’s spiritual growth.

Thus, what the virgin attains is not the original image of authority granted by God in the beginning, to rule over all the created beasts, but that image of the son/daughtership of Christ that I mentioned in my third chapter. Whereas all baptized Christians, whether Jew, Greek, free, slave, male, female, married or single, are equal in the sight of God the Father having become coheirs with Christ for the Kingdom that is to come, virgins have the power to foretaste that Kingdom in the present.

Such was the young Chrysostom’s views of virginity in his treatises On Virginity and Widowhood (De virginitate (MG 48. 533-596) and Against Remarriage (Ad viduam iuniorem (MG 48. 399-410)). In order to see if his views on the celibate life remain consistent, I examined his letters to the deaconess Olympias33 written while in exile near the end of his life.

The Authority of Olympias

The life of Olympias is just one of many examples of women exercising freedom and authority over their own person as she was a widow, and thus had no husband who had authority over her. During one of the emperor Theodosius’ attempts to coax her into a second marriage, Olympias replied to him:

“If my King, the Lord Jesus Christ, wanted me to be joined with a man, he would not have taken away my first husband immediately. Since he knew that I was unsuited for the conjugal life and was not able to please a man, he freed him. Nebridius, from the bond and delivered me of this very

---

33 See Chapter 1 of this investigation for a brief biography of this widow and deaconess of Constantinople.
burdensome yoke and servitude to a husband, having placed upon my mind the happy yoke of continence.\textsuperscript{34}

Olympias's own words reveal her views of marriage as a burdensome yoke, and celibacy as a happy one. Freed from the authority of a husband, Olympias was able to exercise full authority over her own affairs, and wasted no time in doing so. She began to distribute her money to the poor, and was quickly accused of the reckless expenditure of her property. No one was denied who came to her for financial assistance. A married woman could never have so freely given of her family's wealth to all persons who approached her for support. She bought property, built a female monastery,\textsuperscript{35} and funded church projects. She was free to live as she wished.\textsuperscript{36}

During his second exile, Chrysostom wrote numerous letters.\textsuperscript{37} The most congenial and lengthy were the seventeen letters written to the deaconess Olympias.\textsuperscript{38} As was stated in my first chapter, Chrysostom and Olympias were joined in a bond of spiritual and sympathetic friendship. In Elizabeth Clark's words, they were "soul-mates."\textsuperscript{39} Thus, it is to be understood that even though Chrysostom was a celibate and in his youth struggled with his sexual urges, by the end of his life he was able to enjoy the camaraderie of women and the intimate friendship of one in particular. In his letters to Olympias, Chrysostom revealed his esteem and respect for this woman who embraced the celibate life, and thus empowered herself to dedicate her life to works of charity and to God.

\textsuperscript{34}"Sergia’s Narration Concerning St. Olympias" in Elizabeth A. Clark. \textit{Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends} (Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1979), 129.
\textsuperscript{35} Once a deaconess, Olympia bought out property south of the cathedral, and built a convent on the land. See Elizabeth Clark. \textit{Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends}, 113. and 131. Chrysostom praised Olympias for conducting her "battles" from her chamber instead of "descending to the agora" for warfare. \textit{Epistola - Dominae meae} 12. 1c (Malingry; Migne 6): as cited by Elizabeth Clark, \textit{Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends}, 113. 123. Olympias also dressed simply, denied herself sleep, fasted strictly, and dedicated her much of her time to prayer. Clark, 132-33.
\textsuperscript{37} Of Chrysostom’s exile letters 236 are extant.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Epistola - Dominae meae} 1-17 (PG 52. 549-623).
\textsuperscript{39} Elizabeth Clark, "John Chrysostom and the Subintroductae," \textit{Church History} 46 (June, 1977): 183.
He spoke of her as "a treasury of piety, a summit of philosophy, a soul who has trampled upon the ostentation of earthly things." As she had full authority over her person, she was able to overcome distractions of the world that weigh down the soul and lead one to sin. In Chrysostom's first letter to her from his second exile, he clearly revealed that he viewed sin as the only thing that can cast a human being down.

