ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S

PICTURE OF HIS AGE.

Published under the direction of the Tract Committee.

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE;
SOLD AT THE DEPOSITORIES:
77, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS;
4, ROYAL EXCHANGE; 48, PICCADILLY;
AND BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.
1875.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

CONTENTS.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S PICTURE OF HIS AGE.

CHAPTER I.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S BIRTH AND RESIDENCE AT ANTIOCH.

Introduction.—Comparison between Satires and Sermons.—Defects of Post-reformation Divines.—St. Chrysostom's severity of style.—The writer's design.—St. Chrysostom's birth and parentage; his education; his mother Anthusa; monastic predilections; self-discipline; his friends; pious fraud; narrow escape; monastic life; ordination; conduct after the riots at Antioch.

Amongst all great nations there are certain popular customs, which commonly escape the notice of grave historians, but which are seized with avidity by satirists, and chiefly give pungency to their literary compounds. How much of the high life and low life of Rome would for ever have remained hidden

when the curtain of time had dropped over them, if they had not been pointed out and jeered at by such unsparing critics as Horace, Juvenal, Martial and Petronius. In their pages, posterity has discovered the intrigues of Roman ladies, the horrible vices of the men, the banquets of peacocks, turbots, lobsters, British oysters, mullet stewed in Venafrian oil, lampreys and geese livers washed down by sextaries of old Falernian, creating a second hunger (*alia fames*), and demanding a midnight supper.[1] In fact, satirists are peculiarly the historians of vice and folly.

But we do not ordinarily expect to find the same character in the works of Christian divines. The treatises and commentaries of modern theology, and the sermons of modern pulpits, would be supposed to transgress the limits of good taste if they were to enter into the details of every-day life, and attempt any minute representation of men and manners. Rare, indeed, since the Reformation, have been the instances amongst English or Continental divines of such pictorial declamations; but in

[1] This practice, which Juvenal ridicules, was continued to St. Chrysostom's time. Gourmands τὰ δεῖπνα τοῖς ἀρίστοις συναπτόντες are denounced by him, "*Quod Nemo lœditur*," &c. lib. § 7.

England, old Hugh Latimer, and in France, Massillon were illustrious exceptions to the general rule. And it would be difficult to show why the pulpit should not point at the glaring extravagances of the day, or bring to light the hidden things of darkness. Surely it would thus have been employed by St. Paul. Its mild but weighty rebukes would be found more effectual guards and supports of virtue than the stinging chastisements of satire.[2] When men cannot be "laughed into reform," they may be awe-struck by the thunders of a violated law. But the modesty of preachers shrinks now from an exposure of sin's worst deformities: vice is abundantly luxuriant, but we choose to suppose that it is concealed behind a veil, which it would be imprudent to raise.

Not so the great St. Chrysostom. No scruples of real or false delicacy—no dread of entering the lists with popular prejudices, or with the influence of wealth and power—no regard for any arbitrary rules of taste—ever deterred him from ferreting out vice, and then holding it, as it were, at arm's length, to the

[2] The superiority of the pulpit over satire is well argued by Cowper in the Second Book of "*The Task*," but the passage is too long for quotation.

gaze of a blushing audience. In this respect he affords us a grand and imposing spectacle. Living in a most degenerate age, amongst a gay, vicious, and degraded people, he undertook the Herculean task of sweeping away the filth which had accumulated for ages. If he had paused to calculate the probabilities of success, even his daring spirit would have sunk within him; but from the moment when the hands of God's bishop had been laid upon him, he felt impelled and constrained to engage in the work of preaching repentance: he had been bid to go, and he went out, not knowing whither he went—whether it was to work a reformation in society, or to perish in the glorious but vain attempt.[3] He was a wonderful prelate, and an illustrious exemplar.

I propose to exhibit the etchings which he has given us of himself and the society in which he lived. St. Chrysostom did not live, like a priest in England, only amongst Christians. Although the star of heathenism had paled, and was gradually disappearing under the broad light of the Gospel, yet a large

[3] For an evidence of his strong sense of responsibility we may refer to the Homily *De decem millium talent. debitore*, § 4, and to the Books on the Priesthood, *passim*.

number—certainly a majority—of the people even in the large cities were still heathens,[4] and he had witnessed a temporary revival of their superstitions under Julian the Apostate. Hence we find him frequently lamenting—as every sincere believer in India must—the evil influence which the wicked lives of Christians had upon those who were without. To this cause he attributes the tardiness of conversion. The heathen could not help, he declares, suspecting our religion to be fraud and folly: Christians cared little to defend it. If the merits of a dancer or a charioteer were discussed, they would at once have abundance to say, but when arguments for Christianity are proposed, they all hang their heads, and scratch themselves, and yawn, and retire at length the objects of contempt,[5] or if they did attempt to argue in favour of their religion, how could they who were wholly given to covetousness be wise concerning the things of heaven?[6] "There would be no heathen if we were such Christians as we ought to be. . . . But when

[4] In some, idolatry was as vigorous as ever. See *In S. Babylam Lib.* § 8. I shall show the state of Antioch hereafter.

[5] *In Joan. Homil.* xvii. al. xvi. § 4.

[6] *In Rom. Homil.* vi. § 6.

the heathen see us manifesting the same desires, pursuing the same objects—power and honour—as themselves, how can they admire Christianity? They see our lives open to reproach, our souls worldly. We admire wealth equally with them, and even more. . . . How then can they believe? From miracles? But these are no longer wrought. From our conversation? It has become corrupt. From charity? Not a trace of it is anywhere to be seen."[7] As it was, the very boys cut their jokes upon the Gospel.[8] Moreover, heathenism retained its hold on the people for other reasons. A set of cynics, like the Sanyásís of India, with long beards, staves, and tattered clothes, who appeared to lead self-denying lives, but were yet most greedy fellows, exercised a retrogressive influence.[9] The grossest impostures were often practised by the priests

[7] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* x. § 3.

[8] *In Diem Natalem Christi Homil.*

[9] *Ad. Pop. Antioch.* Homil. xvii. § 2. *Habentes eundem spiritum*, &c. Homil. ii. § 3. Julian the Apostate, with a sly hit at Christian ascetics, described these cynics as "men who impudently contemned received opinions without being justified therein by any superior talent or merit of their own, and who trampled under foot all the laws of society, though they introduced no better or purer mode of life, but one much worse and far more detestable." —*The Emperor Julian and his Generation*, by Neander, § 3.

with complete success: concealed apertures were in some cases made beneath the altars of the gods, and by their means an individual, having contrived to light a fire, would so blow it that the flames, appearing upon the altar, would astonish the spectators, and claim from credulity a belief in their celestial origin.[1] Then, again, their periodical festivals, and the licence in which the dissipated were at such times encouraged to indulge, retained the votaries of idolatry in their attachment to superstitions which were found convenient ministers of pleasure.[2]

Some of St. Chrysostom's arguments are particularly aimed at fire-worshippers. With well-directed satire he hits such follies as disgrace the Parsís of India. "What irreverence," he says, "is it to put your God under kettles and cauldrons—why not bring him into your chambers, and deposit him amongst your silken draperies? So far from this, if any accident by fire occurs, you weep and lament!—you consider the presence of your God a calamity! I have a God, and I do all to enshrine Him in my bosom: I am happy, not only when He is

[1] *In SS. Petrum et Heliam Homil.* § 4.
[2] *In S. Babylam Lib.* § 8.

in my dwelling, but in my heart; yet you shrink from your God, and, whilst you lie upon couches, leave him to the care of cooks, bakers, and coppersmiths."[3] Equally irrational, too, says the preacher, is the adoration of the sun, although he does send forth his rays from the east, like a bridegroom appearing from some stately chamber, adorning the clouds with a saffron-coloured veil, and tingeing them with a roseate hue.[4]

St. Chrysostom, too, did not live only amongst civilians. Like a preacher in India, he found that military men composed a portion of his congregation. Hence some of his most lively and striking tropes are taken from their profession.[5] As if standing near their parade-ground, he thus reminds the rest of his congregation that they are engaged in a spiritual warfare:—"Do you not see these soldiers when no war disturbs them, but it is profound peace, brightening up their arms, and going forth

[3] *In Ephes. Homil.* xii. § 2.

[4] *Ad Pop. Antioch. Homil.* x. § 4.

[5] In the Sixth Book *De Sacerdotio* is a magnificent description of a land and sea fight. In the Homil. *In S. Barlaamum* is a beautiful comparison between the life and death of a martyr and a soldier; and in the third Homil. *In Ep.* 2 *ad Tim.* is an explanation of the rule observed in the distribution of prize-money.

with the officers who teach them to manœuvre, into the broad and level plains, I may say every day, that they may keep up with the greatest strictness the exercises of war? Of our spiritual soldiers who has done this?"[6] Allusions, moreover, to the climate, and its intense heat, to the numerous domestics who were attached to the establishments of the wealthy, the seclusion of women, and many other traits of oriental manners, suggest comparisons to the Anglo-Indian reader.

As subordinate to the object in view, the reader should be furnished with an account of St. Chrysostom's life.[7] He was of noble birth[8] —it is surprising to find how many of the great Fathers of that century were. The fishermen of Galilee had many successors amongst the aristocracy of the Roman Empire; and after God had chosen "base things of the world, and things which are despised," He called also wise men after the flesh, the mighty,

[6] *In* 1 *Thes. Homil.* iii. § 4.

[7] The groundwork of this biography is *Montfaucon's Memoir*, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of *St. Chrysostom's Works*, and which is for the most part taken from the life by Palladius. I have, however, consulted as much as possible the Saint's own writings, and permitted him to speak for himself.

[8] *Socratis Ecc. Hist.* tom. vi. cap. 3.

and the noble, to minister at His holy altar. So that, although in His kingdom ignoble birth has been so far honoured as to hold the first place of dignity, yet profound respect is also due to those who, when they might have had "confidence in the flesh," counted all that "loss for Christ." Such were St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and his friend St. Basil the Great, whose younger brother was St. Gregory of Nyssa—all offshoots from families of rank and wealth.

John, to whom the name of Chrysostom, or "golden lips," was subsequently given, on account of his eloquence, was born at Antioch, probably in the year 347.[9] His father was Secundus, a *magister militum*, or one of the eight who commanded the armies of the Empire, and who, according to Vegetius, were all men of distinguished birth. His mother was Anthusa, also of noble birth, who, as her husband died when John was yet an infant,[1] watched over his education, and was added to the innumerable examples of earnest and devout mothers, who have been privileged to lay the foundation of their children's greatness. She

[9] See his eleventh homily *Contra Anomœos*, § 1.
[1] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. i.

found herself a widow at the early age of twenty, but steadily refused to contract a second marriage. Her conduct in this respect was in accordance with what we shall afterwards see was the sentiment of devout persons in that age,[2] and it was spoken of even by a heathen philosopher with astonishment and admiration.[3] She managed her estate with such economy that it was preserved undiminished for her son;[4] but at the same time she cared more particularly for his spiritual and intellectual improvement, which she advanced by gaining his love and confidence,[5] and providing him with the best instructors. The little John was an apt pupil, but especially he showed an eagerness for the study of sacred literature. The most celebrated of his teachers was Libanius, a very superstitious man and a heathen,[6] but he studied rhetoric under him with such success that the master soon became proud of his pupil, and commended his progress in the highest terms. Libanius declared, that when the lad spoke a declamation which he had composed in honour of the Emperors,

[2] This is asserted in the *Liber De Virginitate*, § 37.
[3] *Ad Viduam Juniorem Tractatus*, i. § 2.
[4] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. i. [5] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi.
[6] *Ad Viduam Juniorem Tract.* § 2.

before himself and a select party of friends, who were in the habit of paying attention to such matters, they all showed by their involuntary gestures the enthusiastic admiration with which they regarded the composition.

Although John had conceived a wish to lead a monastic life even before he was twenty years of age, yet he seems to have afterwards forgotten his devotional aims, and to have divided his time between the practice of oratory in the forum and the pleasures of the theatre or of other public exhibitions. From this life, however, he was drawn by a youth named Basil, with whom he had contracted a close intimacy; and he soon exchanged the study of forensic art and amusements for a searching perusal of Scripture, and the daily practices of a devout life.[7] Socrates attributes this change to his conviction that a lawyer's life must be passed not only in arduous toil, but also in injustice.[8] Be this as it may, Libanius much regretted such a determination, and on his death-bed declared that "had the Christians not stolen him, John would have been his fittest successor."[9]

[7] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. i. [8] *Ecc. Hist.* tom. vi. cap. 3.
[9] *Sozom. Ecc. Hist.* lib. viii. cap. 2.

The Bishop of Antioch at this time was the mild and devout Meletius.[1] When he had observed the promising abilities and noble character of the young student, he sought and obtained frequent opportunities of conversing with him. The result was, that with prophetic spirit he spoke of John's future greatness, and, having first received him to holy baptism, consecrated him about the year 369 to the office of Reader. From the moment that John received baptism, says Palladius, he neither swore, nor libelled any one, nor spoke falsely, nor used imprecations, nor even willingly entered into jokes.

Religious earnestness too often leads now only to fine talking or schism; then its invariable direction was towards hardship, and often to the life either of a Missionary or a Solitary. Basil followed the religious fashion of the age, by retiring to a monastic institution, and would have prevailed upon his friend to join him, if the entreaties and tears of Anthusa had not detained her darling and only son. As soon as she perceived his intention, she took him by the hand, led him into her chamber, and bidding him sit near the bed on

[1] *In S. Meletium Homil.* § 2.

which she had brought him forth, thus, with an utterance choked by tears and sighs, addressed him:—

"It pleased God, my child, that I should not be permitted to enjoy for a long time your father's virtues. His death succeeding the birth-throes which I endured for you, left to you an orphan's condition, and to me premature widowhood, accompanied by those evils which can only be understood by such as have experienced them. For no words can express the storm and whirlwind in which a damsel is involved, who, when she has but recently left her father's house, and is inexperienced in business, is suddenly stricken by an intolerable affliction, and at the same time compelled to undertake cares beyond her age and sex. If the deceased has left a child, and it is a girl, she will cause much anxiety to her mother, but without expense and fear; but a boy fills her each day with unnumbered fears and increasing anxieties, though I omit to notice the pecuniary expense in which she must be involved if she is desirous of giving him a liberal education. Yet none of these considerations induced me to contract a second marriage, and to bring another spouse into your father's house. I remained in the tumult

of the waves, and did not fly from the iron furnace of widowhood, chiefly because I was assisted by the Divine favour, and also because I found no little solace of those evils in constantly seeing you, and having before me a living and exact image of the departed. Even when you were a babe, and could not yet speak —at that period when children particularly charm their parents—you were a great comfort to me. And you can never reproach me by saying that, although I bore up nobly against widowhood, yet, on account of its necessities, I diminished your paternal property, as I know has been the misfortune of many orphans. I preserved all untouched for you, although I spared no expense to give you a good education, which I defrayed from my own private resources. Think not now that I say this by way of reproach: I only, on account of all these considerations, ask as one favour of you, that you will not cast me into a second widowhood, nor again awake my slumbering grief. Wait until my death; perhaps it will not be long before I depart. When you have committed me to the earth, and have mingled my bones with your father's, then take long journeys, or sail wherever you please. No one will then prevent you. But as long as I con-

tinue to breathe, take up your abode with me, lest you foolishly offend God by bringing such calamities on one who has never injured you. If, indeed, you complain that I draw you to worldly business, and compel your attendance to your affairs, then respect not the laws of nature, nor education, nor custom, nor anything else, but flee from me as from an enemy who has designs against you; but as my aim is to procure you leisure that you may choose your own mode of life, and as you have no other bonds, let the bond which is between us retain you. For although thousands may love, no one will permit you to enjoy so much liberty, for no one can care so much as I do for your reputation."[2]

To these remonstrances John yielded, and found in his home abundant leisure; but instead of indulging the ease which his circumstances offered, he subjected himself to a severe course of discipline: often he would observe a strict silence, and refuse to speak, because he feared to fall again into an old practice of slandering his neighbours. The consequence was, that his former acquaintances pronounced him a misanthrope. The injustice of this was

[2] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. i.

felt and regretted by him, but he resolved to persevere, as he believed it impossible for him to grow in grace so long as he retained his old associations. Still he preserved a few select companions, amongst whom he clung with peculiar fondness to Basil. Theodorus, afterwards Bishop of Mopsus in Cilicia, and Maximus of Seleucia, were also in the number of his friends.

On account of this Theodorus, he wrote two most interesting and admonitory treatises. That sensitive youth, attracted by the charms of young Hermione, had renounced his strictness of life, and yielded to the fascinations of pleasure. His friend John urged him with the utmost importunity to return, but for long without success. The lover maintained that his conduct was justifiable, that his heart was Hermione's, and that he intended to make her his bride. Judging from the examples which John produced in confirmation of his arguments, we conclude that Theodorus had been drawn into the indulgence of an unchaste affection, and, as his still tender conscience supported the earnest exhortations of his friend, he was eventually recovered.[3]

[3] *Ad Theodorum Lapsum*, Ep. i. et ii.

We come now to an event which we regard as a flaw in the purity of Chrysostom's life, but for which he himself considered that no defence was required. It must be admitted that those impostures, which by a misnomer are styled "pious frauds," have in rare instances had their apologists amongst the Christian Fathers. Even the great and good St. Augustine interprets Scripture in such a way as to suggest a justification of them.[4] Although he certainly was not accustomed to admit of any compromise in preaching the truth, Chrysostom maintains that in certain cases deception is not culpable, and that then it does not deserve the name of "vain deceit," which St. Paul employs. "There is also an honourable deceit," he says, "such as many have been deceived by, which one ought not even to call a deceit at all;" and he softens the fraud with which Jacob outwitted his brother Esau by calling it "an economy."[5] Doubtless he persuaded himself by such reason-

[4] In his sermon on St. Matt. xv. St. Augustine says that our Lord pretended not to hear the woman of Canaan—"dissimulabatur ab eâ;" and he uses similar language in his sermon on the two chapters St. Matt. xxi. and St. Luke xxiv. compared. Any reader of the present day can at once see his error.

[5] *In Coloss. Homil.* vi. § 1.

ing that it was right for him to impose upon Basil. The two friends had heard that they were designed to fill certain Bishoprics which were then vacant, and that if they refused their consent, violence would be imposed upon them. Although intriguing spirits were at that time as abundant as they have ever been, yet the most devout Christians never regarded the episcopal office as an enviable dignity, but rather shrank from its dangerous responsibilities. It was therefore with no small degree of alarm that John heard of the honour which the people had designed to thrust upon him; but when Basil consulted him as to whether they should make their escape from the neighbourhood, he concealed his real sentiments. So high was the opinion which he entertained of his friend, that he dreaded to inflict a serious injury upon the Church, if, by declaring his own intention to refuse the ministerial office, of which he felt himself so unworthy, he should induce the worthy Basil to follow his example. He even went so far as to promise that he would join Basil in presenting himself for ordination. When, however, the Bishop arrived, he was nowhere to be found. Basil at first declared his reluctance to be ordained, but some of the bystanders, conniving at the fraud,

observed how strange it was that when a man of such a determined character as Chrysostom had quietly yielded to the wishes of his spiritual fathers, the moderate and gentle Basil should be found to offer a dogged resistance. Upon this he submitted, and "received the yoke of Christ." He then sought for John, who lay concealed, but, when he had found him, he was unable to speak for grief—his looks alone declared his deep concern at what had happened. What, however, was his indignation, when, instead of meeting with sympathy, his profound sorrow only caused the other to burst into a loud laugh, and to glorify God for the success of his contrivance![6]

About this time John was in imminent danger of losing his life, and, because the circumstance is characteristic of those times, we will tell it as we have received it from him:—The Emperor, having been led to suspect that many inhabitants of Antioch were occupied with the dark arts of magic and witchcraft, had given orders that strict search should be made for all books in which such were taught. By chance a certain sorcerer had in his alarm thrown a book into

[6] These details are all taken from the First Book *De Sacerdotio*.

the river, where it was seen by one of John's friends, who was passing by in his company. The friend, thinking it was a bundle of linen, picked it up, and John in a merry mood contended with him for its possession. Soon they discovered that it was a work on magic, and, looking up, they saw to their terror that a soldier was at that moment approaching. "Who," they thought, "will believe that we have taken it out of the river?" For some time they dared not throw it away, lest they should be seen. At last, however, they did so, and thus escaped from what they regarded as extreme danger.[1]

[1] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* xxxviii. I must confess that at this part of the narrative I was disposed to think that the fearless John had for once been the victim of unreasonable terror, until the history of Ammianus Marcellinus satisfied me that both John and his friend had solid grounds of anxiety. Ammianus, in chronicling events which occurred only ten years before the period referred to in the text, draws a terrible picture of the spy system, the dread of magic, and the persecutions of real or supposed sorcerers, all of which had reached an alarming height in Syria. "A certain Palladius," he writes, "had obtained the power to accuse whomsoever he pleased, without distinction of rank, of addiction to forbidden arts; and, like a hunter who is skilful in tracking wild animals, he caught in his horrid toils some who were polluted by a knowledge of magic, and others who were privy to the designs of traitors. And, that even wives might not be left to bewail their husbands' calamities, spies were suddenly sent into their

Shortly after this event John carried out his long-conceived design, and retired to a monastery situated on the mountains, in the neigh-

houses, on which seals had been set, and they would smuggle into the folds of the furniture some old woman's incantations, or imitations of love philtres, which had been prepared for the ruin of the innocent; and when these were recited at the trial, as there was neither law, nor religion, nor equity to distinguish truth from falsehood, although the accused were undefended on account of their property being taken away, and were guilty of no crime, yet youths and others indiscriminately were deprived of all their members, and led away on chairs to punishment: *the consequence was, that all in the eastern provinces, for fear of such things, burnt all their libraries*, so great was the terror of all. For, to speak briefly, we all during that tempest groped as it were in Cimmerian darkness, and trembled like the guests of Dionysius the Sicilian, who, when they were pampered with banquets which were worse than any hunger, were horrified to see swords hanging from the ceiling of the house in which they sat, fastened by horse-hairs, and impending over their heads." One instance is recorded in which frightful cruelty was perpetrated for magical purposes with impunity—Pollentianus, a favourite of the Emperor, having been convicted of ripping open a living woman, and extracting the fœtus, that he might divine the prospects of the Empire. A certain Festus obtained a vile celebrity for his cruelty when Proconsul of Asia. He put to death the philosopher Cæranius, because, in a private letter to his wife, he wrote a sentence in Greek, which looked suspicious; also a simple old woman, because she muttered a charm to drive away intermittent fever; and an illustrious citizen, because amongst his papers was found the casting of the nativity of his brother Valens, which was supposed to be treachery

bourhood of Antioch. Here he fell into the society of an aged hermit, by whose example he inured himself to study and abstinence. He gives us some insight into the hardships which he endured, and the reluctance with which he at first submitted to them. But a love of severe discipline seemed natural to him, and he persevered now, even in spite of his mother's earnest entreaties. A little later he wrote to another friend in terms of glowing admiration for a monastic life.[8] Moreover, he took up his pen in its defence; and at a time when Valens, the Arian Emperor, was oppressing all orthodox monks, John, in compliance with a friend's urgent request, stood forward as their champion.[9] In another treatise he draws a comparison between the life of a monarch and a monk, and does not hesitate to give the preference to the latter.[1] For four years he lived

against the Emperor of the same name. A young man in the baths was seen to apply the fingers of both hands to the marble, and then to his chest alternately, and to count seven. The poor fellow supposed that this was good for the bowel complaint, but he was taken up, tortured, and executed. Lib. xxix. cap. ii. I hope that no one will now suppose that Chrysostom's fears were groundless.