There is only one thing, Olympias, which is really terrible, only one real trial, and that is sin; and I have never ceased continually harping upon this theme; but as for all other things, plots, enmities, frauds, calumnies, insults, accusations, confiscation, exile, the keen sword of the enemy, the peril of the deep, warfare of the whole world, or anything else you like to make, they are but idle tales.\footnote{Letters to Olympias viii. 13 (SC 13. 2nd ed., 214; cited by Ford, 109.}

In Chrysostom's opinion, Olympias had the power to endure hardships and accept all the ills that life inflicted upon her because of her life of celibacy. Living as a virgin gave her full authority over her entire self. Though it did empower her to manage her own affairs, and do as she pleased in society, this was not viewed as the summit of her choice of lifestyle. As obtaining salvation and overcoming sin was seen by Chrysostom as the only thing needful in life, his true preference for the state of virginity over that of marriage was its assistance in helping the one who embraced it obtain the kingdom of God. Olympias was admired by Chrysostom not because she had the authority to govern her fortune, but that she had the authority to give of her money in a manner that was befitting a Christian. She was praised for her charity to the poor, and for her assistance in ecclesiastical projects. As was noted in the first chapter of this thesis, Chrysostom had become an enemy of the court ladies because though many had authority to live as they chose, they did not choose to live in a Christian manner with compassion for the poor and concern for their souls. Olympias, however, was not only independent, she was focused on what was needful. That is why she was able to proceed to the spiritual height in which Chrysostom saw her as having obtained near the end of his life. He wrote:

But your \textit{powers} [my italics] do not repel the weapons of barbarians, nor the devices of hostile men, nor any assaults and stratagems of that kind, but they have trampled under foot the constraining forces of nature, put down their tyranny and levelled their citadel. And while ceaselessly contending with demons, you have won countless victories, yet have not received a single \footnote{Epistola-Dominae meae 1 (PG 52. 549), NPNF 1, ix, 289.}
blow, but stand unwounded in the midst of a storm of darts and turn the spears which are hurled at you back upon those who discharge them. Such is the wisdom of your art; by the sufferings which you undergo you take vengeance on those who inflict them; by the plots of which you are the subject you put your enemies to pain, possessing in their malice the best foundation for the materials of fame. And you, knowing these things well yourself, and having gained perception by experience, naturally call them all an idle tale.\textsuperscript{42}

Thus, because of her celibate state, Chrysostom saw Olympias as having obtained full authority over her own person to pursue a Christlike life. Yet her power did not only aid herself in her spiritual struggles, it also provided a strong and powerful example for others, who knew her or knew of her, to follow. Chrysostom wrote: "But you on the contrary, woman as you are, clothed with a fragile body, and subject to these severe attacks, have not only avoided falling into such a condition yourself, but have prevented many others from so doing."\textsuperscript{43}

It is obvious that Chrysostom from the beginning of his clerical career to the end of his life firmly believed and proclaimed that the virginal/celibate life was better than marriage as it empowered those who practiced it and assisted them in their spiritual struggles for the attainment of virtue.\textsuperscript{44} The virginal state granted women freedom to live as they chose, as they had full authority over their own heads, and were not subject to a husband. In a similar manner, men too gained freedom in the virgin state as they were responsible for themselves alone, and needed not to concern themselves with dependents. Yet for Chrysostom, such full authority would be futile if it was not used for the pursuit of one's salvation. A focused person in the married state had a greater chance of saving their soul, than a negligent virgin. It must not be forgotten that until the end of his life, Chrysostom saw every human being, male or female, single or married, as being capable of obtaining virtue if they so desired. He wrote:

And very naturally so: for the wrestlings of virtue do not depend upon age or bodily strength, but only on the spirit and the disposition. Thus women have been crowned victors, while men have been upset; so also boys have been proclaimed conquerors, while aged men have been put to shame. It is indeed

\textsuperscript{42} Epistola - Dominae meae 6 (PG 52. 600), NPNF 1, ix, 298.
\textsuperscript{43} Epistola - Dominae meae 6 (PG 52. 600-601), NPNF 1, ix, 298.
\textsuperscript{44} Ford, 85-86.
always fitting to admire those who pursue virtue, but especially when some are found to cling to it at a time when many are deserting it.⁴⁵

Olympias provides us with an example of a fourth-century woman who, once married and then widowed, chose not to remarry so as not to forfeit her freedom. Her reasons to remain celibate were in order to maintain the newly acquired authority and power over her own person that marriage had given to her husband. She desired this authority not to pursue worldly things, but for her soul's benefit. Being for a short while subject to her spouse's needs and desires Olympias soon realized that she did not have the freedom to pursue the life she wanted to lead. Virginity was seen as her escape from a life of subjection. It gave her the freedom to dedicate her life to serve no one save God.