[8] *Ad Demetrium, De Compunctione*, lib. i. § 6, et lib. ii. *ad Stilichium*.

[9] *Adv. Oppugn. Vit. Monast. Libri tres.*

[1] *Comp. Regis et Monachi.*

with the hermit, and then led an ascetic life in complete solitude, passing the day and a great part of the night in watchings, fastings, prayers, psalm-singing, intense study of the holy Scriptures, and other such exercises, his only food being bread and water, with a few herbs. Ill-health compelled him at last to withdraw from his mountain haunts—a result so happy in its consequences to the whole Church of Christ, which followed from his noble but mistaken asceticism. About the year 380 he returned to Antioch, and was shortly afterwards ordained by Bishop Meletius, who a few months later departed this life.

Meletius was succeeded in the see of Antioch by Flavian, who ordained John as Presbyter about 386. By this time his reputation had increased, and, although he had never preached, his writings had proved his great capacity. After his ordination he delivered his first sermon in the Bishop's presence. It is still to be found amongst his works, and is a more formal, laboured, and carefully-prepared composition than his latter discourses.[2] Yet in these early days he often showed his readiness in extem-

[2] It is entitled *Sermo, cum Presbyter fuit ordinatus, de se, ac de Episcopo, deque Populi Multitudine.*

poraneous preaching; and in sermons delivered at the opening of the following Lent, we meet with interesting proofs of the facility with which he turned passing and trifling events to the edification of his hearers.[3]

We come now to the most memorable event which happened during Chrysostom's life—the riot at Antioch, with the contempt shown to the statues of the Emperor Theodosius and his wife Flaccilla. Groaning under the weight of tribute, the most distinguished citizens had in a body, and peaceably, laid their complaints before the Prefect, but a rabble collected round the doors soon became excited, and, being stimulated by designing persons, proceeded to acts of violence.[4] The public baths were ransacked, the Prefect's house was assailed, and the mob with difficulty repulsed; the portraits of the Emperors were pelted and defiled with mud, and torn; the Augusti themselves were reviled, and, last of all, the statues of the Emperor and his deceased Empress were thrown down, and ignominiously dragged through the

[3] *In Genesim Conciones.* For instance in the fourth sermon, where he chides his congregation for withdrawing their attention from him to the lamps, which were then being lighted.

[4] *Adversus Judæos,* Oratio vi. § 6.

city. At this stage the sedition was checked by the approach of a company of archers. Upon receiving a report of the insults heaped upon him, the enraged Emperor gave a rash order for the general destruction of people and buildings. The fury and insolence of a mob were then succeeded by the usual terror of consequences, amounting to a panic. The people seemed stupefied, and fluctuating between hope and fear; whilst the intercession of a neighbouring city did but excite their jealousy, without removing their danger.[5] And then arose the great Preacher of eternally good tidings. As they waited in profound anxiety the result of a mission which good Bishop Flavian had undertaken in order to appease the Emperor, each day John summoned an auditory to the old church, and then, drawing upon his inexhaustible treasury of language and argument, he employed the latest intelligence to the great end of confirming their souls in those devotional feelings which mere fright had originated. We shall frequently have occasion to refer to these homilies when pointing out the vices of the age; but we may remark here, that, delivered, as they were, almost without

[5] *In Coloss. Homil.* vii. § 3.

preparation, they must be regarded as wonderful specimens of pulpit eloquence. He represents the people as suffering for a time the punishments of offended justice, and as sometimes the victims of official barbarity before any distinct edict had been published by the Emperor;[6] he congratulates them upon the temporary change for the better in their habits;[7] he consoles them by Christian exhortations;[8] he pacifies them when impatient under the delays to which the messengers who had been sent to deprecate the Emperor's wrath had been subjected;[9] he dilates upon the great works of the Creator, and deduces from them lessons of hope and confidence;[1] he describes the scourging and tortures of the criminals;[2] mentions the report that the city was to be sacked, and the preparations which the inhabitants were making for flight;[3] expresses his delight that after all their fears had not been realized, and that the great officers who had been sent by the Emperor to inquire into the matter were imposing but light penalties

[6] *Ad. Pop. Antioch. De Statuis*, homil. iii.
[7] *Ibid.* homil. iv.
[8] *Ibid.* homil. v.
[9] *Ibid.* homil. vi.
[1] *Ibid.* homil. vii. viii. ix. x. xi. xii.
[2] *Ibid.* homil. xiii.
[3] *Ibid.* homil. xvi.

upon the offenders;[4] he exhorts against the remembrance of injuries;[5] and, finally, he discourses upon the return of Bishop Flavian, and the lenity of the Emperor, who had granted a free pardon to the rebellious city.[6]

[4] *Ad. Pop. Antioch. De Statuis*, homil. xvii.
[5] *Ibid.* homil. xx.
[6] *Ibid.* homil. xxi.

CHAPTER II.

RESIDENCE AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

St. Chrysostom's increasing reputation.—Nominated to the See of Constantinople.—His Consecration.—Commences reforms.—Remarkable procession.—His labours amongst barbarians and men of fashion.—Protects Eutropius.—Intercedes with, and opposes Gainas.—His visitation in Asia.—Troubles on his return.—Theophilus of Alexandria his enemy.—Measures of his opponents.—Arrival of Theophilus.—Synod of the Oak.—John holds a counter-Synod.—Sentence of deposition passed against him.—Sent into exile.—Recalled.—Offends the Empress.—Second exile.

For ten years John continued an indefatigable preacher at Antioch, and during this time most of his commentaries on the holy Scriptures were written. At length, the power of his oratory, combined with the strictness and holiness of his life, procured him so great influence over the people, that his fame became extended throughout the Eastern Empire, and he was thought worthy of the highest preferment. In the year 397 died Nectarius, who had succeeded Gregory of Nazianzum in the See of

Constantinople. Many were the candidates for the vacant throne, and many the courtly and popular arts—both so unworthy of Christian divines—which were employed to secure the coveted prize. Some fawned upon the authorities; others brought to them gifts and bribes, and others actually fell down upon their knees before the people. However, a large number of orthodox Christians implored the Emperor that he would only select a worthy, learned, and pious prelate; and Eutropius, the chamberlain, who really held the reins of power, conceived that John, the Priest of Antioch, was such a person as was required. An official journey afforded him an opportunity of seeing the celebrated preacher, and he soon recognized in him those endowments which qualified him more than any man living for such a high office.

But there was reason to fear that the people of Antioch would not submit quietly to the removal of their beloved pastor, and also that the modesty of John would lead him to shun the proffered dignity. At the suggestion, therefore, of Eutropius, the Emperor desired the Count of the East to devise some means of sending him away quietly, and this was easily done, on the pretence of taking him to the graves of the martyrs without the city, where he was

delivered to an officer, and transported to Constantinople.

Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, had already arrived to consecrate the Archbishop-elect, but, alarmed at his earnestness and freedom of speech, the ambitious prelate sought to substitute a presbyter named Isidore, who, however, when made aware of the intended honour, escaped it by taking flight to Alexandria. Theophilus, on the other hand, had reason to be anxious on his own account, for numerous and grave charges of malversation had been produced against him, and at last, influenced by the threat of Eutropius, that if he refused to advance John these charges would be investigated, he proceeded in March, 398, to the consecration.

No time was lost by Chrysostom in commencing the great work before him. In a homily against the Anomæans, which was the second preached by him to his new charge, he declares that he had conceived as great an affection for them as if he had lived all his life amongst them.[1] But his regard, instead of

[1] *Contra Anomœos*, homil. xi. § i. The tenets of this sect will be explained in the proper place. They had liberality enough to attend St. Chrysostom's preaching, although he called them a set of infidels. Homil. ii. § 1.

leading him to palliate their vices, made him the more anxious to correct them, and in particular he rebuked so strongly the avarice of his clergy, that many of them from that time became his enemies.

Example was in his case the handmaid of precept. He at once began a close scrutiny of the ecclesiastical, and especially of his own episcopal revenues, and finding to his sorrow that they had been squandered with heedless profusion, he ordered all useless expenses in his own establishment to be curtailed, and the surplus to be appropriated to the support of hospitals, which he founded and supplied with all that was necessary for the entertainment of sick persons and strangers. He also revived an old custom of having nightly prayers, and thus gave great offence to the idle and remiss portion of his clergy.

It was not long before he took part in one of the most remarkable ceremonies that was ever solemnized at Constantinople. The Empress Eudoxia, excited by religious zeal, determined to transport the relics of certain martyrs from the Great Church to the Church of St. Thomas, which was built upon the sea-shore at Drypia, about nine miles from the city. At midnight a long procession was formed of

monks, virgins, priests, and laity, including princes and the commonalty. Delicate ladies vied with robust men in enduring the fatigues of this midnight expedition, whilst noblemen and magistrates, having discharged their chariots and attendants, mixed freely with the common people. The Empress herself followed close to the coffer containing the relics, and near her was the Archbishop. So long was the procession, and so numerous the torches, that Chrysostom compared it to a fiery river, extending from the city to the sea. It was dawn before they reached Drypia, and then he preached in the Martyrs' Church to an overflowing congregation. His sermon is preserved, and testifies to a joy which must almost be pronounced extravagant. The high-flown phrases to which he gave utterance in his ecstasy formed a ground of one of the charges which were subsequently brought against him.[2] On the following day the Emperor Arcadius, with his court and a very large suite, came to do honour to the martyrs; and the ruler of the world, having laid aside his diadem, offered his prayers before their shrine.[3]

[2] Homil. *Dicta postquam reliquiæ*, &c. It begins thus: —*τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω; σκιρτῶ καὶ μαίνομαι;* these last were the objectionable words.

[3] Homil. *Dicta præsente Imperatore.*

At this period there were a great many Goths in and about Constantinople, who were for the most part Arians, but some were Catholics. Chrysostom took great pains to have portions of the Scriptures translated into their vernacular tongues, so that they might be read in the Church of St. Paul, where they met for Divine service, and appointed a Gothic presbyter to preach to them for the first time in their language. He himself left his own Church of Anastasia on the occasion, and delivered at St. Paul's a gratulatory discourse, which proves how anxious he was that the most illiterate should have an intelligent faith; that none should engage in religious services which they could not understand; that whilst Greek philosophers and their followers turned from the light, the beams of the Gospel might shine brightly upon barbarous nations, who, after all, as he remarked, were similar to the great patriarch Abraham, for he was a barbarian, and dwelt in the midst of barbarians.[4]

At the same time he lashed with unsparing hand the fashionable vices of Constantinople. Men writhed and complained; but so great was the fascination of his voice that they again

[4] Homil. *Habita postquam presbyter Gothus, &c.*

and again submitted to the infliction; and when, on the Sunday after Easter, his congregation beheld the pulpit occupied by an aged and respected Bishop from Galatia, unable to restrain their indignation, they left the church in disgust. The next Sunday John renewed his castigation with additional zest, and made some edifying reflections upon their Hippodrome, on account of the miserable death of a young man, who, whilst walking across the course, had been torn in pieces by the contending chariots.[5]

His popularity was now at the flood, but from this period the tide of his affairs changed, and the ebb of adversity commenced. The great and the powerful could not tolerate his interference with their favourite pastimes; and Eutropius himself, enraged at his frequent warnings, was converted from an ardent admirer into an implacable enemy. Amongst other designs, the favourite eunuch resolved that the Church should no longer be, as usual, an asylum for offenders against the law. There can be no doubt that this custom caused serious inconvenience to the State, but in times of disorder it was often a means of rescuing innocence from unjust violence, or guilt from the

[5] Homil. *Pater meus usque modo*, &c. § i.

immoderate revenge of an unreflecting judge; and Eutropius himself before long experienced its advantages. The honours which imperial favour had showered plentifully upon him were viewed with jealousy and rage by those whom he had superseded, until at last Tribiguldus, the Tribune, at the head of a military force, demanded from the Emperor his favourite's life. Eutropius, unable to resist, found a refuge in the church, where the intrepid Chrysostom, standing before the armed soldiers who desired to shed the trembling fugitive's blood, resolutely protected him from their fury. Two days later he detailed all these circumstances from the pulpit in the presence of Eutropius, who afterwards made his escape, but, being eventually taken, was banished to Cyprus, and in the end beheaded.[6]

Gainas, the Gothic chief, whose power was dreaded by the weak Arcadius, had been secretly instrumental in ruining Eutropius. He now insisted that two distinguished noblemen named Saturnine and Aurelian should be put to death, but the good Archbishop interceded for them, and the Goth, yielding to his solicitations, was satisfied with their exile.[7]

[6] Homil. *In Eutropium*; Homil. *De Capto Eutropio*

[7] Homil. *Cum Saturninus et Aurelianus*, &c.

The Emperor, in order to conciliate Gainas, appointed him commander in chief of the army, and the barbarian made use of his new authority to demand that one of the churches should be set apart for worship according to the Arian heresy, of which he was a follower. Arcadius and his courtiers, fearing to deny any of his requests, promised that they would deliberate upon the matter; but John, on being consulted, protested against any such desecration of a sacred edifice, and volunteered to remonstrate with Gainas upon the subject—which he did, and after many arguments prevailed. Thwarted in his purposes, the Goth meditated the pillage of the city, and an assault upon the imperial palace; until at length the poor Emperor, armed with the courage of despair, declared him a public enemy, and offensive measures having been skilfully arranged, a vast number of the barbarian's followers were slaughtered, and he himself compelled to seek safety in flight.

John was now called upon to settle certain ecclesiastical disputes, which were involving the Churches of Asia Minor in most serious troubles. In the year 400 A. D. Eusebius, Bishop of Valentopolis, brought before a synod assembled at Constantinople under its Arch-

bishop charges affecting the character of Antoninus, Bishop of Ephesus. Both Eusebius and Antoninus appear to have had indifferent reputations; and Chrysostom, suspecting that the charges were partly dictated by envy, wished to pass the matter over. Only at the urgent request of Eusebius and his party did he consent to carry on the inquiry, and send commissioners for the purpose into Asia. Antoninus, however, having contrived, by a liberal use of bribes, to remove the necessary witnesses, and at length even to silence the opposition of Eusebius, succeeded in deferring the investigation until the day of his death, which took place shortly after. The affairs of his Church were left in a deplorable condition, and seemed to demand the presence of the Metropolitan Archbishop.

The once vigorous Churches of Asia were already feeling the infirmities of age, and much need had they of a good physician to restore them to spiritual health. When suffering from sickness, and in the depth of winter, John set off upon his expedition. His voyage was stormy and dangerous, but he landed safely at Apamea, where he was joined by three companions, with whom the great Archbishop of luxurious Constantinople proceeded on foot to Ephesus.

Seventy Bishops from Lydia, Asia, and Caria there met him in synod, and condemned certain Presbyters who had procured their ordination from the late Bishop by the presentation of gifts. This expedition occupied Chrysostom more than a hundred days, and on his return he preached a sermon which proves how great was the mutual joy of himself and people on being restored to each other.[8] Fresh troubles, however, awaited him. He had left the charge of his diocese to Severianus, Bishop of Gabali, who had not only employed all his eloquence to prejudice his hearers against their absent Bishop, but had also, with a similar object, gained access to the Imperial Court, and ingratiated himself with Eudoxia. An inordinate desire of power appears to have been his motive, and the people, having been made aware of this, vented upon him their indignation.[9] Through the intercession of the Empress, John was soon reconciled to him; but enmity lurked in the false heart of Severianus, and, when opportunity offered, burst out against the indulgent friend, whom he had already so deeply injured.

Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, was at

[8] Homil. *De Regressu de Asia.*

[9] Homil. *De Recipiendo Severiano.*

this time ambitious of extending the great privileges which his See enjoyed, and making his word law to all the Bishops of the East. Since his vain opposition to the elevation of Chrysostom, his jealousy had only increased. Watching for opportunities, he soon found ready ministers of his vengeance in two presbyters and five deacons, whose vices John had severely handled, two or three courtiers, three widows of note, and especially in the avaricious Eudoxia, all of whom had conceived an intense hatred for their uncompromising censor. Doubtless, in the estimation of worldly men, Chrysostom's worst offence was his retired and ascetic life. His infirm health would have prevented him from indulging in social festivities, if they had been congenial with his tastes; and his practical and earnest piety led him to imitate in the simplicity of his life the apostles and first disciples of Christ. This mode of living, for which his memory has been honoured, his enemies endeavoured to turn to his disgrace, and the fact that he always dined alone was produced by them as an article of solemn accusation. He was also charged with being passionate, morose, and inaccessible. It is, indeed, evident that his temperament was naturally fiery, and that his rigid abstinence

added severity to his character. Single-hearted, and so strict in his own habits, he was, perhaps, sometimes intolerant of crime, and in appearance arrogant; but all writers agree that the charges against him were dictated by envy and revengeful guilt, and that he would never have found any unrelenting enemies, if a constant attention to his duties had not been preferred by him to unprofitable gossip, and a quiet and simple table to luxury and magnificent display.[1]

The first step taken by his adversaries was to make inquiries at Antioch regarding his youthful habits; but there they were foiled, for nothing worthy of blame could be discovered. They then offered their services to the too ready Theophilus, who soon gained a pretext for interference in the treatment of certain monks, called Fratres Longi, who, having been beaten and expelled by him from their abodes, had found kindness and sympathy with John, after due inquiry had been made, and satisfactory proof of their innocence produced. Another pretext was furnished by the works of the famous Origen, which Theophilus

[1] The worst character given of him is by Socrates, lib. vi. cap. 3. But see the *Sermo antequam iret in Exsilium*, § 4.

had in an official decree determined to be heretical, and had required that the same should be done by John, who, however, was so engaged with his flock, which were then in a most flourishing condition, that he would pay no attention to such matters. An invasion of his diocese by Epiphanius, at the instigation of Theophilus, was met with quiet dignity by John, whose recommendation to the intruder not to excite a tumult by his interference was considered a hint sufficient to justify him in taking his departure with all convenient speed.

A discourse, in which John about this time exposed the luxury, pride, and other vices of women generally, was reported by his enemies to Eudoxia as having been specially aimed at Her Imperial Majesty. She complained in consequence to the Emperor, and became the more eager in urging Theophilus to come and assemble a synod. At length he arrived, having numerous Bishops in his suite, and acknowledging that his object was to depose Chrysostom. From Lycia he came to Chalcedon on foot, and there consulted with his Egyptian and some malcontent Bishops as to what further measures should be taken. Loaded with the precious things of Egypt and

India,[2] he proposed by a liberal employment of these to conciliate friends to himself. He reached Constantinople in the month of June. An invitation to the Archbishop's house was refused by him, and he lodged in an imperial mansion without the walls of the city. He would not even enter a church, or see John, and obstinately withheld any explanation of such hostile conduct.[3]

The character of Theophilus by no means fitted him to become the judge of others, and several persons were desirous of bringing accusations against him. John was urged by the Emperor Arcadius to investigate their charges, but he declined, prudently alleging that he had no right to interfere, and that only a synod of Egyptian Bishops could decide upon such a question.[4] Theophilus, however, had no scruples: he resolved to bring John to trial; but knowing how attached the people were to their chief pastor, he would not venture to hold a synod within the walls of Constantinople, although assured of the Emperor's protection. He and his Bishops therefore met in a suburb of Chalcedon, called

[2] Alexandria was at this time the great mart for Indian commodities.