⁴⁵ Epistola - Dominae meae 6 (PG 52. 601), NPNF 1. ix, 298.
Conclusions

Having examined Chrysostom's writings dealing with the issue of image, and tangentially male headship and freedom in virginity, I now summarize my findings in thirteen assertions.

The Thirteen Assertions

First, Chrysostom believed that the image given to the human being was the image of God, and not the image of angels or other principalities.

Second, being faithful to the Antiochene school of thought, as taught to him by Diodore, Chrysostom interpreted Genesis 1:26-27 literally, and thus believed that the image of God in humanity was the authority to rule over all creation.

Third, in his youth, the image of God for Chrysostom meant to have total authority. As post-lapsarian man had no one to rule over him in the created world—save God—Chrysostom viewed him to possess the diminished image of God. Post-lapsarian woman, now ruled by her husband, was no longer in God's image. However, by the time Chrysostom wrote his second work On Genesis this view changed. Chrysostom believed at this stage and for the remainder of his life that woman, though under her husband's authority still has limited authority over the domestic animals, and thus possesses to a limited degree the image of God.

Fourth, before the first transgression, the human being, male and female together equally shared in the image of God.

Fifth, this image of authority to rule was an honour or a gift from God innate to human beings, or natural to them.¹

Sixth, man even at creation was understood as being the head of the woman, but this headship was a position of honour, since woman obtained her origin from the man. This headship did not have any ontological connotation, as man and woman were created equal in essence. Chrysostom based this understanding of equality with headship on the Father/Son relationship in the Trinity. As the Father and the Son are equal in divine essence, so man and woman are created equal in human essence. As the Father is the head

¹ See chapter 2, pg. 61-2 for explanation.
of the Son who obtains his origin in the Father, and is constantly begotten from the Father, so too, man, in a human sense, is the head of woman as she came into being from man.

Seventh, as a result of the first transgression the first man and woman had most of their power to rule taken away. The image of God in them became “amputated.” The human being from that point on was to be in fear of the wild beasts that were once subject to them. Their control to rule became diminished to a great degree, yet the human being still had some control over the domestic beasts.

Eighth, it is at this time that woman lost her equality with her husband, and became second in authority due to her role in the first transgression. Man was given elective authority over his wife that was not innate to the male condition. In addition to his honorary position as her head, the headship of man now included power over his wife. The post-lapsarian headship of the man became tyrannical and oppressive due to the rise of sin.

Ninth, Christ was not seen by Chrysostom as coming to restore the now distorted image of stewardship given in the beginning for the purpose of ruling. Rather he believed that Christ brought a new image to all human beings who accept him as the Son of God and are baptized. This new image is superior to the first since it elevates the human being to the status of a child of God. Thus, being in the image of Christ’s son/daughtership is directly connected with one’s ability to care for one’s soul, and to strive towards salvation. Chrysostom believed that all baptized human beings, male and female, have the “one form” and the “one mold” of Christ. All baptized human beings regardless of race, rank or gender are equal before God and have the same opportunity to obtain salvation and the Kingdom of Heaven. Chrysostom often stated that the only thing that is truly terrible is sin as it takes us away from the presence of God. Thus, women are just as capable as men of obtaining salvation, as they share with men the new image of Christ’s son/daughtership.

Tenth, Chrysostom maintained that equality before God does not mean sameness. Society still had different cultures, still had different economic groups, and still consisted of men and women. Chrysostom did not maintain that equality obliterates these differences as they belong to this world, which is still in sin, and not to the next, which is perfect.

Eleventh, the image of God as authority is expressed through headship. In his commentaries and homilies on 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 and Ephesians 5:21-33, Chrysostom presented the divine perfect model, and then the human image, which is imperfect due to
Men and women were created and remain ontologically equal in Chrysostom's understanding of gender. The husband was to be seen as the first among equals. From the moment that sin entered the human condition the human expression of headship became distorted and significantly deviated from the divine model.

Twelfth, the profound mystery portrayed in Ephesians 5:21-33 is the turning back or conversion (μετανοια), to the married state as God first intended it to be. Christ and his church provide the example for Christians to follow. Due to sin, husbands in the sinful postlapsarian era became despotic heads who would often oppress their wives. Chrysostom taught that the Christian husband who is truly head of his wife is a manic lover, who recognizes his other as self, and rules and respects it accordingly. Under the elective authority of such Christian husbands married women know no oppression, and feel no subjection.

Thirteenth, Chrysostom saw both celibate men and celibate women of the church as having authority over their own person. Celibate men had no wife who had claim over their body, and for whom they were responsible, and the celibate women had no husband to honour as their head. Whereas all baptized Christians whether Jew, Greek, free, slave, male, female, married or single are equal in the sight of God the Father having become coheirs with Christ for the Kingdom that is to come, virgins have the power to more easily foretaste that Kingdom in the present.

Soteriological Implications

Chrysostom's understanding of image is that it is the natural authority given by God to the human being to rule over creation. Though Chrysostom himself never explicitly explained what impact this natural authority had upon the human condition, it is evident in his writings that this gift of authority to govern meant that the human being was created and appointed as God's steward. After the first transgression, most of this power to rule was taken away, as the human being was found to be unworthy of the honour. Do Chrysostom's views of image have something important to contribute to our understanding of salvation? Christ's saving act did not restore the image of stewardship over the created world that was given to the first human being, male and female. Thus, it can be argued that the original image as authority and power over creation gave the human being a second-class
relationship with God. Regardless of how close a steward can be with his master, the steward can never be one with his master until he becomes "like a son." Christ's saving act of redemption did not restore this master/steward relationship, but brought about a new and closer relationship, that of father and child. Thus, it can be inferred that this new image of Christ's son/daughtership gave the human being greater authority, not over the created world, but in the heavenly kingdom to come.

In the Christian era, every baptized child of God is given full authority, not over the created world, but over his/her own selves. Whether one is a Greek, a slave, or a woman, each person has power and authority to fully follow the teachings of Christ and to become members of the Kingdom. For the Jew, the free, and the man, the road to salvation is no different. That which is required is humility and voluntary submission to one's fellow human being.

Chrysostom viewed two worlds existing simultaneously together after the first coming of Christ. The one was the "normative" post-lapsarian world freely governed by sin. The other was the Christian world battling sin. Chrysostom believed that Christians were called to bring a foretaste of the Kingdom to the post-lapsarian world through their "militant" actions against sin. Thus, the Christian master was expected to grant freedom to his slaves, as the Christian husband was expected to love his wife as his own flesh. However, what was expected of Christians was not always practiced, and Chrysostom saw that as falling victim to sin. This is why his views of marriage can be seen to fluctuate between the post-lapsarian and Christian worlds. Marriage in the "normative" sense is seen as oppressive, as bondage and as hampering a person's spiritual growth, being of no assistance to a person's salvation, as it is governed by sinful desires. Marriage in the Christian sense is seen as being an image of the union between Christ and the church. Those who enter this type of marriage and live in the married state in the non-normative sense can and do grow spiritually. Such marriages in which each partner assists the other to grow in virtue and thus in their relationship to God are praised by Chrysostom. However, the Christian marriage can only be beneficial if the persons involved live as the virgins do, without cares and concerns for worldly possessions, or promotions, or wealth. As it was difficult for Christian marriages to refrain from slipping into what was viewed as
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2 Homiliae in Joannem 1-88 xix. 1 (PG 59. 119-120), NPNF 1, xiv, 67.
"normative" for the marriage state, virginity was seen as the purer and thus better state for a Christian.

Chrysostom's priority had always been to preach for the edification of his listeners. His writings dealing with the image of God in the human being, define image as authority over the created being in the beginning. However, that gift of the image that God granted to the human being also established a relationship between God and this being; that of master to steward. The first transgression does not focus on the loss of authority as much as what the loss of authority implied: that the human being's role of steward was taken away. In other words, the human being's relationship with the Creator was in ruins. Christ's saving act did not restore all human beings to the original image of authority for two reasons. First, in order for the restoration to occur humanity had to participate in the restoration by accepting Christ through baptism. Christ's act of restoration was achieved on an individual basis and on a personal level. As the post-lapsarian world even after Christ still remained sinful, the state of the people of the world remained that of the "amputated," "diminished" image with the severed relationship between God and his creature. Christ established a new image, greater than the original image for those who accepted him. He did not restore the relationship of master and steward in the fallen world. Instead he established a new relationship that of father and child for those who desired to be with him in the Kingdom: the eschatological era. As a child of God, baptized Christians, male and female, have greater authority over themselves. They have more power to battle their passions, and to become what they were originally called to be: like God. They have been given the power to unite with God, and be eternally with him as his children in the eschatological era.
Appendix A

According to Krupp’s Scripture Index, these are all the writings in which John Chrysostom refers to Genesis 1:26 and 1:27.