[3] *Epist. Ad Innocentium Episc. Romæ*, § 1. [4] *Ibid.*

"The Oak," where twenty-nine articles of accusation against Chrysostom were produced by John, a disreputable deacon, and to these, eighteen were added by a person named Isaac. It is sufficient to declare that the charges were either most frivolous, or that there was no attempt to prove such as were of a grave nature. The Archbishop was accused of degrading the above-named deacon for beating his own servant; of calling his clergy a beggarly set; of not praying when he entered and left the church; of having the public baths lighted for himself alone, and not permitting other persons to enter; of dining every day alone, and eating intemperately. No evidence, on the other hand, was produced to establish such a grave charge as that he had disposed of the church property for his own benefit. Although it was not pretended that any distinct act of incontinence could be imputed to him, it was basely insinuated that he admitted females to his society when he was alone; and he was declared to have encouraged sin because he had preached thus:—"If thou hast sinned again, repent again, and come to me as often as thou committest sin—I will heal thee!"

Thirty-six Bishops were combined in this

atrocious conspiracy. John very properly refused to appear, on the ground that his judges were his enemies. "If," said he, "you will remove my open enemies from the number of my judges, I am ready, and will present myself; but if you refuse to do that, you may cite me as often as you please, but you will gain nothing." He demanded that four persons,—Theophilus, Severianus, Acacius, and Antiochus,—who had all committed overt acts of hostility to him, should be excluded. As this demand was not attended to, he summoned a synod of his own Bishops, who met to the number of forty, and despatched a letter of remonstrance to Theophilus. That prelate, however, seems to have soon gained to his side—chiefly by the aid of the Archdeacon—the greater part of the Constantinopolitan clergy, who certainly disliked their frugal and reforming Metropolitan.[5]

The result was as all anticipated. The Synod at the Oak decided on the deposition of John, and their sentence was confirmed by Arcadius. No sooner, however, did the people hear of it, than they began to flock together in tumultuous excitement. The intelligence of the synod's decision arrived in the evening,

[5] *Ad Innocentium Episcopum Romæ Epist.* § 2.

and all night the people remained watching, declaring that their Bishop ought not to be removed, and that his cause must be heard in a larger council. As for John himself, whilst his flock sat up with him in the church, he preached soothing exhortations to patience.[6] Their affectionate opposition prevented him for some time from complying with the Emperor's decree that he should go into banishment; but on the third day, when they were unaware of his intention, he delivered himself to a Count and a military guard, who took him away quietly to Nicomedia, as he repeated the words "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. The Lord hath done whatsoever pleased Him. Blessed be the Name of the Lord for evermore."[7]

Theophilus now ventured to enter the walls of Constantinople, although amidst the execrations of the people. Subsequently, when Severianus in a sermon declared that John was justly deposed for his arrogance, the indignation of the multitude could no longer be restrained: numbers created a disturbance in the churches and the forum, whilst others rushed to the palace, and implored the Emperor

[6] *Orationes cum iret in Exsilium.*
[7] *Sermo post Reditum ab Exsilio.*

to restore their Bishop to them. An earthquake which happened at this time favoured their appeal, for the superstitious Eudoxia, being struck with terror, joined her intercession to theirs, and it was determined that John should be recalled. The following morning at dawn the Empress despatched a letter to him, beginning in this strain:—"Let not your Holiness suppose that I was aware of the circumstances which have occurred. I am innocent of your blood. Wicked and abandoned men designed this plot. God, whom I serve, is witness of my tears," She appealed to him by her son, who had been baptized by his hands, and when he arrived she sent to him this congratulatory message: "Tell him that my prayer is granted. I entreated for restitution. I have a better crown than a diadem. I have received the priest, have restored the head to the body, the pilot to the vessel, the shepherd to the flock, the bridegroom to the bridal chamber."[8] The return of John was in fact a triumph. A fleet of boats, filled with persons anxious to meet him, covered the Propontis, and others waited for him on the road with torches. Although he for long hesitated to enter the city until he was ab-

[8] *Sermo ut supra.*

solved by a synod, yet the excitement of the multitude at last overcame his scruples; and, proceeding to the Church of the Holy Apostles, he addressed them in a short and extemporaneous discourse.

His first step was to request that the Emperor would call a synod for the trial of his cause.[9] Arcadius after some delay consented, but Theophilus, instead of waiting for the synod to assemble, was urged by his guilty conscience to leave the city with his party in the middle of the night. The Emperor in vain desired him to return. He pleaded his fears, saying that the people were so devoted to John that they would raise a tumult against his accusers. In the end no synod was held, but, according to Sozomen, about sixty Bishops, who were at that time in Constantinople, declared that the acts of the Synod at the Oak were null, and that John might lawfully resume his episcopal functions.[1]

He was permitted to enjoy but brief tranquillity, and soon sealed his fate by irreconcileably offending the fickle Empress. It seems that a silver statue to her honour had been placed on a pillar opposite the Church of

[9] *Ad Innocentium Epist.*

[1] *Sozom. Hist. Eccl.* lib. viii. cap. 19.

St. Sophia, and before it the popular games were celebrated. With his accustomed freedom of speech John declaimed, as usual, against these spectacles, which were at variance with religion and morality. The Empress regarded this as an insult to herself, and from that moment did all in her power to injure the preacher. It was then that he delivered that homily, which, although now lost, has become almost as celebrated as his name, and which began with the words "Again Herodias rages, again she is vexed, again she dances, again she demands the head of John on a charger."[2]

Reconciliation with his opponents was now hopeless. They sent and urged Theophilus to return, but as that wily prelate stood too much in dread of John's popularity to risk his own person, he commissioned three Bishops to try the Archbishop according to the decisions of an Arian Council, which had been held at Antioch, and a canon of which was to the effect that if any Bishop who had been deposed by a council should return to his see on his own or with the Emperor's authority, he should be deposed for ever, and his case should never be even admitted to a hearing. Many Bishops

[2] *Socr. Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. cap. 18. We have a spurious homily with this commencement.

were assembled to condemn John, but he himself had forty-two on his side, and at the same time he frequently preached with unusual diligence and acceptance to his congregations. This time he was determined to face his accusers. When he entered their synod his noble bearing had such an effect on them that they scarcely ventured to speak, but at last came to the conclusion that they would pass over all the accusations which before had been urged against him, and confine themselves to the question whether, after his deposition, he had resumed his office without proper authority. The defence was that sixty-five Bishops who communicated with him had approved of his return, and, moreover, that the canons according to which he was accused were not framed by the Catholic Church, but by certain Arian Bishops, who had met with the object of overthrowing the orthodox faith. However, all defence was useless in a matter which had been long prejudged. An appeal was made to the Emperor by Elpidius and others on the part of John, and replied to by Acacius and others on the part of the synod. The former ingeniously proposed that the latter should subscribe a declaration to the effect that they held the same faith as did the framers of the

canon by which John was condemned. The Emperor was amused, and at once agreed, but the advocates of the synod contrived after all to evade the test. However, it was by no means an easy matter to induce the wavering Emperor and Empress to agree to the deposition of the popular Archbishop, and the most influential of his opponents, who had a military force at their command, at last took the matter into their own hands. What followed shall be related in his own words:—

"How can I narrate the circumstances which then occurred? They exceed any tragedy. What words will unfold them? What ear will receive them without horror? On the great Sabbath were collected a number of troops, which at the close of day entered the churches with violence, cast out all the clergy who were on our side, and encompassed the pulpit with arms. The women of the religious houses, who had just at that time put off their dress for baptism, fled naked in fear of that fierce intrusion, and were not permitted even to clothe themselves as female decency requires. Many were wounded and ejected, and the baptisteries were filled with blood, so that the sacred springs were red with gore. Nor did the affair end here; but the troops—some

of whom, as we know, were uninitiated—entered where the sacred vessels were deposited, and saw their contents. The most holy blood of Christ, as was likely in such confusion, was spilt upon the soldiers' garments, and they were as audacious as if we had been in the captivity of barbarians. The common people were driven to an uninhabited place, and the whole multitude remained outside the city, so that at that high festival the churches were empty, and more than forty Bishops of our communion were causelessly driven away with their people and clergy: the market-places, the houses, the uninhabited places, all parts of the city, were filled with wailing, lamentations, and gushing tears; for not only they who suffered by that lawless excess, but even they who had no such affliction to endure—not only those of the same sentiments as ourselves, but even heretics, Jews and Gentiles, as though the city had been sacked—sympathized with us. Thus all was in tumult, trouble, and mourning; and these acts were ventured upon in the shades of night, contrary to the wish of the most religious monarch, according to the plans of the Bishops, who everywhere gave their orders, and were not ashamed to have captains instead

of deacons under their command. When it was day the whole city migrated to the trees and groves outside the walls, there, like scattered sheep, to complete the celebration of the festival."[3]

Such was the account which Chrysostom wrote to the Bishop of Rome. One confirmatory of it was also forwarded to him by the friendly Bishops, and one on the other side by Theophilus. They naturally desired the sympathy of him who presided over the Church at the Western Capital, but not a hint is given that they sought his interference, as if he were supreme ruler of the whole Catholic Church. Innocent, in reply, exhorts John and his friends to be patient, and expresses his disapproval of the sentence by which he had been condemned.[4] By his desire, also, at a later period, Honorius, the Emperor of the West, sent certain Bishops to his brother Arcadius, entreating him to call a General Council, where John might be fairly tried. These mediators, however, were dismissed with contempt, and some Oriental Bishops who had joined them were banished, with circumstances of so great barbarity that one named Deme-

[3] *Ad Innocentium Episc. Romæ Epist.* § 3.
[4] *S. Chrysost. Opera*, vol. iii.

trius perished on the journey to his place of exile.

For two months Chrysostom remained in his episcopal residence. An attempt was made on his life by a real or pretended maniac, whom the people, when he had been seized, hurried to the Prefect, and who would have been subjected to torture if John had not interceded for him. A second attempt on his life was happily no more successful. But the people, now become anxious for their pastor's preservation, agreed to keep guard at his residence night and day, one band relieving another. The Bishops who were opposed to him were of course annoyed that the decree of their synod was not immediately carried into effect, and begged the Emperor to banish John as a man who had made himself odious to both Bishops and Presbyters. At length Arcadius sent to him Patricius, the Notary, with an injunction that he should commend himself to God and depart. Upon this he turned to the Bishops who were present, and said, "Come, let us pray, and say farewell to the Angel of the Church."[5] He rejoiced, indeed, at his

[5] *Epistolæ ad Episcopos*, clii. cliii. cliv. clvi.—clix.; *Ad Episcopos qui ab Occidente venerat*, clx.; *Ad Romanos Presbyteros*, clxi.; *Ad Episcopos*, clxv.—clxvii.

own tribulations, but grieved with his people's grief. Shedding, then, many tears, he embraced as many as his sorrow would permit him to embrace, and afterwards in the sacristy bid others farewell, at the same time desiring them to wait whilst he took a little rest. However, he called to him the deaconesses, Olympias, Pentadia, and Procla, with Silvina, the worthy widow of Nebridius, and thus addressed them:—"Come and attend to me, my daughters. I perceive that the things concerning me have an end. I have finished my course, and perhaps you will no more see my face. I have only one request to make—that you will not turn from your usual benevolence towards the Church, and that you will bow to the authority of him who may be ordained and inducted into this chair—not by intrigue, but against his own wish, and with the consent of all—even as you would to me, John. For the Church cannot exist without a Bishop. So may you obtain mercy; and remember me in your prayers." With floods of tears they fell at his feet, and there remained until he was compelled to desire one of the old Presbyters to remove them. He then ordered his horse to be taken to the western side; but that he might not meet the people, he himself went

out at the east, and there delivered himself to the soldiers, only complaining that he was banished contrary to law, and that he had not had the privilege which homicides and adulterers enjoyed, of defending himself before properly-constituted judges. He was led into exile on the 20th of June, 404. His first halting-place was Nicæa in Bithynia.

CHAPTER III.

THE LAST YEARS OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

Tumult after John's departure.—Sufferings of his friends Olympias, Pentadia, and Serapion.—Journey to Cucusus.—Correspondence.—He is ordered to Pityuns.—His sufferings.—Death.—Personal appearance; habits; character; learning; Scriptural knowledge; preaching; pastoral superintendence.—Results of his labours.—His style and rank as an orator.

In the midst of the tumult which arose after John's departure, his church was set on fire, and totally destroyed. His enemies without reason attributed this unhappy result to the designs of his friends, many of whom were put to the torture by Optatus, Prefect of the city, but without drawing from them any confession tending to inculpate them or their party.[1] Chrysostom's correspondence shows that others were cast into prison, and in many ways ill-treated, simply because they were known to

[1] *Ep. ad Olympiadem et Constantium Presbyterum*, x. et ccxxi.

be attached to him.[2] At the instigation of Eudoxia his chair was occupied by Arsacius, an old man of eighty, brother of the Nectarius who had succeeded Gregory of Nazianzum. The new Bishop was mild towards his own party, but severe towards those who steadily adhered to John. He enjoyed his dignity but a short time, and was succeeded by Atticus, an industrious Presbyter of moderate learning and eloquence, but a terrible persecutor of his opponents.[3]

It would not be right to omit all mention of those faithful Christians who stood by their spiritual father in adversity, and endured great afflictions on his account.[4] John had ever pleaded for such friendships as are cemented, not by external attractions, but by the spiritual beauties of the soul; they had ever been to him a cordial of life, light in his darkness,[5] consolation in his griefs, calm in his excitement,[6] and now he learned still more to appreciate their value. Foremost amongst his friends was the Deaconess Olympias. She was the

[2] *Ep. ad. Episcopos et Presbyteros in Carcere degentes*, cxviii.

[3] *Ep. ad Cyriacum Episcopum Exsulantem*, cxxv.

[4] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* xi. § 3.

[5] *In* 1 *Thess. Homil.* ii. §§ 3, 4.

[6] *De Davide et Saule*, homil. iii. § 5.

grand-daughter of Ablabius, Prætorian Præfect under Constantine the Great, and daughter of Count Anysius. She was given by her father in marriage to Nebridius, a Prefect, and one of the most interesting letters of Gregory Nazianzen, which has been preserved, was written to excuse himself from the wedding, and enclosed an epithalamium or laudatory poem for the spouse. For twenty months only she lived with Nebridius, who died in 383, and then, although in the flower of her age, adorned with wealth, beauty, and elegance, and continually urged by the Emperor to marry, she persevered in widowhood till the day of her death. Her house was open to all the clergy who visited Constantinople. She was made a deaconess by Nectarius, who was then Bishop of Constantinople, and the praise of her meek and devout character was in all the Church. After John's expulsion, this virtuous lady was charged before the Prefect with setting fire to the church. "That," she replied, "is not my manner of life; for I have spent my resources, which were many and large, in repairing the temples of God." No proof against her being produced, she was fined a large sum for not joining the communion of Arsacius, and dismissed. Eventually

she was expelled the city. We have many and long letters written to her by John after he had been banished, and also two works which he forwarded to her.[7] They prove his tender affection for her, and his sympathy with her sufferings; they represent her beautiful spirit of resignation, and exhort her to persevere in counting as nothing those afflictions which were as for a moment, and which were light when compared with "the eternal weight of glory which shall be revealed."

Pentadia was another widow and deaconess. She had been the wife of Timasius the Consul. As a strenuous supporter of John she was cast into prison, where her tranquillity and firmness of mind never forsook her. We find him writing to her also, dissuading her from leaving the city, as she intended, and pointing out how useful she might be to her fellow-citizens.

Serapion, who for long had been his attentive deacon, and had been appointed by him Bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, was, after being assailed with the grossest calumnies, and fiercely beaten, ejected from his see, into

[7] Namely, the book entitled "*Quod Nemo læditur nisi a seipso*," and perhaps the one "*Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt.*"

which another Bishop was thrust. Six Asiatic Bishops, who had been deposed by John for simony, were now restored.

As for John himself, his short sojourn in the salubrious climate of Nicæa invigorated him, but he was soon told that his destination was Cucusus, a deserted spot in Armenia. He started at a season of the year when the heat was most oppressive, and was compelled to travel night and day without ordinary comforts.[8] Still his guards treated him with great kindness, showing themselves anxious to serve him, and attend upon him in every way; and when, deprived by a tertian ague of health and spirits, he had arrived at Cæsarea, he was restored by wholesome bread and pure water, of which he had not for some time partaken, by the use of the bath, by repose, and the kind offices of many sympathizing friends.

He was on the point of leaving for Cucusus, when information arrived that large bands of the barbarous Isauri were marauding in the intervening country, and threatening Cæsarea itself with assault. By this time Pharetrius, Bishop of the place, who had at first treated him kindly, had become envious of the attentions shown to him by the nobility and clergy,

[8] *Ep. ad Theodosiam*, cxx.

as well as by all who had it in their power to render him any assistance.[9] A troop of subservient monks were found ready to execute his evil designs, and these, invading the residence of the exiled Bishop, threatened to destroy it with fire unless he should immediately depart. He was compelled therefore to risk the tender mercies of the Isauri, which could not be more cruel than those of these Christian monks.[1] Throwing himself on a litter, whilst suffering from a newly-contracted fever, he was borne away amidst the regrets of the people, who vented their execrations upon his persecutors. Seleucia, a noble matron, who owned a country house about five miles from the town, afforded him a temporary protection; but even from this he was driven by his relentless enemies.

His journey lay through Cappadocia and Taurocilicia, where monks and weeping virgins met him, exclaiming, "It had been better that the sun should have contracted his beams, than that the lips of John should be silenced." By these condolences he was more pained than by his own sufferings.

At length he arrived at Cucusus, which he found to be a small deserted town, without

[9] *Ep. ad Olymp.* xi. xii. et xiv. [1] *Ep.* xiv.

even so much as a market. Dioscorus, a wealthy man of the neighbourhood, who highly venerated him, placed his house at the exile's disposal, leaving it himself, that the other might enjoy roomy and comfortable winter quarters. In this and other respects he displayed such kindness and liberality towards John, as to excite his earnest remonstrances.[2] The Bishop of the diocese also received him with great respect: indeed, he would have resigned his see in Chrysostom's favour, if this proffered honour had not been firmly declined. An aged deaconess also, named Sabiniana, came to wait upon him, and was fully determined to follow him wheresoever he might be removed. In fact, he wrote and informed his friends that although the climate was most severe, medicines were not to be procured, provisions were scarce, and the inhabitants lived in constant fear of the Isauri, yet he had every reason to be grateful for comparative ease, quiet, and improved health.[3]

During his banishment that collection of his letters which has been preserved was composed. The resigned and devout spirit

[2] *Ep. ad Olymp.* xiv.

[3] *Ep. ad Theodotum, Nicolaum, et Chœream,* cxlvi.; *Ad Elpidium,* cxiv.

breathed in them—the consideration shown for others' feelings, whilst the writer was under calamities which would have engrossed ordinary minds, are worthy of all admiration. He wrote to numerous Bishops, clergy, monks, and especially to those who were in prison, for their adherence to his cause; many of his letters were addressed to the noble matron Adolia and other most respected inhabitants of Antioch; and if anything were wanting to prove the spotlessness of his reputation, it would be found in the circumstance that he was still regarded with profound reverence at that city which had been the scene of his childhood, youth, and early ministry. The continued affection in which he was held by his friends, generally, was shown by the gifts which they forwarded to him with such liberality, that he had money to spare for the relief of the poor, the redemption of captives from the Isauri, and for missionary purposes, and after all was obliged to entreat his correspondents to curtail their generosity.[4] Of one he begs that he will send gifts, not to him, but for the support of missionaries who were labouring in Phœnicia, and for whose suffer-

[4] *Ep. ad Diogenem*, l.; *Ad Theodotum*, lxi.; *Ad Carteriam*, ccxxxii.

ings he felt deeply.[5] He took great interest, also, in missions to Persia and Gothland. In the former country his friend Maruthas, a Mesopotamian bishop, was labouring under great difficulties; to the latter he had despatched the venerated Bishop Unila.[6]

The winter of 404-5 was more than usually severe, and so much affected his health that he was brought to the gates of death. For two months he was confined to his bed with excruciating pains in the head, which drove away sleep; and so delicate had he become that he was unable to retain ordinary food upon his stomach.[7] Spring brought to him a partial restoration of health, but then the roads being opened, the Isauri renewed their incursions, and put to death many noble men and women who fell into their hands. Fears were entertained that they would attack Cucusus, which was unfortified, and consequently John was compelled to seek a refuge, now in cities, now in caves, and at other times in the woods. At length, the alarm having somewhat subsided, he fled to Arabissus, which town possessed a

[5] *Ep. ad Gerontium Presbyterum*, liv.; *Ad Symeonem et Marum Presbyteros*, lv.; *Ad Phœniciæ Presbyteros et Monachos*, cxxiii.; *Ad Rufinum Presbyterum*, cxxvi. *Ad Olymp.* xiv.

[7] *Ep. ad Olymp.* vi.

citadel, and there took up his abode. He was so fortunate as to find the Bishop of the place most friendly,[8] and he could enjoy quietness, although the barbarous foe raged terribly in the neighbourhood; and on one occasion a band of three hundred came close to the town.[9] Most of his friends were of course deterred from visiting him by the terror of these ravages, but some—amongst whom Theodotus the Deacon, and Theodotus the Reader, deserve honourable mention—overcame all the difficulties and dangers of the journey.[1] Their persevering friendship was indeed in singular contrast with the envy and spite of his enemies, by whose means he was compelled to reside in such inhospitable regions. He probably returned before long to Cucusus.

He is supposed to have composed at this time the two books to which reference has been made above. In them he shows that they who are earnest in seeking their salvation must suffer tribulations, but these will be greatly to their spiritual advantage. In the second book he urges the faithful in Constantinople to endure their wrongs patiently, by

[8] *Ad Rufinum*, cxxvi.
[9] *Ad Theodotum Diaconum*, lxvii. lxviii.
[1] *Ad Theodotum Ex consularibus*, lxi.

quoting the examples of saints of the Old and New Testaments.

In the year 406 he enjoyed tolerable health, and the Isauri seem to have ceased from their depredations.[2] His fragile body was preserved from disease during the severity of winter only by his confining himself entirely to the house. He was, moreover, buoyed up with expectations of recovering his bishopric.[3]

So many persons flocked to see him, and his fame had become so extended throughout the East, that his jealous enemies intrigued with the Emperor to have him removed to Pityuns, a desolate place on the shores of the Pontine Sea. The barbarous order was accordingly issued, and he was hurried away by soldiers, who declared that they were charged to hasten him on, and that if he should die on the way they might expect promotion. When it rained he was drenched, and not permitted to seek for shelter, and in turn he was exposed to the fierce rays of the sun. He could not even enjoy the refreshment of a bath—to which through life he had been accustomed—in any of the towns and villages through which they passed. He thus travelled for three months. At length they reached Comani, but, passing

[2] *Ad Elpidium*, cxlii. [3] *Ad Olymp.* iv.

rapidly through the town lodged in a chapel five or six miles beyond, dedicated to Basiliscus, Bishop of the place, who suffered martyrdom in the reign of Maximinus at Nicomedia, in Bithynia. That night, we are told, the martyr appeared, and said, "Be confident, brother John, for to-morrow we shall be together." We read also that he said to a Presbyter who was lodging there, "Prepare a place for brother John, for he is coming."

Believing what he had heard, John begged the soldiers to remain where they were until the fifth hour of the day. However, they paid no attention to his request, but proceeded for nearly four miles, until he was so ill that they were obliged to return to the chapel. Arrived there, he called for a handsome dress, such as became his station, and having changed everything, even to his shoes, distributed the clothes which he had taken off amongst his friends. As they stood round him he offered a last prayer; and when, according to his custom, he had said, "Glory be to God for all things, Amen," he was gathered to his fathers, and so passed away to Christ.

He departed on the 14th September, 407 A.D. Such numbers of virgins, monks, and others renowned for piety came from Syria,

Cilicia, Pontus, and Armenia, to celebrate his obsequies, that many thought some signal had been agreed upon. As a spiritual conqueror he was buried in the same chapel where the bones of Basiliscus lay. His memory soon became venerated throughout the world, and in 438 his body was removed with great pomp to Constantinople. He had committed his way unto the Lord, and put his trust in Him; in return the Lord made "his righteousness as clear as the light, and his just dealing as the noon-day." After a period of injustice and disgrace "the memory of the just is blessed." His body was buried in peace, "but his name liveth evermore."

The personal appearance of John was striking, but not what could be called imposing. His stature was low, like the great heroes of the world, his head large and bald, forehead expansive, but full of wrinkles, his eyes deep-set, keen, and penetrating, beard short and thin, cheeks pale and sunken, and he was altogether as a man of mortified life, who, like St. Paul, "died daily."[4] His habits, as we have seen, were simple, partly on account of his infirm health, which prevented

[4] *Life* by Cave, sec. ix. Palladius says that he had "an Elishaic cranium."

him from going much into society; and by his example and precept he discountenanced the domestic display and luxurious establishments of Bishops. He lived above the world, steadily rejecting all its allurements and charms. He was an enemy of all pomp and vanity; the temptations of riches had no hold upon him: he declined all preferments, and when the highest dignity which the Church could confer was forced upon him, he took no more of the revenues of the Church for his own use than sufficed for a spare and frugal household. He refused to keep a luxurious table, considering that it was highly inconsistent for a preacher of the Gospel to employ himself in overlooking bills of fare; and when blamed for his frugality, he replied, "It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God, and serve tables, who are to give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word." What he thus saved from luxury he gave to the poor, and he thought that it was a kind of sacrilege to withdraw it from them, and devote it to dinner guests and luxurious companions. He had long before parted with his own estate, and distributed it for charitable uses, and the exigencies of the Church at Antioch.[5]

[5] *Life* by Cave, sec. ix.

His boldness of speech gained him with many a character for arrogance, and certainly his temper was too easily excited.[6] But perhaps these faults were inseparable from that fervent and inflexible zeal, that manly independence, and that fearless perseverance, with which he acted upon conviction. Whilst he always taught obedience to authority, he was yet emphatically a man of the people. He told them that love rejects inequality of rank, and that it makes a man the more humble the higher his dignity may be; that their best ornament was virtue, not ancestral splendour, and that he should consider the greatest aristocrat vulgar if he had a servile soul.[7] "When I see my lord lying drunk on his bed," he said, "and his attendant standing by sober, which shall I call the slave?"[8] "Let me have no rich man, no potentate puffing at me here and drawing up his eyebrows; all these things are to me a fable, a shade, a dream. For no one of those who are now rich will stand up for me

[6] *Socr. Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. cap. 3. "I am bursting with wrath; bear with me," he exclaimed, on one occasion. *In 1 Cor. Homil.* xxi. § 5.

[7] *De Profectu Evangelii*, § 7; *Homil. in illud, Vidua eligatur*, § 13; *De Lazaro Concio*, vi. § 6.

[8] *De Lazaro Concio*, vi. § 8; *Homil. in illud, Salutate Priscillam, &c.* § 2.

there, when I am called to account, and accused as not having thoroughly vindicated the laws of God with all due earnestness."[9] "Why, O man, are you high-minded? Do you think that you are doing us a favour, if, when you come here, you attend and hear that which concerns the salvation of your soul? Why, and on what account, tell me, do you boast? On account of your wealth? On account of your silk clothes? And do you not consider that these are the webs of worms, and the inventions of barbarians, and that harlots, effeminate persons, resurrection men, and thieves wear these? Acknowledge the true riches, and sometimes come down from such high and vain puffing: you are earth and ashes, cinders and dust, smoke and shadow, grass and a flower of the field—and are you proud of such a nature? What can be more ridiculous? But have you authority over many persons? What is the use of this if you govern men, and are at the same time the captive and slave of your passions?"[1] Great men now-a-days would rather wince if they were to hear themselves addressed in this fashion, or remonstrated with in private for their avarice and ambition,

[9] *In Matt. Homil.* xvii.

[1] *Homil. in Principium Actorum*, i. § 1.

as Eutropius, the powerful eunuch, was by St. Chrysostom.

Yet there are many traces of genuine modesty and humility in John's character. At one time he expresses with evident sincerity the difficulty he felt in edifying his auditors; at another he attributes the degeneracy of Christians to the degeneracy of teachers, including himself.[3] He does not conceal his spiritual defects;[4] for long he steadily refused to enter the ministry, pleading his natural idleness and carelessness;[5] when at last he was ordained Presbyter, his sermon on the occasion was a fine specimen of modest eloquence, and to the latest hour of life he had a humbling sense of sin, against which the most advanced Christian must struggle.[6] "Then shall we also be caught up," said he, in preaching upon the second advent of Christ; "and when I say 'we,' I do not reckon myself in the number of those who are to be caught up. I am not so without sense and reason as not to know my peculiar sins. And if I had not feared to disturb the enjoyment of this festival (the Ascension), I had wept bitterly at the recollection of my sins

[2] *In Isaia.* vi. *Homil.* ii. § 1. [3] *In Ephes. Homil.* vi. § 3.
[4] *Lib. ad Stagirium*, i. § 1. [5] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi.
[6] *Ep. Ad Olymp.* xiv. § 4.

when calling to mind this saying."[7] The greatest saints have ever thus been penetrated with a conviction of the corruption of our common nature, and, according as their spiritual vision has been quickened by faith, they have both seen with pain and admitted all the flaws in the purity even of their characters. It is recorded of Origen that when at Jerusalem he was urged by the college of Presbyters to preach, and had at length consented: he looked out for a text, and chanced to light upon this verse of the fifteenth Psalm: "Unto the ungodly, said God, why dost thou preach my laws, and takest my covenant in thy mouth?" He had no sooner read the passage than the thought of his former apostasy flashed across his mind, and although that apostasy would, under the circumstances, have been excusable, if such could ever be excused, he was so overwhelmed with the recollection that he burst into tears.[8]

St. Chrysostom had received a liberal education according to the ideas of his age, and had the advantage, which so few of the Fathers

[7] *Homil. De Ascensione*, § 5.

[8] *Huetii Origenianorum*, lib. i. § 17. He had been offered the choice "ut vel Idolis sacrificandum sibi esset, vel Æthiopis libidini offerendum."

enjoyed, of knowing something of the Hebrew language.[9] He had certainly studied deeply profane history and philosophy.[1] He was well acquainted with the scientific theories which then prevailed. The earth he conceived to float upon the ocean;[2] the sun was a star; the firmament a solid substance, which divides the waters above from those below.[3] Some of his arguments drawn from natural theology are true, and extremely beautiful; and with the most charming elegance he summons us to adore the great Statuary, who out of the meanest materials has formed such an exquisite specimen of beauty as the human body. The structure of the eye and eyelash particularly calls forth his admiration;[4] the soft brain, and the two membranes of the skull by which it is protected, are skilfully anatomized by him; the sutures are shown to be of utility in stopping the injury of a fracture; and he erroneously supposed that vapours exhaling through them prevented suffocation.[5] He attempts to trace the causes of disease to a disproportion amongst the four elements of which the body is composed.[6] He

[9] *In Psalmum* xlvii. § 2.
[1] *In Principium Actorum*, homil. i. § 4.
[2] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. ix. § 3. [3] *Ibid.* § 4.
[4] *Ibid.* homil. xi. § 3. [5] *Ibid.* § 3. [6] *Ibid.* homil. x. § 2.

proves that he was a student of natural history, and minutely draws his hearers' attention to the various properties of beasts, birds, and reptiles;[7] from the ant and bee he derives lessons of industry, and from the spider of mechanical skill. "Great, great indeed," he concludes, "is the advantage that may be gained from irrational creatures for correction of manners."[8] The devout old man solaced his last and most weary days by writing one of the finest passages on the beauties of creation that was ever penned. It is a proof from nature of God's providence, and is far too long to be extracted. The following fragment only we have chipped off:—"What more delightful than the sky, now like pure and bright linen unfolded overhead, now displaying a diadem, like a meadow, with flowers of various kinds and hues? For certainly it is not so pleasant to behold a meadow by day as it is pleasant and delightful to behold the heaven by night, in all parts garlanded with millions of stars for flowers—flowers which never wither, but always display their beauty uncontaminated. And what more pleasant than it, when the night has passed away, and no sunbeam has yet appeared, when purpled by the rising sun it is

[7] *Ibid.* homil. xi. § 2. [8] *Ibid.* homil. xii. § 2.

beautified like some crocus-dyed vestment? And what more charming spectacle than the sun rising from beneath the East, and in a moment gilding with his beams all the land and sea, every mountain, grove, and hill, and the whole heaven, throwing aside the cloak which night had cast over all things visible, and exposing all to our view!"[9] This passage would show, what others abundantly confirm, that Chrysostom was endowed with a poetical genius, and that if his mind had not been distracted by the anxieties of an active life, he would have been as accomplished a poet as his predecessor Gregory.

But all knowledge yielded in his estimation to an enlarged and profound comprehension of the Word of God. We may say that his whole life was devoted to the acquisition and communication of this knowledge; and so successful was he considered in penetrating the meaning of Scripture, that he was styled the eye of the whole Church.[1] He was not content with taking a single text, according to modern fashion, although at times he would deliver orations similar to those which are heard from

[9] *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*, cap. vii. See also *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. x. § 3.

[1] *Isidorus Pelusiota*, lib. i. ep. 156, quoted by Montfaucon.

our pulpits. But he was anxious to expound Scripture, chapter by chapter, and verse by verse; and he would sometimes give his congregation notice of the subject of his next discourse, that they might study the matter in private, and then become a more intelligent audience.[2] "I always exhort you," he said, "and will not cease to exhort you, not only to attend to the things which are spoken here, but also when you are at home to employ yourselves diligently in reading the sacred Scriptures." He would admit of no excuse, and repeatedly warned them against pleading the urgency of their business. The Devil, he said, could only be resisted, and tranquillity and joy be secured, by the assiduous study of Scripture. Let them not say that they could not understand it, for some portion would always be intelligible. The Holy Spirit gave it through the agency of herdsmen, fishermen, and other such humble persons; and now the labourer, the servant, the uneducated woman, might certainly derive much profit by reading it, or hearing it read. They must not skip all the difficult parts, and only read such as appeared easy and clear. This would lead to the introduction of heresies. Many passages which

[2] *In Matt. Homil.* i. § 6.

at first sight are obscure, become plain after repeated perusal.[3] Scripture is a spiritual meadow, and a paradise of delight to the souls of the faithful; it is a healing fountain for the sinner, and quenches the flames of evil desire which rage within his soul.[4] The Psalms in particular he commends. Better, he says, that the light of the sun should be extinguished, than that David's words should be forgotten.[5]

He was an indefatigable preacher of the Word. At Antioch he preached regularly twice every week,[6] and we find him at Easter preaching seven days consecutively.[7] Ill-health sometimes restrained his zeal, and his voice was occasionally unequal to the length of his discourses,[8] but he declared that in general no sooner did the first words pass from his lips than he felt invigorated, and his infirmities were at once dissipated.[9] In expounding Scripture he differed from the depraved taste

[3] *In Psalmum* xlviii. § 1; *Homil. in illud, Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam*, § 1. *De Lazaro Concio*, iii. §§ 1, 2, 3.

[4] *In Principium Actorum*, homil. iii. *De Utilit. Lectionis Scripturarum*, §§ 2, 3.

[5] *De Penit.* homil. ii. § 2.

[6] *In Joan. Homil.* xxv. al. xxiv. § 1; *In Princip. Actorum*, homil. iv. § 2.

[7] *De Resur. Homil.* § 5.

[8] *Adv. Judæos*, homil. vi. § 1.

[9] *De Terræ Motu Homil.*; *Homil. in illud, Scimus autem quoniam diligentibus.*

of his day, and cared not for pompous language and set phrases, but desired the power of the Spirit.[1] So far from making a display of eloquence, he concealed the knowledge of rhetoric and philosophy which he had acquired. Being of Syrian origin, he adopted a custom which St. Jerome says was peculiar to his nation, of using numerous metaphors and other figures of speech, and to this circumstance we owe those vivid representations of men and manners, of which I am about to make a copious use.[2] But he protested—and every impartial student will admit his protest—that he laboured not for the pleasure, but for the profit, of his hearers, and that he cared not if he wounded their feelings, so that he could only lead them to salvation.[3]

One naturally wishes to know how such plain, earnest, and laborious preaching was received. The numbers who attended it varied. It is remarkable to find the man to whom the palm of eloquence has been conceded by the whole Christian Church frequently complaining of the small attendance upon his ministry. We see him deploring with tears that the zeal of his few hearers seemed to have no influence

[1] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* XV. [2] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall.*
[3] *Homil. Non esse ad Gratiam concionandum,* § 2.

upon the multitude, and pointing out to those who thought that they could pray as well at home as at church, that their own houses, being often the scenes of frivolities, or ordinary business, would suggest to their minds associations from which they might more easily free themselves at church;[4] then subsequently complaining that these appeals had no effect, and that the church was deserted.[5] "It is not to be borne," he exclaims on another occasion, "it is beyond endurance: each day the assembly becomes diminished—the city is full of men, but the church is empty; the forum, the theatre, the portico are full, but the house of God is deserted."[6] And if he did see a larger number than usual, he felt it necessary to use brevity, lest they should become noisy and troublesome.[7] He sometimes would say, like even a greater preacher,—"I have laboured in vain—I have spent my strength for nought and in vain;"[8] and on this account carnal men followed him with taunts and ridicule.[9]

[4] *De Mutat. Nominum*, homil. iv. § 1.

[5] *Homil. in illud, Si esurierit Inimicus Tuus*, § 1.

[6] *De Mutat. Nominum*, homil. i; *In Principium Actorum*, homil. i.

[7] *Ibid.* homil. ii.

[8] *In cap.* i. *Genes. Homil.* vi. § 1; see Is. xlix. 4.

[9] *De Lazaro Concio*, i. § 3.

And yet on the whole St. Chrysostom was encouraged by such a popularity and such crowded audiences as have been rarely witnessed. At Constantinople he had so many hearers that he left his ordinary place, and preached from the reader's stall in the middle of the church. The more frequently they heard him, and the longer he preached, the more they hung upon his lips, so that he compares them to hard drinkers, who become the more thirsty the more wine they consume.[1] Family men, artificers, and labourers, neglected even the duties of their houses and shops, that they might listen to the great preacher.[2] Each day the field in which he sowed put forth a more abundant crop, so that the grace of God obviously supported his labours.[3]

It was of course impossible for him to become acquainted with every individual in such overwhelming congregations, and this he laments, urging his hearers at the same time to suppose, as they were sitting at table, that he was present with them.[4] Still he did what he

[1] *Dæmones non gubernare Mundum*, homil. i.

[2] *De Pœnit.* homil. iii. § 1.

[3] *Contra Anomœos*, homil. xii. § 1; *In cap.* i. *Gen. Homil.* iv. § 1.

[4] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. v. § 7, et ix. § 1.

could in pastoral labour, and was very diligent in confirming his public instruction by private exhortations.[5]

He frequently bewails with bitterness the poor results which followed upon his zealous endeavours. "To say the truth," he says, "as things are, we have fairly given up in despair. For I have not ceased giving these admonitions either to those whom I meet in private, or in discourse with you all in common. Yet I see no advantage at all gained, but you are still clinging to the former rude beginnings, which thing is enough to fill the teacher with weariness."[6] Yet by watching for opportunities he was often rewarded with great success, particularly when God had softened and prepared the hearts of the masses by visiting them with some public calamity.[7] With profound joy he then contemplated the wonderful change which had taken place. By God's blessing the afflictions which sometimes drive multitudes to despair had, under his guidance, contributed to the reformation of society; and although in many instances the impressions thus made were

[5] *De Lazaro Concio*, iii. § 1; *In Matt. Homil.* xvii. § 7.

[6] *In Matt.* ut supra.

[7] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. x. et passim; *De Pœnit.* homil. iv. § 2.

temporary, yet doubtless the work so happily commenced was in some hearts brought to perfection.[8] The matters upon which he particularly dwelt were, as we have shown above, the more constant perusal of Scripture, and perseverance in hearty prayer[9]—a subject upon which he preached at great length,[1] and on which he wrote when he himself was under affliction[2]—the duty of abstaining from unlawful oaths,[3] the necessity of coming out of the world by rejecting the vicious pleasures and inordinate frivolities which were then so fashionable, and, finally, a frequent theme was the duty of alms-giving, and of relieving the poor, by seeing them, and sympathizing with them, and not simply by depositing funds in the hands of the clergy. So successful was he in promoting this last object, that he was commonly styled John the Almoner.[4]

The style of St. Chrysostom varies much.

[8] *De decem millium talent. Debitore Homil.* §§ 1, 2.

[9] *De Profectu Evangelii Homil.* § 2; *Peccata Fratrum non evulganda, Homil.* § 5.

[1] *Non esse desperandum, Homil.* § 1.

[2] *De Chananea,* §§ 1—3.

[3] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* passim.

[4] Or Ἰωάννης ὁ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης. *Life* by Cave. See especially *De Eleemosyna Homil.*; *In Matt. Homil.* lxvi. al. lxvii. § 3; *In* 1 *ad Cor. Homil.* xliii. § 4.

His sermons and homilies are either elaborate treatises, or plain and rough expositions of Scripture. In the former case they are extremely ornate: earth, sea, and air are rifled to furnish him with metaphors, and they are arranged with a skill and a comprehension of the arts by which the feelings of an audience can be excited, which prove him a perfect master of rhetoric. In the latter case his similes are more homely, and there is an evident absence of study as to the selection of words and sentiments. He was sometimes blamed for the length of his exordiums,[5] but at other times he had no exordium at all. In fact, he refused to observe on all occasions the rules of composition, to which the writers and preachers of that age were generally enslaved. Ordinarily his expositions were lucid, his arguments powerful, his diction elegant and copious —now communicating pleasure by his acuteness and ingenuity, now striking with awe by the lightning and thunder of his words. His standard of morality was high and firmly fixed, his sentiments sublime, and he was in word, as he was in act, a despiser of the vanities above

[5] *In Princip. Actorum*, homil. iv. § 3; *De Mutat. Nominum*, homil. iii. §§ 1, 3.

which he soared. If not the most spiritual of Christian teachers, yet he was one of the boldest, most faithful, and most impressive that ever lived: as an orator, he ranks by the common consent of Christians with the highest examples of antiquity.

CHAPTER IV.

SCENES OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S LABOURS.

Antioch and its suburb Daphne.—Character of the Population.—Constantinople.—State of Society at that period.—Violence and turbulence.—Effeminacy.—General Depravity.—The Imperial Court.—Administration of Justice.—Examination by Torture.—Collection of the Revenues.—Official Employés.

FROM the constitution of the Christian Church, it followed that those of its first preachers who were engaged in missionary and itinerant labours were regarded with the highest veneration. The truth was not to radiate of itself from one centre. It was to be borne about by holy men, and to form an infinite number of centres in the different places where it was fixed. The Founder of the Church went about from place to place doing good, and thus He published His glad tidings through the Holy Land. "Go ye into all the world," was His injunction to His Apostles, and such as fulfilled it with the greatest energy have had the largest

space allotted for their deeds in the inspired records. The most illustrious was St. Paul, whose spirit seemed to have no rest until he could find out fresh countries where no other man had laboured, and could startle the inhabitants of most distant regions by the proclamation of a risen Saviour. We must admit that the Author and Finisher of our faith, as well as His immediate and most honoured followers, were itinerants.