Ad populum Antiochenum homiliae 1-21
- for Gen. 1:26 – iii. 18; vii. 3
Ad Stagirium a daemone uexatum libre 1-3
- for Gen. 1:26 – i, 2
Contra Anomoeas homilia 11
- for Gen. 1:26 – xi. 2
De prophetiarum obscuritate homiliae 1-2
- for Gen. 1:26 – ii. 5
De virginitate
- for Gen. 1:26 - xlvi (2x)
Expositiones in psalmos 4-12, 41. 43-49. 103-106. 106-117. 119. 150
- for Gen. 1:26 – iv. 2; viii. 7; viii. 8; xi. 3; xlviii. 1; cix. 1
- for Gen. 1:27 – cxxi. 2
Fragmenta in Iob
- for Gen. 1:26 - 1:1
In Colossenses homiliae 1-12
- for Gen. 1:26 – v. 4 (2:5); vi. 4 (2:15)
- for Gen. 1:27 – xii. 5 (4:18)
In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum
- for Gen. 1:27 – xx. 1 (5:24)
Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim
- for Gen. 1:26 – viii. 1: x. 1
- for Gen. 1:27 – x. 1: x. 3
In illud: Domine non est in homine (ler 10:23)
- for Gen. 1:26 – 3
In illud: Ne timueritis cum diues factus fuerit homo (Ps 48:17) homiliae 1-2
- for Gen. 1:26 – i. 1
In Ioannem Homiliae 1-88
- for Gen. 1:26 – xxxiii. 2; lxiv. 2
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In Isaiah 1-8. 10
- for Gen. 1:26 – i. 2.

In quatriuam Lazarum (PG 48, 779-784)
- for Gen. 1:26 – A 2

In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32
- for Gen. 1:26 – xxiii. 4 (13:10)

In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18
- for Gen. 1:26 – xvi. 2 (6:2)

In epistulam ad Titum homiliae 1-6
- for Gen. 1:27 – iii. 4 (2:1)

Sermones 1-9 in Genesim
- for Gen. 1:26 – ii. 1 (2x); ii. 2; iii. 1; iv. 1
Appendix B

According to Krupp's Scripture Index, these are all the writings in which John Chrysostom refers to Galatians 3:28.

*Ad Demetrium, de compunctione 1*
  i. 3

*Catecheses ad illuminandos (2)*
  xi. 21

*Expositiones in psalmos 4-12, 41, 43-49, 103-106, 106-117, 119, 150*
  vii. 10

*In Acta apostolorum homiliae 1-55*
  v. 2 (2:20)

*In Colossenses homiliae 1-12*
  vi. 4 (2:15); xii. 5 (4:8)

*In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44*
  xii. 12; xl. 6

*In dictum Pauli: Nolo uos ignorare (1 Cor 10:1)*
  3

*In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum*
  xx. 1 (5:24)

*In Matthaenum Homiliae 1-89 (3)*
  lxiii. 3

*In epistulam ad Philemonem argumentum et homiliae 1-3*
  i. 1 (v3)

*In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32*
  xxx. 3 (16:4)

*In s. Ignatium martyrem*
  1

*Sermo post reditum a priore exilio*
  i. 1
Appendix C

According to Krupp’s Scripture Index, these are all the writings in which John Chrysostom refers to 1 Cor. 11:2-16.

Ad populum antiochenum homiliae 1-21
- for 1 Cor. 11:6 - v. 6
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - iii. 18

Ad Stagirium a daemone vexatum 1-3
- for 1 Cor. 11:9 - i. 2

Adversus Iudaeos orationes 1-8 (i)
- for 1 Cor. 11:4 - 3, 2, 2
- for 1 Cor. 11:5 - 3, 2, 2

Expositiones in psalms 4-12, 41, 43-49, 103-106, 106-117, 119, 150
- for 1 Cor. 11:2 - xliv. 10

In ascensionem d. n. Iesu Christi
- for 1 Cor. 11:10 - 1

In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44
- for 1 Cor. 11:3 - xxvi. 1
- for 1 Cor. 11:4 - xii. 14; xxvi. 4
- for 1 Cor. 11:6 - xxvi. 4
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - xxvi. 4; xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:8 - xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:9 - xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:10 - xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:11 - xxvi. 5; xxvii. 2
- for 1 Cor. 11:12 - xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:13 - xxvi. 5
- for 1 Cor. 11:14 - xxvi. 5; xxx. 1
- for 1 Cor. 11:15 - xxvi. 5; xxx. 1
- for 1 Cor. 11:16 - xxvi. 2; xxvi. 5; xxvii. 3
In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum
- for 1 Cor. 11:3 - xx. 4 (5:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:5 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:6 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:8 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:9 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:10 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:11 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:12 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:13 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:14 - xv. 4 (4:31)
- for 1 Cor. 11:15 - xv. 4 (4:31)