But the case was altered when once there were settled communities of Christians. Precious as are the memories of the Missionaries of a later period, still more precious are the memories of many holy Fathers, whose labours were restricted to some one portion of the Lord's vineyard. Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clement, who presided respectively over the Churches of Smyrna, Antioch, and Rome; also most of those who lived a little later, and are justly styled the Primitive Fathers, were not Missionaries, but had fixed residences. They were not "catchers of men" who in the pursuit of souls explored unknown and distant wilds, but settlers in an animated forest; their business was to clear the space around them, and then in God's name to plant and water. And surely it cannot be said that the local Bishop, or the

parish Priest who waged continual war with the vices of a great city, exhibited less moral courage or less enduring faith than the Missionary. Such a city was Antioch, and such was Constantinople, where, except during one short interval, all St. Chrysostom's pastoral labours were undergone.

Antioch the Great was the metropolis of Syria. St. Chrysostom was proud of his native city, and styled her the head and mother of the cities of the East.[1] In fact, from the time that the Oriental part of the Roman Empire had been divided into seven dioceses, Antioch had been the capital of the Eastern diocese, and residence of its Prætorian Præfect. It derived many advantages from its situation on the river Orontes, and all ancient geographers have confirmed the encomiums of St. Chrysostom by pronouncing it the first and queen of cities, celebrated in the whole world for its commercial and internal wealth.[2] Amongst Christians it has enjoyed a lasting reputation, from the circumstance that their venerated name was first given there to the disciples of Christ; and we may be sure that in St. Chry-

[1] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. iii. § 1.

[2] *Stephani Dictionarium; In illud, Vidi Dominum,* homil. iv. § 1.

sostom's estimation this added greatly to its dignity.[3] Not a little of its celebrity was due to Daphne, a village five miles distant, and which was considered one of its suburbs; so that, in order to distinguish it from other cities of the same name, it was frequently called Antioch near Daphne.[4] In this suburb was a temple of Apollo, renowned throughout the world for its elegance, and the lascivious rites of which it was the scene. So notorious had they become, that at one time for any respectable person to be seen there was loss of character. It was a charming spot, rendered attractive both by nature and art, having an agreeable climate, shady walks, and a prolific soil, refreshed by clear and abundant springs. Its origin was accounted for by one of those indecent fables which characterize heathen mythology in all countries.

Absurd as the fable was, the existence of the consecrated suburb remained a melancholy fact. It was the constant resort of the wanton youth of Antioch, and presented a scene of shameless profligacy directly connected with heathen worship. An oracle, too, was much

[3] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xvii. § 2.
[4] *Stephani Dictionarium.*

consulted, and a stadium had been erected: all were largely endowed; and the whole revenue applied to purposes of pleasure is said to have amounted to thirty thousand pounds sterling.

This scandalous village had been in a great measure purged by the piety of Cæsar Gallus, and consecrated to Christian worship after the remains of the martyr Babylas, a Bishop of Antioch, had been deposited there. An edict, which was subsequently issued by the Emperor Julian the Apostate, for the removal of these relics, led to a riot, and the destruction of Apollo's temple. St. Chrysostom asserts that it was destroyed by fire from heaven. In his time the martyr's body was replaced, and Daphne became again the resort of devout Christians, who, especially on the festival of St. Babylas, crowded a church which was built on the ruins of that disgraceful temple where the false god of light had been so foully worshipped. A monode composed by Libanius, and of which St. Chrysostom has preserved a part, records the grief of the heathen sophist on account of this change, and is an involuntary commemoration of the triumph of Christianity over heathen impurities.[5] How-

[5] This account of Daphne is taken from St. Chrysostom's

ever, the cypress shades and bright fountains of Daphne for long invited even Christians to voluptuous idleness or licentious indulgence, and many repaired with the heathen to a consecrated shrine of Apollo which still remained, and a disreputable cave dedicated to the divine Matrona.[6]

At this time the Gospel had made such progress, that a majority of the Antiochenes were said to profess the Christian faith.[7] Yet Christians and heathens must have been pretty evenly balanced, for the whole number of the male population was estimated by St. Chrysostom at two hundred thousand,[8]

Liber in S. Babylam. See also Gibbon's "*Decline and Fall.*" St. Chrysostom narrates some very interesting circumstances regarding St. Babylas. He repelled an Emperor (supposed to be Decius) from his church, because he had murdered a confederate prince. Babylas drove him out as he would have done a dog or an offending slave. The enraged Emperor threw him into prison, and he was subsequently put to death.

[6] *In S. Julianum Homil.* § 4; *Ad. Pop. Antioch.* homil. xvii. § 2; *In Tit. Homil.* iii. § 2.

[7] *Adv. Judæos,* Oratio i. § 4. Gibbon seems to contradict himself on this point. In chap. xv. he says, in spite of St. Chrysostom's authority, to which he refers, that the Christians "did not exceed a fifth part of that great city;" in chap. xxiv. he says, with reference to the same period, that "a majority of the people supported the Christian name."

[8] *In S. Ignatium Martyrem Homil.* § 4.

and the number of Christians at a hundred thousand.[9]

In the absence of exact statistics, we are glad to meet with some calculations which furnish us with information regarding their temporal condition. About a tenth part were extremely rich, and a tenth part extremely poor. The remaining eight parts enjoyed various degrees of competency. Very large numbers were included in the second class of wealthy inhabitants; so that if the paupers were divided amongst all who were rich, or who had moderate incomes, there would not have been one pauper to fifty, or perhaps a hundred, whose condition was above poverty. The revenues of the Church were equivalent to one large and one moderate fortune. With these it supported three thousand virgins and widows, besides strangers, persons kept in prison, or sick in hospital, cripples, and occasional applicants for relief.[1]

When we would form an opinion of their moral and religious condition, we are a little perplexed by meeting with conflicting statements. The probability is that there was an

[9] *In Matt. Homil.* lxxxv. al. lxxxvi. § 4. We suppose that St. Chrysostom here means Christian males.

[1] *In Matt. Homil.* lxvi. al. lxvii. § 3.

alarming prevalence of vice, but, as is often the case under such circumstances, there was a most zealous band of Christians, who were earnestly endeavouring to keep themselves from the evil by which they were surrounded. By this supposition we account for the praise which St. Chrysostom bestows on the people, as when he says, that there was no other city whose inhabitants were so eager to hear spiritual discourses,[2] that the churches were filled, and that if Rome exceeded their city in grandeur, yet not in devotion;[3] that they

[2] *De Proditione Judæ*, homil. i. § 1.

[3] *In illud, Vidi Dominum*, homil. iv. § 1. A passage in the writings of Julian the Apostate proves his disappointment at finding how little relish the inhabitants had for heathen festivals. He writes:—"I hastened from the temple of Jupiter to the sacred grove, in the hope that I should there be gratified with the greatest display of your riches and your love of show. I already pictured to myself the festive processions, and saw by anticipation the victims and the holy choirs, the rows of youths attuning their voices in honour of the god, and dressed in garments of dazzling whiteness. But when I entered the grove I saw no burning of incense, no wafer-cakes, no victims! I was at first amazed, though I endeavoured to believe they were only on the outer skirts of the grove, waiting out of compliment to me as the Pontiff Maximus, for a signal from me for their entrance. When, however, I inquired of the priest, 'What offering does the city intend to bring to-day in honour of the annual festival of the god?' he answered me, 'I bring from my own house a

manifested singular affection for their pastors, as was shown not only towards himself, but also towards the memory of their deceased and revered Bishop Meletius, after whom many named their children, and of whom as many likenesses were preserved as are to be seen of the Duke of Wellington at the present time, for portraits of Bishop Meletius were on their rings, phials, bedchamber walls, and in a variety of other places.[4] When they were all living in dread of the infuriated Emperor's revenge, St. Chrysostom declared that their city was of all cities most dear to Christ, not only on account of their ancestors, but on account of their own virtues, and because they worshipped God with unusual diligence.[5] But this, we say, was spoken when they were in a state of alarm, and other flattering commendations of these Antiochene citizens were pronounced after their city had been visited by one of the earthquakes which were so frequent, and which filled them with the utmost terror. After such occasions their devotion was beyond all praise;[6]

goose as an offering to Apollo; but the city has prepared nothing for him!'"—*The Emperor Julian and his Generation*, by Neander, § 4.

[4] *De S. Meletio Homil.* § 1.

[5] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. iii. § 2.

[6] *Post Terræ Motum Homil.*; *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. iii. § 7; *De S. Basso Martyre Homil.* § 1.

the day was not long enough to satisfy their spiritual cravings, and they passed whole nights in prayer. Hints that these fits of propriety were only periodical and temporary lead us to conclude that ordinarily they were a fickle, light-minded, and vicious people, and in subsequent chapters we shall see such an opinion confirmed by abundant evidence.

Let us now turn to Constantinople, the scene of St. Chrysostom's episcopal labours. Under its ancient name of Byzantium it had attracted the notice of the Emperor Constantine by its security from hostile assaults, and the facilities which it offered for commercial intercourse. Situated in Europe, it is yet so close to Asia that Scutari, which may be called one of its suburbs, is actually in that quarter of the globe. The climate is healthy and temperate, the neighbouring soil fertile, the harbour secure and capacious. Within its own territory it could supply all the wants of luxury; and, in addition, an extensive trade imported the treasures of both East and West. It was of immense extent, and had been endowed by Constantine with imperial liberality. The magnificent forum was adorned with triumphal arches, with porticoes containing numerous statues, and in its centre was a colossal figure of Apollo. The circus, too, was a stately

building, set off with statues and obelisks. There were also a gorgeous palace, and public baths, with the most elegant decorations. "It may be sufficient to observe, that whatever could adorn the dignity of a great capital, or contribute to the benefit or pleasure of its numerous inhabitants, was contained within the walls of Constantinople. A particular description, composed about a century after its foundation, enumerates a capitol or school of learning, a circus, two theatres, eight public and one hundred and fifty-three private baths, fifty-two porticoes, five granaries, eight aqueducts or reservoirs of water, four spacious halls for the meetings of the senate or courts of justice, fourteen churches, fourteen palaces, and four thousand three hundred and eighty-eight houses, which, for their size or beauty, deserved to be distinguished from the multitude of plebeian habitations."[7] One house of God was distinguished above all the rest by its appellation of the Great Church, and here were deposited so many relics of our Lord's first followers, that on this account alone Constantinople was called the City of the Apostles.[8]

[7] Gibbon's "*Decline and Fall*," chap. xvii.

[8] *Contra Ludos et Theatra Homil.* § 1; *Contra Judæos et Gentiles Lib.* § 9.

We cannot ascertain with any accuracy the number of its inhabitants. Constantine, by a despotic edict, transplanted multitudes to his favourite metropolis, and many more were attracted to it because it was the seat of Government. Several large cities are said to have been impoverished by the loss of their wealthy inhabitants, who flocked to this new colony. The number of Christians was not larger than at Antioch: St. Chrysostom hazarded a guess that they were a hundred thousand. There was the same painful contrast of poverty and wealth which is exhibited in our own large cities. Constantinople contained fifty thousand paupers.[9]

It is not to be supposed that there was any important difference in the moral condition of the Antiochenes and Constantinopolitans. In both cities there were that degradation and depravity of manners which usually accompany a distracted state of society. The Roman Empire was far gone towards dissolution, and, especially in the eastern portion, persons of high and low degree alike suffered from insecurity of life and property. In the royal palace violent deaths were matters of frequent occurrence: the Prince's Pavement "was always

[9] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* xi. § 3.

full of blood," said our Preacher, "the blood of his own relations." Julius Constantius was put to death, with his sons Dalmatius and Annabilianus, by his nephew Constantius Augustus, who also slew his cousin Gallus. Constantine the Great had slain his son Crispus, and then his wife Fausta. Another destroyed his queen with drugs, by which he hoped to remove her barrenness. Another was himself poisoned. Valens was burnt to death in a house where he had taken refuge after his defeat at Hadrianople, and Arcadius, the reigning Emperor, was living in constant dread of secret conspiracies. Of the nine princes who reigned in that age, two only died natural deaths.[1]

And when royalty was attended with such misfortunes, private life could not be secure. The soil of Rome's overgrown empire was no longer inviolate; it had been invaded by foreign enemies. Roman citizens had been condemned to see—what their more happy forefathers had been spared—hordes of barbarians leaving their own inhospitable regions, overrunning the fertile provinces of the East, laying waste the fields, and sacking the towns, and finally set-

[1] These facts are detailed in the 15th homily on the Philippians.

tling themselves on the conquered lands without any intention of abandoning the properties which their swords had won. Such sturdy invaders ridiculed the effeminate descendants of ancient warriors, and scornfully smiled at the opposition of men who could only boast of victories which they *hoped* to gain, and who were regarded by their ruthless foes as sheep prepared for slaughter.[2]

But although the inhabitants of Constantinople could not muster courage to resist the invading forces of stern barbarians, they were but too ferocious in contending with each other. Their Archbishop compared them to wild beasts, and their Church to the corpse of one recently deceased, the lineaments and features of which are as distinct as ever, although warmth and life have fled.[3] The clergy often set the worst example. Bishops and Priests trafficked almost openly in ecclesiastical preferments. Wealthy laymen were surrounded by parasites and flatterers, who drove away the poor from their houses, and appropriated to themselves the pittance which the needy hoped for. When an earthquake had driven the inhabitants in dismay from Constantinople, they

[2] *Ad Viduam Juniorem*, § 4.
[3] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxxvi. § 5.

returned to find their houses pillaged, and their property removed. When, after the constant alarms of war, peace had been restored, and men's minds were for a brief period undisturbed by public calamities, then the temptations of immodest beauty, wealth, and luxury, invited them to indolence, or instigated them to covetousness, ambition, and revenge.[4] Then Constantinople became, what St. Gregory had feared it would be,[5] a mere city of triflers, or a den of thieves and poisoners. Money-making amounted to a passion in those who had not yet acquired riches, or had dissipated them in extravagance. Supreme happiness was imagined to be wealth. To procure a rich wife for a son, not to train him in virtue; to drive a profitable trade, no matter how sinful—these were the objects of an old sensualist's existence.[6]

The supine idleness, also, which wealth indulged, was at the root of much crime. Gallantry and amorous intrigue, ruinous as they are to the soul, seemed almost excusable when compared with the still more abominable vices

[4] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* xvii.

[5] Ullman's *Life of Gregory of Nazianzum*, translated by Cox, sec. iii. chap. 1.

[6] *In Ephes. Homil.* xx.

which disgraced the debauchees of the day. Virtue itself could scarcely preserve a fair reputation. It was not believed in where crime was so general, or, when vile reprobates felt that its presence was a reproach to them, they industriously strove to bring it into discredit by spreading evil reports, and throwing out insinuations against its motives.[7] Our faithful censor, taking the Gospel law as the standard of morals, pointed out that all its precepts were despised. Let the reader consider his arguments, and probably he will think that some reflect upon society as at present constituted. Does the Gospel say, he asked them, "Woe unto you that are rich"?—but their single aim was to obtain riches; or, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you"?—all their powers were engaged in seeking popular applause. He who reviles his brother is said to be in danger of hell fire, but they would have called any one a milksop who should submit in silence to reproach. Strife was forbidden: they were constantly engaged in it. They were commanded to pluck out an eye if it offended them; but they did the very reverse—their object always was to conciliate the friendship of such as had

[7] This picture is drawn in the treatise *Adv. Oppugnatores Vitæ Monast.* lib. iii. § 8.

money, although they knew that they would thus be led into sin. Christianity did not permit them to put away a wife, except for the cause of adultery; but they despised the precept so long as they saw that they could gain anything by a divorce. All kinds of swearing were forbidden: they would laugh at any one who observed such a rule. They were warned that if they forgave not men their trespasses, their Heavenly Father would not forgive them; but they reviled those who suffered an injury without demanding satisfaction. Christ had said that the best actions, such as fasting, prayer, and patience under affliction, were useless, if done from a desire of vainglory; but they left no stone unturned to obtain such glory. They broke not only some one, but all of these commandments. Vices were glossed over and concealed under fair names. A riotous life at the circus and theatre was called urbanity; wealth was identified with liberality; a love of glory with high-mindedness; arrogance with ease and confidence; extravagance with kindness; unrighteousness with manliness. And, as if this was not enough, they would apply to virtues the names of opposite vices: temperance they called clownishness, modesty timidity, holiness weakness, freedom from pride

servility, patience under injuries cowardice.[8] In short, their Archbishop recorded, as his deliberate opinion, that of the vast numbers who thronged that city not more than a hundred were on the road to salvation, and even of those he could not speak without hesitation.[9]

That these were not the angry denunciations of a prudish divine, but the solemn declarations of a calm and judicious observer, who drew his conclusions from experience, will be shown *seriatim* in the following chapters. But before looking into private life, we will say a few words of official personages and public institutions.

Ostentation and vainglorious display had arrived at a height previously unknown, and which has scarcely been exceeded in later ages. This must partly be ascribed to the love of magnificence which is so general throughout "the gorgeous East," partly to the habits which are always prevalent when a great empire is in decay—when the accumulated wealth of distant provinces has indulged idleness—when military duties, and the stern virtues which they encourage, are delegated to mercenaries—when ease and pleasure are supposed

[8] *Adv. Oppugnatores Vitæ Monast.* lib. iii. § 7.
[9] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* xxiv. § 4.

to be birth-rights of dwellers in the proud metropolis.

Under such circumstances, Government does not seek to check the national extravagance; rather it becomes interested in encouraging it. An idle people must have some resource, or else they will be discontented and troublesome. A magnificent court, *fêtes* and public exhibitions, not only gratify the pompous disposition of a ruler, but are important parts in his machinery of state. We are not surprised, therefore, to read St. Chrysostom's accounts of the imperial court: how the monarch endeavoured to dazzle his subjects by the splendour of his pageantry; how his household was composed of so many officers, the highest of whom was styled Prefect, and the inferior grades *Decani*, or Deans of the Palace;[1] how

[1] *In Heb. Homil.* xiii. § 5. The Emperor Julian had attempted to cut down this courtly extravagance, and to substitute primitive simplicity. Having ordered that a hair-dresser should attend upon him, there entered an individual in a most ambitious dress. Julian was astonished, or feigned to be so, and said, "I did not order a receiver (*rationalem*) to be sent for, but a barber." When the man was asked what were the profits of his art, he admitted that he had a table allowance sufficient for twenty persons, keep for twenty horses, and a large annual stipend, in addition to many perquisites. Julian immediately dismissed all such retainers, together with the highly-paid

that he himself sat on court-days aloft upon a golden throne: his brows were crowned with a fillet-shaped diadem of the same precious metal, set with gems of such value, that one would have purchased vast estates; his long and flowing robe was purple, and composed of silk, or some such material, embroidered with representations of dragons.[2] When he traversed the city or its neighbourhood he appeared in great pomp, guarded by spearmen and bearers of shields with golden bosses, who were styled his body-guard.[3] His chariot was of pure gold, adorned with precious stones, and having attached to it metal plates, which were so contrived, that by continually moving to and fro they dazzled the eyes of the spectators. It was drawn by a pair of white mules, resplendent with gold-mounted harness.[4] The whole appearance was, as we are assured, im-

cooks, and other grand servants.—*Ammianus*, lib. xxii. § 4. I shall hope to interest the reader by occasionally appealing for confirmation of our Christian prelate's statements to the heathen historian Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote a few years earlier.

[2] *Comparatio Regis et Monachi*, § 2; *De Mutatione Nominum*, homil. iv. § 4; *In Ephes. Homil.* viii. § 1.

[3] Σωματοφυλακες, *Expos. in Psalm.* cxlv. § 1.

[4] *De Perfectâ Caritate Homil.* § 6; *Ep. ad Theodorum Lapsum*, i. § 12. These plates were according to Etrurian fashion; Becker's *Gallus*, Excurs. I. § iv.

posing, and persons seeing it for the first time gazed in astonishment at the effect of the purple vestment, the enormous jewels, milk-white mules, the splendid yoke, the snowy and brilliant seat.[5]

When the Emperor travelled, Generals, Prefects, and an advanced guard appeared before him in the city which was to be honoured with his presence, bringing with them a train of servants, whose duty it was to prepare a palace for his residence, and to see that he received the usual honours.[6] Sometimes his majesty would send his royal letters to be read in the theatre, the churches, or other place of public resort. On such occasions the same respect was shown to his notifications as if he himself were present, and they were listened to in profound silence;[7] indeed they were esteemed sacred, and Socrates gives us an example of the awe with which they were regarded, by telling us that once when the people had been excited to sedition on hearing that Eustathius, their Bishop, was deposed, they had been appeased merely by the arrival of the imperial

[5] *In Joan. Homil.* xii. al. xi. § 1; *In Rom. Homil.* xiv. § 10.

[6] *In Genes. Sermo.* ii. § 1.

[7] *In Genes. Homil.* xiv. § 2; xliv. § 1; *In 2 Thess. Homil.* iii. § 4.

letters.[8] Lent, and particularly Holy Week, or the festival of Easter, were seasons chosen for sending these official circulars to declare a general pardon of offences. The act of mercy was designed in imitation of Christ, who at that season had delivered sinners from the captivity and thraldom of sin.[9]

It is reasonable to suppose, that where there was such moral and political degradation, justice was not administered with regularity and rigid equity. And indeed corruption was the order of the day.[1] Yet all the forms of law were observed with strict punctuality. The judge sat upon a high tribunal, and the prisoners, being brought by their jailer to a bar, were there arraigned. When deliberating, the judge sat behind a curtain, which was drawn up when he passed sentence.[2] Before the doors of the court might be seen the relations and friends of the accused, whilst soldiers armed with swords and clubs kept the anxious and inquisitive at a respectful distance. The condemned were ignominiously led away with

[8] *Socr. Hist. Ecc.* lib. i. cap. 24.

[9] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. vi. § 7; *In Genes. Homil.* xxx. § 1.

[1] *In 2 Tim. Homil.* v. § 3; *Adv. Oppugnat. Vitæ Monast.* lib. iii. § 10.

[2] *In Matt. Homil.* xlii. al. xliii. § 4; *In Is.* cap. vi. § 2.

a rope to instant punishment, or else their punishment was inflicted in open court.[3] The following description of a scene at a criminal trial is so vivid that it needs no comment: it represents the state of affairs at Antioch, when judicial inquiries were proceeding after the statues of the Emperor and Empress had been cast down:—

"One sight there was more pitiable than all. A mother and a sister of a certain person, who was among those under trial within, sat at the very vestibule of the court of justice, prostrating themselves on the pavement, and becoming a common spectacle to all the bystanders; veiling their faces, and showing no sense of shame but that which the urgency of the calamity permitted. No maid-servant, nor neighbour, nor female friend, nor any other relative accompanied them. But surrounded by many soldiers, alone, and meanly clad, and dragging themselves along upon the ground, about the very doors, they were in more pitiable case than those who were undergoing judgment within; and hearing, as they did, the voice of the executioners, the strokes of the scourge, the wailing of those who were scourged, the fearful threats of the judges, they themselves

[3] *De Incomprehens. Dei Naturâ*, homil. iii. § 7 et iv. § 4

endured at every scourging sharper pains than those who were beaten. For since in the examination of others there was a danger of their own betrayal; if they heard any one scourged, they feared that he might mention those who were guilty, and they cried aloud; looking up to heaven they besought God to give the sufferer some strength of endurance, lest the safety of their own relations should be betrayed by the weakness of those who were incapable of sustaining the sharp anguish of the strokes. And again, the same thing occurred as in the case of men who are struggling on the waves. For just as when they perceive the violence of a wave lifting up its head from afar, and gradually increasing, and ready to overwhelm the vessel, they are almost dead with terror before it comes near the ship; so also was it with these. If at any time they heard voices and cries that reached them, they saw a thousand deaths before their eyes, being in terror lest those who were urged to bear witness, giving way to their torments, should name some one of their own relatives. And within one saw tortures; and without, tortures. The men within, the executioners were tormenting; the women without, the resistless force of nature, and the sympathy of the bowels.

Within there was lamentation, and without there was lamentation! Of those who were found guilty within, and of their relatives on the outside. Yea, rather not these only, but their very judges inwardly lamented, and endured heavier woes than all the rest; being compelled to take part in so bitter a tragedy."[4]

Many of these sufferers were persons of great distinction and wealth; but after the final sentence of the court was pronounced, they might be seen paraded in irons through the streets to prison.

The *Quæstio*, or examination by torture, was permitted under specified limitations by the Roman laws. Persons who could claim Roman citizenship, and certain privileged classes, such as the higher orders of clergy, the military, municipal officers, and learned professors, were enumerated as exempt from it. However, when St. Chrysostom lived, such a privilege was suspended in cases of treason, which included a large variety of offences.[5] Of course the sedition which the people of Antioch had raised when the imperial statues were thrown down, brought those concerned in it under a charge of treason. The ordinary punishment

[4] *Ad. Pop. Antioch.* homil. xiii. § 1.

[5] Gibbon, chap. xvii.

for capital crimes was decapitation with a sword, after which the bodies were thrown into a large pit called the *Barathrum*. There were also numerous punishments of a most barbarous description. The condemned were sometimes placed upon a rack, or in the pillory, as we may style a heavy wooden collar known by the name of *xylum*, which appears to have been similar to that used at the present day in China.[6] Others were beaten with thongs, or their flesh was torn by an instrument called "the talons," from its shape, or with one called a *molybdis*, which we conceive was a piece of lead charged with iron spikes, and with which the body was lacerated, or the sides pierced. The limbs of others were thrown out of joint by a sudden jerk, and then they were held suspended. In these inflictions of torture considerable latitude was allowed to the soldiers who guarded the criminals, and ample opportunity was afforded them of indulging their brutality.[7] The prisons were scenes of the utmost wretchedness; in the dank dungeons reigned squalor, hunger, darkness, and despair.[8]

When we glean information regarding the

[6] *Dæmones non gubernare Mundum*, homil. i. § 5.

[7] *Contra Judæos et Gentiles Liber*, § 10; *In* 2 *Cor. Homil.* ix. § 4.

[8] *In* 2 *Cor. Homil.* x. § 4.

management of the imperial revenues we find that, as has generally happened in ill-governed countries, the farmers of taxes amassed large fortunes by cruel exactions. The demands of a luxurious court rendered the taxes burdensome, and, as we have seen, led to the alarming riots at Antioch; in addition, taxation also was made intolerably oppressive by the avarice of receivers. Wherever a collector of revenue appeared, he was regarded as a common enemy. Like a winter torrent, he brought desolation to the houses of the poor, and involved whole villages in misery and lamentation, by insisting that the cultivator should make larger payments than the land could bear.[9] The appearance of these ravenous officers—and sometimes of the absentee landlords—was viewed with as much terror as an invasion of barbarians. Too often they troubled themselves little about any equitable adjustment of the revenue, and demanded the same payment from the tenants of barren as of fertile estates. They would seize the whole produce, and in return give to the cultivator a bare subsistence. The occupant of the soil was ordinarily compelled to pay fifty per cent. of its returns.[1]

[9] *Comparatio Regis et Monachi*, § 3.

[1] *In Matt. Homil.* lxi. al. lxii. § 3.

All places under Government were generally saleable, and considered excellent investments for purchasers. They were situations in which the people might be plundered with the forms of law, and so eagerly were they sought after, that candidates not only bid for them with money borrowed at a high percentage, but in some instances raised the required sum by pledging the persons of their wives and children.[2] The qualifications for magisterial offices were but little regarded: if one aspirant could produce a higher sum than his competitors, the Emperor would immediately go through the ceremony of investiture, by handing to him a set of golden tablets.[3] He then took his seat in the magisterial chair, and was surrounded by a crowd of attendants and flatterers, all of whom had an interest in securing for some suitor his favourable judgment.[4]

[2] *In Rom. Homil.* ii. § 4, et xiv. § 10.
[3] *In illud, Vidi Dominum,* homil. ii. § 2.
De Beato Philogonio Homil. § 2.

CHAPTER V.

THE MAN OF FASHION.

Mansions and their furniture.—A Gentleman's dress.—Picture of a dandy.—Education.—Tone of Conversation.—Swearing.—Gastronomy.—Slaves, servants, and retainers.—A Slave story.—Advice.

If it is true that Christian divines are apt to give exaggerated descriptions of vice, and that each particular preacher represents his own age as the most demoralized of all, it is also true that a hearer with the slightest degree of acumen naturally conceives a tolerably accurate idea as to the precise value which is to be attached to their invectives. In the same instinctive way we generally form a correct judgment as to the works of a painter. On looking at one of Vandyke's portraits, we feel certain that the likeness is good, although we have never seen the original, and although we are persuaded that, like all others of his craft, the artist has heightened the charms or manly graces of his subject.

When turning over Hogarth's inimitable works we are quite aware that a great deal is caricature. No such rake ever existed; no such marriage *à la mode* ever was celebrated; but yet there is so much of truth in the artist's brush as to inspire us with a confident belief, that after making all allowances, we are enabled to form by his aid a very accurate idea of the manners of the age in which he lived. Just so with St. Chrysostom's literary works of art. Probably he was sometimes carried away by excitement, or in his more finished pieces he indulged in rhetorical flourish, and some of his colouring is too high; but the mind at once seizes certain descriptions as undoubtedly faithful, and we are sure that the voice of posterity has rightly pronounced him one of the truest painters of men and manners which has ever existed. Much as he had pored over books, he was also a close observer of men. He had passed from the closet and the quiet of Anthusa's home to the bustle and activity of a town life. He was no mere bookworm, nor one who only dwelt in the past—he was engaged in a mortal struggle with the present. He felt that he was fighting with the arch fiend in a human form. Before he began the contest he looked well at human-

ity; scanned well all its members; and when he closed with it in combat he found that it was what he expected to find it; and either from the pulpit, or in solitude, during his dreary exile, he told a true tale, and described society as he had seen it, with simplicity and power.

Into no descriptions has he entered with more minuteness than when he discloses the splendour of great establishments. He exhibits to us the rich of those days in all the circumstances of their lives. Not satisfied with pointing them out as they moved in public, he carries us to their homes, yes, even to their bedchambers and ladies' boudoirs; nor does he neglect their personal appearance, but gives us full-length portraits of proud and foppish gentlemen.

The mansion of the wealthy citizen was stately and magnificent. A golden roof surmounted it, and reflected the glittering sunbeams.[1] The saloons had tesselated pavements or rich carpets; around them were vases of curious workmanship, fine pictures, or elegant embroidery covering the marble walls, and the ceilings were supported by statues or ponde-

[1] In Jeddo, the capital of Japan, "many houses of great lords are covered with rich plates of gold."—*Japan*, by Charles Macfarlane, book vi. Metal roofing was used also by the Romans.—Becker's *Gallus*, Excurs. I. § 2.

rous columns, with elaborately-worked capitals of gold.[2] The tables were overlaid with gold, and at night all was brilliantly lighted up with lamps suspended by silver chains. The sleeping apartments were also tastefully furnished. Without were ornamental grounds. Picturesque walks, over which noble trees threw a grateful shade, and along which various kinds of stones were laid, led the eye up to arcades and porticoes, where refreshing streams were supplied by aqueducts and fountains.[3] Hounds of valuable breeds roamed about,[4] and even wild beasts, such as bears and lions, were kept either for their lord's amusement, and to in-

[2] Individuals, to perpetuate their memories, placed statues of themselves in their mansions. The practice of overlaying these with gold was first introduced when a statue was decreed to the honour of Acilius Glabrio, after he had conquered King Antiochus.—*Ammianus*, lib. xiv. § 6. For an account of the variegated (marmor maculosum) and other kinds of marble see Becker's *Gallus*, note v. § 2. The walls of Roman houses were covered with slabs of marble.—Excursus, i. § 2.

[3] *De Sanctis Martyribus Sermo.* § 4; *Expos. in Psalm.* xlviii. § 8; *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. ii. § 5; *In Philip. Homil.* x. § 3; *in* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xi. § 5; *in Matt. Homil.* xlix. al. l. § 5; et l. al. li. § 4. The expensive *monopodia* or massive tables, and the *Abaci* or small tables on which plate was displayed, were introduced into Rome from Asia. *Liv.* lib. xxxix. cap. 6.

[4] *In Rom. Homil.* xi. § 6.

dulge his curiosity, or else as the guardians of his treasures.[5]

The destruction of a large house by fire, and the sumptuous interiors which on such occasions were revealed, are skilfully depicted by our author. The stupid and apathetic conduct of the populace was the same as is described even now by visitors at Constantinople. There the crowd would stand, rendering no assistance, and making no attempt to extinguish the flames. They might be seen pointing out to each other the falling rafters and bulging walls, or one more venturesome than the rest would take a closer survey, that he might indulge his silly curiosity. Then a pitiable spectacle would meet his inquisitive gaze—columns shattered to pieces, and capitals crumbling to dust, or wooden pillars thrown down that they might not serve as fuel to the flames; graceful statues which once supported the roof standing by themselves, and hideously disfigured. "And why should one go on to describe the wealth stored up within; the tissues of gold and the vessels of silver; yea, and the chamber, too, into which none entered

[5] *In Matt. Homil.* lix. al. lx. § 6; *In Genes. Sermo.* iii. § 1; *In Acta Apost. Homil.* xxix. § 4. Wild beasts were also led about for public exhibition.

but the lord and his consort, where was the treasure-house of tissues and perfumes, and the caskets of costly jewels—all turned into one blazing pile, and within it now bathmen, nightmen, vagabonds, and others, whilst the whole interior is a mass of fire and water, mud, dust, and half-burnt beams."[6]

The furniture was grand and *recherché*. If a seat was to be made, or even a footstool, it must be of gold or silver. The couches were mounted with silver on every side. Utensils which could not be named were of the same material.[7] Jars, ewers, and scent bottles were of gold. How lavishly the precious metals were used for household furniture may be judged from the following appeal:—"The mere having of silver dishes indeed, this even is not in keeping with a soul devoted to wisdom, but is altogether a piece of luxury; but the making unclean vessels of silver, is this then luxury?

[6] *In Ephes. Homil.* x. § 2.

[7] *In Rom. Homil.* xi. § 6; *De Lazaro Concio*, i. § 7. The utensils which in the above passage are nameless are in another passage called by their proper names, but with an apology, and on the plea of necessity. See *In Coloss. Homil.* vii. §§ 4, 5. Clement of Alexandria (*Pædagogus*, lib. ii. cap. 3) enumerates various articles of furniture, all of which were of silver, and adds that there were numerous vessels of gold and silver, some for the table, and others for purposes which he is ashamed to mention.

Nay, I will not call it luxury, but senselessness; nay, nor yet this, but madness; nay, rather worse than even madness! I know that many persons make jokes at me for this; but I heed them not—only let some good result from it. In truth, to be wealthy makes people senseless and mad. Did their power reach to such an excess, they would have the earth too of gold, and walls of gold, perchance the heaven too, and the air of gold. What a madness is this, what an iniquity, what a burning fever! Another, made after the image of God, is perishing of cold; and dost thou furnish thyself with such things as these? Oh senseless pride! What more would a madman have done? . . . . Everywhere is excessive pride, everywhere is vainglory. Nowhere is there moderation, but everywhere excess."

What follows is so remarkable and impressive that I must extract it, although the passage is rather long:—

"I am afraid lest, under the impulse of this madness, the race of woman should go on to assume some monstrous appearance; perhaps they will wish even to have their hair of gold. . . . . For if you dare to do what is even more absurd than this, much more, I think, will you long to have this hair of gold, and lips

and eyebrows, and to melt down gold with which to overlay every part. But if you are incredulous, and think I am speaking in jest, I will relate what I have heard, or rather what is now existing. The king of the Persians wears his beard golden, those who are adepts at such work winding gold-leaf about his hairs as about the woof, and it is laid up as a prodigy. Glory to Thee, O Christ—with how many good things hast thou filled *us!* How hast Thou provided for our health! From how great monstrousness, from how great unreasonableness, hast Thou set us free! Mark! I forewarn you—I advise you no longer—but I command and charge; let him who pleases obey, and him who does not please be disobedient. If the women continue to act thus, I will not suffer it, nor receive you, nor permit you to pass across this threshold. For what need have I of a crowd of distempered people? and what if, in training you, I do not forbid what is not excessive? and yet Paul forbade both gold and pearls. We are laughed at by the Greeks (heathen)—our religion appears a fable. . . . . I admonish and command you to break up both those gay deckings of the face, and such vessels as I have described, and give to the poor, and not to be so mad. Let him that

likes quit me at once; let him that likes accuse me; I will not suffer it in any one."[8]

On another occasion St. Chrysostom entertained his hearers with the story of Aristippus, the heathen philosopher, who, when he had entered a palace that shone with a profusion of gold, with beautiful marbles and columns, and the floor of which was covered with rich carpets, spat in the owner's face, and met all remonstrances by saying that really he was very sorry, but there was no other part of the house fit to receive his saliva.[9] He further reproaches his hearers because their proud mansions were not thrown open, as they ought to have been, for hospitality to their poorer

[8] *In Coloss. Homil.* vii. §§ 4, 5. Pliny, in his Natural History, records the increasing use of the precious metals amongst the Romans. He declares that their cars (*carrucæ*) were made of solid silver; that Nero's wife, Poppæa, had some of her horses shod with gold; that as much silver might be seen in a service of plate on a dinner table as was brought by Scipio Africanus amongst his spoils after the destruction of Carthage. The women's beds and the couches were covered with silver. Fenestella in the reign of Tiberius first began to ornament sideboards with silver, and at last they were entirely made of that metal. Even common people, who were forbidden to wear gold, had silver on their sandals; and it was applied by young men to as base a use as in the instances referred to in the text.—*Hist. Nat.* lib. xxxiii. cap. 12 et 13.

[9] *In Rom. Homil.* xi. § 6.

neighbours: on the contrary, if a poor relation visited them, they would show him a cold shoulder, and feel ashamed of being seen in his society.[1]

The dress of these fine gentlemen was as much studied as the decorations of their houses. They were particularly anxious about their boots and shoes, which were highly ornamented, and of most costly materials, being made of leather and the choicest silk. No general could pride himself so much on his legions and trophies, as profligate youths upon their boots, their sweeping garments, and carefully-dressed hair.[2] It was astonishing to see the inconvenience with which they would put up so long as they could indulge their vanity. St. Chrysostom had learnt the value of an old shoe, but he could not persuade his gay hearers that it was better than a new one which pinched the foot.

In other parts, too, of their dress, comfort

[1] *In illud, Salutate Priscillam,* &c., homil. i. § 2.

[2] *In Matt. Homil.* xlix. al. l. §§ 4, 5, 6. In Rome, fashionable gentlemen had been gradually paying more and more attention to their boots. Horace represents a fop as laughing at a country friend because his boots were too large—"*male laxus in pede calceus hæret.*"—(*Sat.* i. 3.) But the most absurd extravagance in this matter was introduced from St. Chrysostom's country, Syria, by Lucullus, after his Asiatic victories. The Emperor Heliogabalus is said to have worn beautiful cameos on his boots.

gave way to pride. During the hottest weather they would, from excessive self-importance, wear two, and even three tunics, or inner garments, all of which they contrived to display, together with a cloak and its girdle, and a pair of breeches.[3] The perspiration might be seen dripping from their brows, but the most oppressive heat would still be endured, that they might exhibit a garment which had cost a hundred pieces of gold or more, and a golden girdle.[4] Yet they had fabrics, as for instance those of Cean manufacture, which were compared, on account of their fineness, to spiders' webs, and the material of which was produced by silk-worms. They had, indeed, numerous kinds of silks, half-silks,[5] and fine linen.[6]

[3] Braccæ (*Græcè* ἀναξυρίδες. *Scoticè* breeks, *Anglicè* breeches) were startling innovations to Greeks and Romans. They seem to have been introduced from the West.

[4] *In Philip. Homil.* x. § 3. Money was carried in these girdles, as it is at the present time by natives of the East.

[5] Silk was another innovation from the East. Sumptuary laws in vain prohibited the use of it by men. Tiberius decreed that silk clothing should not pollute men (*ne vestis serica viros fœdaret*). The half-silk had a warp of linen or wool. Silk-worms were first brought to Constantinople, and reared there, by monks, more than a century after St. Chrysostom's age. The reader will find a very interesting and full account of the introduction of silk in Gibbon's "*Decline and Fall*," chap. xl.

[6] Linen was coming into use at this time. So late as the

We have a most amusing account of a gentleman turned out in the highest style of fashion. He was pronounced literally, although with a little circumlocution, to be *a regular swell.*[7] He might be seen picking his way on tiptoe through the forum. His chief

reign of Augustus it was scarcely known at Rome, and the absence of comfort in the midst of luxury is well satirized by Arbuthnot when he says that the Emperor Augustus had not a pane of glass to his windows, nor a shirt to his back.

The account, as given above, is fully confirmed by Ammianus (lib. xiv. § 6):—"Others," he says, "place their chief pride in cars higher than ordinary, (Query, dog-carts or drags?) and in the ambitious display of their dress. They sweat under the weight of cloaks, which hang from their necks, and are fastened by girdles, but are of such delicate texture that the wind must pass through them. They expect that by constantly moving themselves, and especially on the left side, they will display the too long borders, and the tunics of different shapes, which are figured over with a variety of work in imitation of animals." —See also lib. xxii. § 4, where the use of silk amongst the military is said to have been becoming more and more fashionable.

[7] What is the origin of the word "Swell"? St. Chrysostom seems to explain:—"A dandy," he says, "is like burnt tow; for it seems to *swell* (οἰδεῖν) when lighted, and to lift itself up; but when it is submitted to a slight touch of the hand, it all tumbles down, and turns out to be more worthless than the veriest ashes."—*In Rom. Homil.* xx. § 4. A French writer happily expresses the same by another metaphor. He says such gentlemen are "belles bourses d'étalage: qu'y a-t-il au fond? Du vide." Martial also gives a graphic description of the genus "bellus homo."

thoughts were about his boots, and where the road was dirty, instead of looking up or straightforward, and of having a manly gait, he was looking with an affected stoop at his feet: if the street was sufficiently clean to set his anxiety at rest, he paraded himself with stiffened neck, knit brows, and stuck-out breast. To him it was quite a subject for sorrow and distress of mind if he should stain his boots with mud in winter, or cover them with dust in summer. "Bah!" would the preacher exclaim, "Your shoes were made to tread on mud and mire, and all the splashes of the pavement. If you cannot bear this, take them off, and hang them from your neck, or put them on your head. You laugh when you hear these words; but I am disposed to cry, when I behold this insanity and anxiety about such matters." Of course such a trifler's idea of happiness was the possession of plenty of money, and as all his fine clothes and other fopperies must be provided at a great expense, he would resort to the most disgraceful means of raising a sufficient sum for the indulgence of his vanity.[8]

Now let us inquire into the ways this fine gentleman had of passing his time so long as he remained at home. Amongst Orientals a

[8] *In Matt. Homil.* xlix. al. l. §§ 5, 6.

disposition to lie late in bed is a rare failing, and so, where St. Chrysostom lived, the whole population was astir before sunrise.[9] May we suppose that then the rich man who had leisure betook himself to his library? No; we are told that these gentlemen had no appetite for books. If we may judge of general knowledge from their progress in Scriptural studies, it was certainly very limited; for St. Chrysostom, when commencing his lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, declared that many were not aware of the existence of such a book.[1] To be sure they sometimes possessed handsome volumes, but such were oftener preserved for show than for use, and they thought more of the binding than the contents. "Which of you," he asked, "when in his house, takes some Christian book in hand, and goes over its contents, and searches the Scriptures? No one can say that he does so; with most we shall find draughts, and dice, but books nowhere, except among a few. And even those few have the same dispositions as the many; for they tie up their books, and keep them always put away in cases, and all their care is for the fineness of the parchments, and the

[9] *In Rom. Homil.* xxiv. § 1.