In epistulam ad Galates commentarius
- for 1 Cor. 11:14 - v. 5 (5:17)

Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim
- for 1 Cor. 11:13 - xvii. 4; lxvi. 2
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - viii. 4
- for 1 Cor. 11:8 - xv. 3
- for 1 Cor. 11:9 - xv. 3
- for 1 Cor. 11:11 - xv. 3

In Matthaeum homiliae 1-89 (3)
- for 1 Cor. 11:10 - lix. 4
- for 1 Cor. 11:12 - xxxii. 8

In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32
- for 1 Cor. 11:2 - xxix. 1 (15:15)

In epistulam i ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-18
- for 1 Cor. 11:9 - xi. 1 (2:15)

In epistulam ii ad Timotheum argumentum et homiliae 1-10
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - viii. 1 (3:5)

Quod regulares feminae uiris cohabitate non debeant
- for 1 Cor. 11:3 - 6

Sermones 1-9 in Genesim
- for 1 Cor. 11:7 - xv. 3
Appendix D

According to Krupp's Scripture Index, these are all the writings in which John Chrysostom refers to Ephesians 5:21-33.

Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt
- for Eph. 5:25 – xvii

Catecheses ad illuminandos (2)
- for Eph. 5:25 – i. 16-17; xi. 9
- for Eph. 5:26 – i. 16-17; xi. 9
- for Eph. 5:27 – i. 16; i. 17; i. 18; iv. 32; xi. 10
- for Eph. 5:31 – i. 11; xi. 3
- for Eph. 5:32 – i. 11; i. 13; xi. 3

Contra Anomoeos homilia 11
- for Eph. 5:23 – xi. 4

De Christi precibus
- for Eph. 5:25 – 6

De paenitentia homiliae 1-9
- for Eph. 5:27 – v. 3

De sacerdoto libri 1-6
- for Eph. 5:27 – iv. 2

Expositiones in psalmos 4-12, 41, 43-49, 103-106, 106-117, 119, 150
- for Eph. 5:27 – v. 2

In Colossenses homiliae 1-12
- for Eph. 5:32 – xii. 5 (4:18)

In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1-44
- for Eph. 5:25 – xix. 2
- for Eph. 5:33 – xix. 2

In epistulam ad Ephesios argumentum
- for Eph. 5:21 – xxii. 1 (6:8)
- for Eph. 5:22 – i. 1 (1:2)
- for Eph. 5:23 – xx. 5 (5:33)
- for Eph. 5:27 – iii. 2 (1:22)
- for Eph. 5:31 – xx. 3 (5:29); xx. 5 (5:33); xx. 8 (5:33)
Homiliae 1-67 in Genesim
- for Eph. 5:23 – xiv. 4
- for Eph. 5:32 – lxvi. 1

In epistulam ad Hebraeos argumentum et homiliae 1-34
- for Eph. 5:30 – vii. 4

In Illud: Propter fornicationes uxorem (1 Cor. 7:2)
- for Eph. 5:21 – 4
- for Eph. 5:22 – 4
- for Eph. 5:33 – 4

In Iohanem homiliae 1-88
- for Eph. 5:26 – lxxxii. 1
- for Eph. 5:30 – xlvi. 3

In Matthaeum homiliae 1-89 (3)
- for Eph. 5:32 – lxix. 1

In epistulam ad Romanos homiliae 1-32
- for Eph. 5:25 – xxvii. 2 (15:3)

Non esse desperandum
- for Eph. 5:28 – 6

Quales ducendae sint uxores
- for Eph. 5:25 – 2; 3
- for Eph. 5:26 - 2
- for Eph. 5:27 - 2
- for Eph. 5:28 - 3 (2x)
- for Eph. 5:29 - 3
- for Eph. 5:30 – 3 (2x)
- for Eph. 5:31 - 3
- for Eph. 5:32 – 3 (2x)

Sermones 1-9 in Genesim
- for Eph. 5:25 – iv. 2
- for Eph. 5:33 – iv. 2
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