[1] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* i. § 1.

beauty of the letters, not for reading them. For they have not bought them to obtain advantage and benefit from them, but take pains about such matters to show their wealth and pride. Such is the excess of vainglory. I do not hear any one glory that he knows the contents, but that he has a book written in letters of gold."[2] Yet the sons of rich men were regularly educated under private tutors,[3] and literary pursuits, particularly the study of law and forensic eloquence, led to rank and opulence.[4]

Where education was so little valued, the

[2] *In Joan. Homil.* xxxi. al. xxxii. § 3. Seneca (De Tranq. an. 9) gives a similar account of the Romans of his time. The library was a necessary ornament of the house, but of no further use. [3] *In Matt. Homil.* xxxv. al. xxxvi. § 4.

Adv. Oppugnat. Vitæ Monast. lib. iii. § 5. Very rarely had they in any houses grave occupations. Idleness sought for amusement in buffoonery, in songs, or fiddle scraping. Libraries were like sepulchres, kept closed for ever; but hydraulic organs, immense lyres, as large as waggons, flutes, and other musical instruments of the stage were constructed. To such indignity were the professors of the liberal arts subjected, that when Rome was threatened with a famine, they were all thrust out, whilst all the hangers-on of the theatres, and three thousand dancing-women, were retained.—*Ammianus*, lib. xiv. § 6. Learning they hated like poison, but would read carefully Juvenal and Marius Maximus—the Byron and Lytton Bulwer of their country. No other volumes would they touch.—Lib. xxviii. § 4.

tone of conversation was of course extremely low. Gentlemen were acquainted with the characters, families, and native cities of charioteers and dancers, could expatiate upon their various qualities, knew the points of a horse, could tell the names, ages, performances, breeding, training, sires, dams, and native countries of such as ran in the races, but probably not one knew the number of St. Paul's Epistles, or, if they knew the number, they could not mention the names.[5] They would pass whole days in conversing about the public games, or perhaps talking over an actress, and gravely discussing her words, attitudes, looks, ringlets, the smoothness of her cheeks, the very paint upon her eyebrows.[6] Their dogs, their pigs, or their game, "banquets, dishes, preserves, wines of all sorts, and such extravagances," were favourite topics. The interest of money and loans was an ordinary subject in fact, their discourse was as unintellectual as that of the very beggars in the streets.[7] At times the most indecent language was heard, and that in the presence of ladies.[8] Many a

[5] *Homil. in illud, Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam*, § 1 *In Joan. Homil.* xxxi. al. xxxii. § 3.

[6] *In Joan. Homil.* xxxi. al. xxxii. § 3.

[7] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xiii. § 5.

[8] *In* 2 *Cor. Homil.* vi. § 4.

man, indeed, would resent it as an insult offered to himself, if improper expressions were used by his family or dependents; yet he would not only listen to such at the theatre, but on his return would retail them at home.[9] The use of oaths in ordinary conversation was so frequent, and so little thought of, that St. Chrysostom could not persuade his hearers that it was sinful, until he had made it a frequent subject of reprobation. Of the twenty-one homilies which he preached to the people of Antioch after the imperial statues had been thrown down, there is scarcely one in which allusion is not made to this evil practice. "We shall preach to you," he says, "during the whole week respecting oaths." He reminds them that no servant would dare to call his master unceremoniously by a familiar name, and yet they would everywhere bandy about the name of the Lord of Angels with irreverence.[1] He assures them, that however long established the habit, yet they may overcome it if they wil refresh each other's memories, and impose a penalty upon those who forget themselves.[2] They might be satis-

[9] *In Matt. Homil.* xxxvii. al. xxxviii. § 6.
[1] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. iv. § 6; vi. § 7.
[2] *Ib.* homil. vii. § 5.

fied with saying "Believe me," instead of employing any stronger asseveration.[3] After a little he could rejoice that they had complied with his suggestion, and had begun to fine such as were heard to swear.[4] At last, they really showed a desire to check this profane habit, and he therefore further urges them to form societies or fraternities, the members of which should engage to exhort and rebuke each other; for, as he justly remarks, we naturally perceive the failings of others much more sharply than we do our own.[5] He went so far as to recommend them to strike, if necessary, any one whom they should see blaspheming in the forum, or public thoroughfares. "Smite him on the face," he said; "strike his mouth; sanctify your hand with the blow, and if any should accuse you and drag you to the place of justice, follow them thither; and when the judge on the bench calls you to account, say boldly that the man blasphemed the King of Angels! For if it be necessary to punish those who blaspheme an earthly king, much more so those who treat Him contemptuously. It is a common crime, a public injury; and it is lawful for every one who is

[3] *Ib.* homil. viii. § 4. [4] *Ib.* homil. ix. § 1.
[5] *Ib.* homil. xi. § 4.

willing, to bring forward an accusation. Let the Jews and Greeks learn that the Christians are the saviours of the city; that they are its guardians, its patrons, and its teachers. Let the dissolute and the rebellious also learn this; that they must fear the servants of God too; that if at any time they are inclined to utter such a thing, they may look round every way at each other, and tremble even at their own shadows, anxious lest, perchance, a Christian, having heard what they said, should leap forward and sharply chastise them."[6] The preacher felt ashamed to harp upon one subject, but he was anxious to eradicate the evil.[7] "I protest," he cried, "and give warning to all, that if, when I meet you in private, and put the matter to the proof (and I certainly will put it to the proof), I detect any who have not corrected this vice, I will inflict punishment upon them, by ordering them to be excluded from the holy mysteries."[8]

The art of indulging the appetite, which in an irrational animal and a barbarian is an instinct, but is elevated by a morbid civiliza-

[6] *Ib.* homil. i. § 12. [7] *Ib.* homil. xii. § 6; xiii. § 1.

[8] *Ib.* homil. xx. § 5. It was the custom to take an oath with the form of touching the Gospels, a custom which St. Chrysostom condemns. *Homil.* xv. § 5.

tion to the dignity of a science—this art, which its professors call gastronomy, had, at the time of which we treat, attained a high degree of perfection. Gluttony was witnessed, not only in its coarser forms, but also in those more dangerous disguises under which it is concealed by refinement. The very first thing in the morning which the master of the house thought of was dinner, and he might be seen giving his orders about it to cooks and butlers with the greatest earnestness.[9] Indeed, the preparation of a banquet needed much care and attention, for the arrangements were various, intricate, and costly, especially if the host had ventured to invite a governor-general, commander-in-chief, or other such great officers as were always to be met with at the metropolis.

We will take a glance at an entertainment of this description. The guests having first refreshed themselves with a bath,[1] came arrayed in robes of fine lawn, and belted with golden girdles. Such as arrived first were

[9] *In Joan. Homil.* xxx. al. xxxi. § 3.

[1] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xi. § 5. Plutarch (Sympos. I. 2) discusses the manner in which places should be appropriated to guests. He decides that strangers and great persons should have proper places allotted to them, but others should be left to suit themselves.

expected to wait punctiliously for the rest before the banquet could commence. The ponderous table was of the form of a semicircle or the Greek letter *sigma*, in its ancient shape of C [2] and was covered with soft drapery or linen clothes. The drinking-cups were of gold and silver, glass not being deemed sufficiently precious, except when overlaid with silver.[3] Along the table were ranged wine jars glittering with gold; handsome carpets were also laid down, and couches with easy cushions. The guests were waited upon by servants, who were selected for the beauty of their persons, being "young, plump, and well-conditioned," and dressed as splendidly as their masters.[4]

The dishes were of great variety, were highly

[2] Such tables were introduced under the Roman Emperors, and were called *lunatæ mensæ* or *sigmata*.

[3] *De Virginitate Lib.* § 68. The Crystallina, however, or pure, white and transparent glasses were very valuable.

[4] *In Coloss. Homil.* i. § 4; *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. ii. § 21; Homil. *De Verbis, Habentes eundem Spiritum*, iii. § 9. Such care was taken to preserve the good looks of these young slaves, that when they travelled their faces were covered with a medicated crust or ointment, to secure them against the effects of sun or frost.—*L. An. Senec. Epist.* cxxviii. Indian servants were in much esteem. They had been so even as early as the time of Horace, who celebrates a stately butler from India thus:—

"Ut Attica virgo
Cum sacris Cereris procedit fuscus Hydaspes."

flavoured with spices from India, Arabia, and Persia, and were artistically cooked by the commanders of a grand *batterie de cuisine*:[5] many of the meats, however, were more valued on account of their rarity, and consequent expense, than from any superior delicacy of taste. The wines, particularly the Thasian, were in themselves a bouquet. Chorus and comic singers and buffoons were in attendance.[6]

Such a dinner was styled a Sybaritic banquet. It would be kept up until it was thought time for supper, and it was often dead of night before the guests dispersed.[7] At the be-

[5] Στρατόπεδα μαγείρων λαμπρά.

[6] At Roman banquets *Symphoniani* or a corps of household musicians were in attendance.—Becker's *Gallus*, Excurs. iii. § 1. The *scurra* or buffoon occupied the lowest place:—

"Sæpe tribus lectis videas cœnare quaternos
E quibus unus amet quavis adspergere cunctos."
Hor. Sat. lib. i. 5.

These descriptions of St. Chrysostom agree in many respects with the *Symposia* or drinking parties of the ancient Greeks. Music and dancing (nautching) were commonly introduced at these, but were objected to by Plato, who thought conversation more intellectual.—*Plat. Convivium*, 176. In Rome they had their *commissationes*, which were usually scenes of riot and debauchery. Drinking was often kept up till dawn, and hence Martial's phrases *bibere in lucem*, and *cœnare in lucem*.

[7] *De Angustâ Portâ Concio*, § 5; *In Matt. Homil.* liii. al. liv. § 4; *De Annâ Sermo.* v. § 3; *Quod Nemo lœditur Lib.*

ginning of the entertainment the strictest formality was observed, for great people were then as determined sticklers as ever for the rights of precedence;[8] but before long wine became a leveller; discussions arose, and the fuddled disputants, losing the thread of their argument, soon gave their tongues unlimited licence. Nor did they stop at words; they often came to blows.[9] Increased potations would alone deprive them of the power of injuring each other, and then having ceased to

§§ 7, 10; *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxi. § 5; *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* ii. § 3, xvii. § 3.

[8] As our author does not mention one practice at the commencement of an entertainment, we may trust that in his time it had fallen into desuetude. Cicero, in writing to Atticus, and giving an account of a day which Cæsar had passed at his house, proceeds thus:—"Post horam viii. in balneum; tum audivit de Mamurra; vultum non mutavit; unctus est; accubuit; ἐμετικὴν agebat; itaque et edit et bibit ἀδεῶς et jucunde."—*Ad Att.* xiii. 52. Cæsar's conduct on this occasion was highly complimentary to Cicero. The emetic intimated his disposition to eat and drink freely. This custom is also mentioned by Seneca, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius. The latter states that the glutton Vitellius preserved his life by it, whilst his friends who did not use the same precaution perished.—See Middleton. The Roman *cœna* in later days commenced at three in the afternoon; if prolonged till night it was called reproachfully *convivium tempestivum*. With the Greeks it sometimes began as late as sunset.

De Resurrectione Homil. § 2.

distinguish what they saw, or to speak articulately, they would be borne by jeering attendants from their couches to their beds, there to be tormented till morning by the horrible dreams of a drunkard's sleep. The results were loss of appetite, head-ache, ending in some youths with stunted growth, or in others with gout, dropsy, apoplexy, inflammation, tumours, and a thousand other diseases. The victim of dissipation involuntarily confessed his crime by the tremor of his hands and feet, or the distension and flabbiness of his body. Such were and are *the pleasures* of luxury and excess.[1]

One passage only I have selected from very many on this subject:—"Would you behold a multitude from the habitations of the dead? Let us see the appetites which spring from luxury—from bakers, cooks, purveyors, and pastry-cooks. I feel ashamed to tell of all, but nevertheless I will speak of the pheasants, the profuse mixture of sauces, the moist and the dry dishes, and the rules observed in these matters. For just as men who govern a state, or marshal an army, so these regulate and arrange what shall come first, and what next.

[1] *Quod Nemo lœditur, Concio*, §§ 7, 8; *De Pœnitentia*, homil. v. § 4; *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxxix. § 9.

And some bring in first birds roasted on charcoal, and stuffed with fish; others prepare in a different way the first course of these immoderate entertainments, and there is great rivalry in these affairs, as regards the quality, the order, and the quantity; and they strive with each other about matters which ought to make them hide their heads for shame, some that they may spend half, some the whole day, and some add the night also."[2] The reader who is curious in such matters will find that in Horace's time the courses were differently arranged.[3]

As one check upon thoughtlessness or excess at their meals, and indeed on all occasions, St. Chrysostom recommends them to introduce religious conversation, not forgetting heavenly

[2] *In Matt. Homil.* lxx. al. lxxi. § 4.

[3] *Hor. Sat.* lib. ii. 8. Ammianus mentions the squirrels, or rather the small animals called *glires* in Latin and *gilahrí* in Hindustani (the similitude of the words should be observed). These were in great demand, and so much attention was paid to the fattening of them, that often at a banquet a pair of scales would be produced to show the weight of the *glires*, as well as of the birds and fishes, and this was attested and recorded by notaries, who were present for the purpose.—Lib. xxviii. § 4. Petronius represents the *glires* as served up on small bridges, sprinkled with poppy seed and honey.—See *Dictionary of Antiquities* by Smith, who calls these animals *dormice*.—*Petron. Satiricon*, cap. 31.

philosophy in the presence even of great men;[4] and let them remember that they who live luxuriously and softly cannot attain to the kingdom of heaven.[5]

We have already touched upon the attendants at the mansions of the great, but they deserve a little more notice. Eunuchs, those unhappy ministers of Oriental pomp and sensuality, were the most conspicuous.[6] Servants swarmed everywhere. Such as had been imported from barbarous countries—probably black men—were coveted, and were clothed in liveries of gold.[7] There were not only free servants, but also slaves, whose condition was generally very wretched. They were compelled to submit quietly to insults and blows; if even they had not done wrong, still they had no redress. A little straw served for their beds, and their ordinary food was bread. We need not, then, be surprised to be told that such as had the luck to gain their liberty observed the day of their emancipation as a birth-day.[8]

[4] *In Joan. Homil.* xvii. al. xviii. § 4; *In Rom. Homil.* xxxi. § 5.

[5] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xlii. § 3.

[6] *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 8; *In Joan Homil.* xxvii. al. xxviii. § 3.

[7] *In Rom. Homil.* xvii. § 4; *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 2. *De Eleemosyna Homil.* § 3. Ammianus gives a worse

Yet in some instances a slave's lot was enviable, particularly at seasons of scarcity, for they were wholly provided for by their masters, whose interest it was to preserve them in health and vigour. Each had his own apartment. They had a regulated amount of labour, and after that was performed they were left at liberty to do as they pleased.[9]

The morality of these poor creatures was well spoken of. Their honesty was on the whole commendable: they could safely be trusted with sums of money, and were rarely known to rob or injure their fellow-slaves. In these respects their example might have been worthily imitated by freemen.[1]

Jesters, monsters, idiots, and dwarfs were always amongst the retainers of the great men who, like our own ancestors, converted the

account. If a slave should be too long in bringing his master's hot water, he would be sentenced to receive three hundred lashes. But if the same man should commit a wilful homicide, and the friends of the deceased demanded his punishment, the master would merely exclaim, "What could be expected of such a rogue? He is a shocking fellow. If any one does such a thing again he shall be chastised."—Lib. xxviii. § 4. The numbers of slaves at Rome were almost incredible. Pliny (xxxiii. 10) states that C. Cæcilius Claudius Isidorus left 4116, when he died.

[9] *In Tit. Homil.* i. § 4. [1] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* xvi. § 2.

defects of nature into subjects of amusement.[2] Then there was usually also a long train of parasites, who were expected to say funny things for their lords' amusement, to utter coarse jokes if his tastes lay in that direction, to act plays, submit to be kicked, in return for being supported in idleness. Singular as it appears to us, the title of such an individual was parasite or flatterer—tuft-hunting was a recognized profession.[3]

All these luxuries and absurdities were from time to time assailed with bitter ridicule by St. Chrysostom in his stirring declamations. A reader of the present day is surprised to find the great archbishop addressing his hearers in terms very similar to those used by Benjamin Franklin, the frugal republican of America:—"If you wish your business to be done," said the latter, "do it yourself; if you

[2] *In 1 Tim. Homil.* iii. § 3. So they had at Rome *moriones, fatui, nani,* and *pumiliones.*

[3] *In Matt. Homil.* xlviii. al. xlix. §§. *In Philip. Homil.* x. § 3. In public, says Ammianus, a great man would offer to these parasites his knee or his hand, to be kissed, and would consider that then the poor fellows had a stock of joy for life. It was further the business of these people to listen to their patron's stories, and applaud all that they said, to admire the marble columns of his house, and to be in perfect raptures with the mosaics on the walls.—Lib. xxviii. § 4.

wish it done imperfectly, employ a servant; if not at all, employ two." "As in our apparel," said St. Chrysostom, "and in our table, we ought to follow our need only, so also in our servants." "One master," he adds, "need employ one servant, or rather two or three masters one servant." "If we do not like this, we should consider those who have none." However, he would not be too particular, and would permit them to keep a second servant; "but what means," he asks, "these swarms of servants? You go your rounds to the baths and the forum like sheep-sellers and slave-dealers, who lead their animals or men with them. You say that you keep so many slaves for humanity's sake. If that is true, do not let them attend you, but teach them trades, and when they are able to support themselves, let them go free. But you scourge them, and put them in chains, and call these works of humanity."[4]

[4] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xl. § 5.

CHAPTER VI.

LIFE IN THE CITY.

A city Lord's equipage and suite.—His places of resort.—The Theatre: anecdote.—The Amphitheatre.—Olympic Games: tragic story.—Sophists and Rhetoricians.—Street Shows.—Slang.—Parallel in these respects between the fourth and nineteenth centuries.

THE reader has now seen a gay man of the world at home, and has even taken a walk with him across the forum, but he has yet to learn the true character of a city life. When the rich citizen sallied out, his equipage was most sumptuous. Golden collars adorned, not only his servants, but even his mules and horses,[1] whose trappings also were generally covered with gold.[2] He was preceded and followed by fan-bearers and lackeys, some of whom were savages, some eunuchs.[3] He would not move out of doors without a long train of attendants.[4]

[1] *In Joan. Homil.* xxvii. al. xxvi. § 3.
[2] *In Matt. Homil.* xx. al. xxi. § 2.
In Rom. Homil. iv. § 4; xi. § 6.
[4] *In Joan. Homil.* lxxx. al. lxxix. § 3.

Often all seemed one blaze of gold—his horses' reins, servants' ornaments, his garments, his girdle, even his shoes, being all gilded;[5] his chariot was silver tinselled.[6] First in the procession came a gorgeous herald or outrider, accompanied by lictors, whose duty it was to clear the road, and drive away with whips any who might impede the progress of their haughty lord.[7] If he met an acquaintance,

[5] *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 2.

[6] *In Rom. Homil.* xvii. § 4. Seneca, when dwelling upon the degeneracy of his age, points to a taste for display, which was intermediate between the frugality of Cato and the extravagance of a Constantinopolitan lord. In many respects it was similar to the pomp above mentioned. He writes of the pampered mules all of one colour, the carved carriages, the animals covered with scarlet and pictured tapestry, having jewels suspended from their chests, gold-mounted harness, and golden bits. "Oh!" he exclaims, "how I should like to see Cato meet one of these fine gentlemen of the streets with his runners and African slaves, and raising a cloud of dust before him."—*L. An. Senec. Epist.* lxxxvii.

[7] *In Matt. Homil.* xxiii. al. xxiv. § 10. At Rome some would drive furiously through the great thoroughfares of the city, tearing up the pavements as though they were travelling post, although they had no reason to be in a hurry. They were followed by attendants in crowds like predatory bands, and not a cook's mate was left at home. The ladies, too, in close carriages, would imitate them. And just as a general would arrange his army,—with the heavy armed troops, the light armed and javelin men behind, with his reserve in the rear of all,—so the head

etiquette was scrupulously observed, and, according to established rule, the man of higher rank waited for the other to address him first.[8] Boldly did the stern censor rebuke such vanity, pride, extravagance, and punctiliousness. Over and over again did he chastise those wealthy fools, although he knew that he was drawing down upon himself the severe displeasure of the most influential nobility. Over and over again did he exhort others not to imitate them. "Why," he said, "do you stand gazing at riches? What do you see so wonderful, that it rivets your gaze? These gold-harnessed horses, these lackeys, partly savages, and partly

domestics, bearing wands of office, arranged the household. In front, near the carriage, ran the tailors and such workpeople; then came the sooty kitchen servants, then a promiscuous crowd of slaves, joined by any vagabonds of the neighbourhood. Last of all followed the eunuchs, ranged from old men to boys, according to age, remarkable for their deformity and distorted features. (*Ammianus*, lib. xiv. § 6.) Gibbon applies this account to the *journeys* of great men. Perhaps he was puzzled by some circumstances which are quite intelligible to a resident in the East. Certainly the Roman historian is writing about the grandee's ordinary progresses through the city. In the reign of Claudius carriages were not permitted to traverse the streets of cities, but such was not the case in the times of Ammianus and Chrysostom. (See Becker's *Gallus*, § iv.) The runners or outriders in Rome were called *cursores, anteambulones*, and *Numidæ*.

[8] *In Matt. Homil.* xviii. § 6.

eunuchs, and costly raiment, and the soul that is getting soft with all this, and the haughty brow, and the bustling, and the noise? Do these deserve your admiration?"[9]

Perhaps the most impressive appeal of all was St. Chrysostom's exordium when Eutropius, the once proud and fallen favourite, had sought an asylum in the Church, and was sitting before him as an humble penitent. "At all times," he began, "and now especially, is it seasonable to say—'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.' Where now is that display of the consulate? Where are the blazing torches? Where are the applauses, the dances, the banquets, and the festive assemblies? Where are the crowns and the veils? Where are the tumult of the city, the acclamations of welcome in the circus, and the cheers of the spectators? They are all gone; and a tumultuous wind has blown, strewed the leaves, and exhibited to us a bare tree, a stump shaken to its very root. So great was the force of the blast as to threaten to tear up the tree root and branch, and to snap its very fibres. Where now are the false friends? Where are the drinking bouts and the feasts? Where is the hive of parasites, and the strong wine poured out during the

[9] *In Rom. Homil.* iv. § 4.

whole day, and the various arts of cooks, and the attendants upon power, who act and speak only to curry favour? All those things were night, and a dream—when the day dawned they disappeared. They were spring flowers, and when spring was passed they withered. They were a shadow, and they flitted by. They were smoke, and were dissolved. They were toys, and were broken. They were a cobweb, and were snapped. We have therefore chaunted this spiritual sentence, and we repeat—'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.'"[1]

But now let us return to our grandee. We have seen him issuing into the streets, and showing himself off in great style. Where is he going? Perhaps he will drop into his club. There he would meet some kindred spirits, and they would enjoy a luxurious supper together, ending, probably, with a regular debauch.[2] Perhaps he will see what is going on at the baths. There was generally to be found a large concourse of people there, as we may judge

[1] *In Eutropium Homil.* § 1.

[2] *In Rom. Homil.* xxiv. § 3; *In 2 Tim. Homil.* i. § 4. These clubs were more frequent amongst the humbler classes, but such associations were also formed by the luxurious. They probably had their origin in the Athenian συμβολή, which was a sum of money contributed by a party for a convivial meeting.

from the Baths of Diocletian at Rome, which contained marble seats for three thousand. In all the chief towns of the Roman Empire the baths were amongst the most spacious and elegant of the public buildings. They were used not only for cleanliness, but medicinally, and also for pleasure, so that they were the general resort of loungers, and to close them was one of the severest punishments which a despotic government could inflict upon the populace.[3] In opposition to the rather dirty tendencies of devout persons in his age, St. Chrysostom often used the bath, yet even he found it necessary to give up frequenting the public establishments.[4]

[3] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xiv. § 6; xviii. § 3. We have a picture drawn from the life of grandees at the Roman baths. When they entered with a train of fifty attendants they would call out in a threatening tone—"Where are our places?" If some obscure slave or common prostitute should appear, they would bespatter these ministers of their pleasure with the most extravagant flatteries, and caress them—they, whose ancestors thought that a senator should be censured if even he kissed his wife in their daughter's presence! Then, having dried themselves with the finest linen, they would open their wardrobe, which contained as many clean clothes as would suffice for eleven persons, and having selected a suit, and replaced their rings, which had been given in charge to their servants, they would take themselves off.—*Ammianus*, lib. xxviii. § 4.

[4] *In 2 Tim. Homil.* vi. § 4.

Some shops, as for instance barbers' and perfumers', were places where the lovers of gossip used to meet; or they would often sit at the apothecary's, and talk over politics or their neighbours' affairs.[5] The more dissipated met to drink and riot, or perhaps to stake their money at a throw of dice,[6] in taverns.[7]

The amusements of the gay and licentious were perhaps as numerous as they are at present in Paris or London. At the theatre, which was opened by day, and not by night, the

[5] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxxvi. §§ 5, 6. Such were the *tonstrinæ* of Rome, and the *tabernæ* of the *medici* and *librarii*.

[6] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xv. § 4; *In Princip. Actorum*, homil. i. § 2. At Rome gamblers formed close associations: a few refused to be called "Dicers," and aspired to be styled "Backgammon players" (tesserarii)—the difference, says the historian, being about the same as between a thief and a highwayman. These people were admitted to the most fashionable circles, and if a man of Proconsular condition took precedence of them at a banquet, they would consider that an indignity had been cast upon them.—*Ammianus*, lib. xxviii. § 4.

[7] *Homil. In Martyres.* Taverns were so numerous at Rome, and were such general resorts, that Ammianus feared his readers might think that his whole history was about seditions, taverns, and such abominations. They were chiefly wine-shops, where the poorer classes would often pass the whole night. Ampelius the Præfect ordered that they should not be opened before ten o'clock in the morning.—Lib. xiv. § 6; xxviii. § 4.

indelicacy even of the modern ballet was exceeded. The minds of wild youth were inflamed by amorous songs, and such exhibitions of female dancers on the orchestra as modesty dare not record.[3] By the force of custom people were brought to tolerate on the stage sights with which elsewhere they would have been shocked. Sometimes the Holy Eucharist, and other rites of the Church, were profanely represented.[1]

After what we have stated, it is almost superfluous to add that actors and actresses were persons of the worst reputation; and, although admitted to the mansions of the great on festive occasions, were generally regarded as infamous, and habitually excluded from Christian communion.[2] It may also be supposed that where vulgar indecency thus supplied the place of poetry and artistic ingenuity, the drama was at a very low ebb. Tragedies and comedies, which the Romans had derived from the immortal dramatists of Greece, had almost ceased to be acted since the fall of the Republic, and

[3] *In* 1 *Thess. Homil.* v. § 4; *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xv. § 1; *De Lazaro Concio*, vi. § 5. The orchestra was a stage for dancing.

[1] *In Matt. Homil.* vi. § 8.

[2] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xii. § 5. See Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, book xvi. chap. iv. § 10.

their place was supplied by these shameless exhibitions, or by pantomimes, licentious farces, gaudy pageantry, and vocal and instrumental music of the most wanton description.[3] It is not to be wondered at that under such circumstances the minister of the Gospel raised his voice against all theatres. Setting aside the coarsest performances, still he felt that that effrontery with which a woman could address a large audience, and sing amorous songs in their presence, was utterly inconsistent with true modesty; and much more was she to be reprehended when, as often was the case, her words and gestures were both impure.[4] He pronounced the stage to be the seat of pestilence, the gymnasium of incontinence, and a school of luxury.[5] Satan, he asserts, was its author, and the architect of their theatres.[6] And it must be admitted that, perhaps, without a single exception, the Christian fathers, whenever they alluded to this subject, recorded against the stage a similar testimony.[7]

[3] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxxi.

[4] *In Matt. Homil.* xxxvii. al. xxxviii. § 6.

[5] *De Pœnitentia*, homil. vi. § 1.

[6] *In Matt. Homil.* vi. § 7.

[7] *S. Cyprian, Ep. ad Eucrat.*; *S. Augustin. Confess.* lib. iii.; *De Civ. Dei*, lib. i. cap. 32; *Sermo de Symbol.* Christianity and the Catholic Church were common subjects of

An affecting anecdote introduced into a sermon confirms our opinion as to the ordinary character of those who composed the *corps du ballet*. The preacher, when illustrating our Lord's assurance—"The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you" (Matt. xxi. 31)—proceeds thus:—"Have you not heard how that courtesan who went beyond all in impurity eclipsed all in piety? I speak not of the one in the Gospels, but of her who in our age was from the most iniquitous city of Phœnicia. This courtesan was formerly with us a prima donna,[8] and her name was celebrated, not in our city only, but even as far as Cilicia and Cappadocia. Many a property did she consume, and many orphans did she get possession of, so that several persons accused her of sorcery, as if she had laid her snares, not with the beauty of her person, but with magic spells. This same courtesan captivated even the brother of the empress, for her power was

ridicule in comedies. "There is hardly," said St. Gregory Nazianzen, "any gratification for the eye and ear so popular as a Christian exposed to mockery and insult in a comedy." "They have taken not a little from our Churches in order to transfer it to the theatre. . . . . I shall wonder if they do not make me also a subject of laughter while I am thus addressing you this day."—*Life* by Ullman, translated by Cox, sec. iii. chap. 1.

[8] *τὰ πρωτεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἔχουσα.*

great. But on a sudden, I know not how—or rather I do know well—she reflected, changed her mind, obtained the grace of God, despised all those things, and, casting aside the devil's illusions, hastened towards heaven. Really nothing was viler than she was whilst she was on the stage, but yet she afterwards surpassed many in strict chastity, and spent her time clothed in sackcloth. The Præfect was importuned, and soldiers were armed on her account, yet they could not remove her to the same stage, nor take her away from the virgins who had received her. She was thought worthy of the most holy mysteries, and when she had exhibited a zeal proportionate to her grace, she ended her life, having through grace cleansed herself from all defilements, and displayed much philosophy after her baptism. She shut herself up, and would not exchange even a look with her former lovers when they came for this purpose. Many years she passed, as if she had been in prison. Thus 'shall the last be first, and the first last.'"[9]

One homily in particular St. Chrysostom delivered, after he had been a year at Constantinople, against the public games, and more especially against the theatre. His congre-

[9] *In Matt. Homil.* lxvii. al. lxviii. § 3.

gation had attended these exhibitions during Passion Week, although they had also been listening attentively to his exhortations. This aroused his indignation. "Are these things to be endured or tolerated?" he asks, over and over again: "Old men have disgraced their hoary hairs; young men threatened their youth with ruin; fathers took their sons there, thus beginning by dragging into the pit of iniquity the age which was inexperienced in guilt. Certainly no one would be wrong if he were to call those who thus by their wickedness bring their children's souls to destruction, not fathers, but murderers of sons. 'Where is the harm?' you will say. Assuredly it is for this I mourn, because, when you are labouring under a disease, you do not know that you are sick, so as to call in the physician. Is your body made of stone or iron? You are clothed in flesh—human flesh—which is easier set on fire by lust than is dry grass." He then points out the danger arising from an actress elegantly and showily dressed, winning in her gestures, singing soft ballads and meretricious songs, and asks them if they can dare to say that they remain unmoved. They know perfectly well that even when the theatre is over, and she has gone away, yet her image, her words, dress,

looks, carriage, grace, figure—all continue in their minds. And then follow all kinds of domestic troubles; for when a man goes home, thinking of nothing but the pretty actress, his wife seems to him ugly and disagreeable, his children plagues, his servants nuisances, and all ordinary every-day matters are troublesome.

"I proclaim, therefore," he proceeds, "and publish distinctly, that if, after this exhortation and instruction, any one shall fall away to the vile wickedness of the theatre, I will not admit him within these rails; I will not impart the mysteries to him, nor will I permit him to touch the holy table; but, as shepherds separate the scabby from the sound sheep, lest they should communicate their disease, so will I do. Despise not, then, our sentence, for although we may be mean and wretched, yet we have received by Divine grace the dignity which enables us to accomplish this. But if you are horror-struck on hearing this sentence (for I see all looking mournful and penitent), let them repent, and the sentence is dissolved; for as we have received the power of 'binding,' so also of 'loosing.'"[1]

The amphitheatre was the favourite amusement of all classes. Wealthy citizens were

[1] *Contra Ludos et Theatra Homil.*

attracted by having conspicuous seats reserved for them, and to the poor the charge for admission was trifling. Gladiatorial contests had been prohibited by Constantine, but they must have lingered in the cities where St. Chrysostom preached. Gladiators are alluded to by him but rarely. He represents them as a rollicking, reckless set, who endeavoured by hard drinking, gormandizing, and luxurious living of all kinds, to drive away forebodings of the miserable fate which was probably in store for them.[2] However, their numbers were small.

[2] *In Rom. Homil.* xii. § 7. As late as 404 A.D., when Honorius celebrated his triumph at Rome, there were combats of gladiators, but these were the last. Lactantius, who wrote in the age of Constantine, shows in a fine declamatory passage that the citizens of Rome were then as fond as ever of playing at murder. (Lib. vi. cap. 20.) So were they when St. Augustine was a young man, as is evident from his *Confessions*. Theodoret accounts for the abolition of these shows by the following anecdote:—"A certain monk named Telemachus entered the amphitheatre when the games on account of Honorius were being celebrated, and, descending into the arena, endeavoured to dissuade the gladiators from joining in the mortal struggle. Indignant at the prospect of being deprived of their sanguinary enjoyments, the spectators stoned him to death. The Emperor, however, so much approved of the noble monk's attempt, that he had his name inscribed amongst the martyrs, and decreed that the abominable spectacles should be abolished."—*Theodoret, Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. cap. xxvi.

Although gladiatorial exhibitions were on the wane, it was still found necessary to gratify the savage taste of the day. Christianity would no longer permit men to shed each other's blood for the amusement of others, and so the people were indulged by being shown the furious onslaughts of wild beasts one upon another, or upon human opponents.[3] Even to these contests we have but few references, and hence we conclude that they also were growing unfashionable, and that the people were gradually becoming satisfied with less sanguinary exhibitions.

The games which in the days of classic antiquity had their origin at Olympia in Elis are supposed to have had great influence upon the national character of Greece. They were now at their native city on the eve of extinction, but were still celebrated with great splendour at Antioch, or rather Daphne, which had long been famous for the magnificence of its shows.[4] Foot-racing, wrestling, boxing,

[3] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xii. § 5.

[4] The Olympic festival is said to have been abolished A.D. 394, or four years before St. Chrysostom went to Constantinople. See *Athenæus*, lib. v. caps. 23, 24, for an account of the ancient shows at Daphne. Amongst other things was a coach, like the present king of Oude's, drawn by four elephants.

horse and chariot-racing over various courses, formed the programme of the entertainments. All who were to engage in trials of agility or strength underwent a previous training in the *palæstra* under a regular master, and runners in particular were restricted to a strengthening diet. The *pentathli*, or professors of leaping, quoit-throwing, running, wrestling, and boxing, used to try their strength with sandbags, and the younger pugilists by amicable boxing-matches.[5]

The greatest interest was taken by the people in the training of their favourites. Immediately after the arrival of a new batch of athletes was reported, a crowd of persons would visit them to examine their limbs and muscles.[6] No one of servile condition or notoriously bad character was allowed to contend, and so carefully was this rule observed that as a preliminary measure a herald demanded whether any one present could bring a charge of misconduct against the athlete,[7] or could show that he was a slave, a thief, or in any way of bad reputation.[8] When the day of trial

[5] *In Matt. Homil.* xxxiii. al. xxxiv. § 6.
[6] *De Sanctis Martyribus Homil.* § 2.
[7] *In Princip. Actorum*, homil. i. § 5.
[8] *In Hebr. Homil.* xvii. § 5.

arrived, the wrestler clothed himself with a garment soaked in oil, which he threw off before the contest began, and then was regularly anointed by one of his supporters.[9] After that he exhibited himself for general admiration. When actually engaged the slightest infringement of the laws of the contest would forfeit his claim to any reward.[1] A palm branch was the prize,[2] and at the close of the games the principal victors had their heads, and sometimes their right hands, decorated with a crown by the Emperor, or some other great person, to whose seat they ascended amidst the plaudits of the spectators, and the joyful exclamations of their backers.[3] Clothed in robes of victory, and with the laurel crowns upon their brows, the victors would then advance into the arena, whilst amidst breathless silence a herald proclaimed their triumph.[4]

[9] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. i. § 8; iii. § 3; *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* viii. § 3; *In* 2 *Tim. Homil.* viii. § 3. Hence the trainer was called by Cicero and Juvenal the "*Aliptes.*"—*In Coloss. Homil.* xi. § 3.

[1] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* v. § 1.

[2] *In Philip. Homil.* xii. § 2; *Ad Illuminandos Catechesis,* i. § 4; *De Verbis, Habentes eundem Spiritum,* homil. iii. § 9.

[3] *In Genes. Homil.* xxx. § 1; *In Psalm* ix. § 4; *In Coloss. Homil.* xi. § 3; *De Davide et Saule,* homil. ii. § 2.

[4] *De Baptismo Christi. Homil.* § 4; *De Mutatione Nominum,* homil. ii. § 1.

Such as engaged in these exciting struggles became so passionately fond of the amusement that they would not relinquish the profession of an athlete, but, when too old to contend themselves, became trainers, or else might be seen hanging about the stadium, and shouting their advice to the more youthful wrestlers, telling one to seize his opponent's leg, another to lay hold of a hand, or to clasp the other's back, and he would certainly gain the throw.[5]

Both at the Olympic games, and at the ordinary exhibitions of the hippodrome, chariot races afforded the most interesting and exciting sport to the citizens. The extravagance to which the enthusiasm of the different parties was carried is almost incredible. On one occasion, at Constantinople, their rivalry caused popular dissensions which shook the Empire to its very foundations, and in 532 A.D. the mutual hatred of the factions led to a sedition which almost laid the metropolis in ashes.[6] Persons of one side would meet over night at each other's houses, and form parties that they might sit together the whole day and the

[5] *In illud, Si esurierit Inimicus tuus, Homil.* § 5; *In 2 Cor. Homil.* xii. § 4; *De Resurrectione Mortuorum Homil.* § 3.

[6] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. xl.

better enjoy the sport.[7] The excitement was so great that the infatuated spectators seemed to have been worked upon by a magician's spell,[8] and, like Alypius, St. Augustine's friend, were, in spite of themselves and their previous resolutions, carried to a perfect furor by the exhibition.[9] Foolish people appeared to have lost all self-control: they would applaud St. Chrysostom's earnest denunciations of the games, and then, with singular inconstancy, repairing to them again, once more take a maddening interest in their favourite charioteer.[1] At one time the clamour of the hippodrome broke upon the Archbishop's solitude, and deeply afflicted him. As he sat at home, the noise, he said, sounded in his ears like the

[7] *De Mutatione Nominum*, homil. iv. § 2; *In Joan. Homil.* xi. At Rome, too, the circus was the most engrossing of all amusements. People lounged there, even when it was raining, from sunrise to sunset, minutely scrutinizing the peculiarities or defects of the horses and chariots. An innumerable multitude might be seen waiting with intense ardour the result of a pending contest. (*Ammianus*, lib. xiv. § 6.) To them it was a virtue to gain the first intelligence of the arrival of any new horses and chariots, and to pronounce before others an opinion upon them.—Lib. xxviii. § 4.

[8] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xii. § 5. τί δεῖ λεγειν τὰς μαγγανείας τὰς ἐν ταῖς ἱπποδρομίαις.

[9] *S. Augustin. Confess.* lib. vi. § 13.

[1] *De Lazaro Concio*, vii. § 1.

roaring of a storm at sea, and he could hear the cheers of the great men who were on the high tiers of seats mingled with the shouts of the mob below.[2] At last, indeed, his repeated warnings had some effect, and an unfortunate accident, before alluded to, which occurred after he had preached with much acceptance on this subject, added considerably to the weight of his exhortations. "Although," he says, "we should not speak a word, yet the accident which happened yesterday is sufficient to turn from this unreasonable passion even those who are mad and in raptures about the hippodrome. For the death which yesterday occurred in the hippodrome exhibited to our city a tragedy, attracted bands of women, and filled the forum with much wailing, whilst he who was so pitiably cut in two by the chariots was borne through the midst of the people. For he was about on the morrow, as I know, to light his marriage torches, his bridal chamber having been arranged, and all things prepared for his wedding. Acting on the Prætor's orders, he was running below on the course when intercepted in the midst by the chariots, which came on racing with one another. He suffered

[2] *Contra Ludos Homil.*

a violent and miserable death, his head and extremities being severed from his body."[3]

The fine exordium to the homilies on the Gospel according to St. John well represents to us the taste of the day. In the following words the preacher endeavours to claim his hearer's attention for the inspired words of the "Son of Thunder:"—

"They that are spectators of the heathen games, when they have learned that a distinguished athlete and winner of crowns is come from any quarter, run all together to view his wrestling, and all his skill and strength; and you may see the whole theatre of many ten thousands, all straining their eyes, both of body and mind, that nothing of what is done may escape them; so, again, these same persons, if any admirable musician come amongst them, leave all that they had in hand, which often is necessary and pressing business, and mount the steps, and sit listening very attentively to the words and the accompaniments, and criticizing the agreement of the two. This is what the many do.

"Again, those who are skilled in rhetoric do just the same with respect to the sophists, for they, too, have their theatres and their

[3] *Homil. in illud, Pater Meus, &c.* § 1. (vol. xii.)

audience, and clappings of hands, and noise, and closest criticism of what is said.

"And if in the case of rhetoricians, musicians, and athletes, people sit in the one case to look on, in the other to see at once and to listen with such earnest attention, what zeal, what earnestness ought you in reason to display, when it is no musician or debater who now comes forward to a trial of skill, but when a man is speaking from heaven, and utters a voice plainer than thunder! for he has pervaded the whole earth with the sound; and occupied and filled it, not by the loudness of the cry, but by moving his tongue with the grace of God."[4]

Every day were seekers after pleasure invited to some exhibition, and they obeyed the call with incredible ardour; gazing till they were stupefied, and yet never satiated with Satanic shows. The few who had a literary turn, or at least wished to gain a credit for it, resorted to the schools of the sophists and professors of rhetoric. Although these persons are alluded to in the above quoted, and in a few other passages, it is to be regretted that St. Chrysostom furnishes us with but little information regarding them. He considered them the

[4] *In Joan. Homil.* i.

most zealous opponents of Christianity,[5] but their arguments were often extremely puerile, and they suffered many defeats, which covered them with shame and ridicule.[6] Their chief aim was to gain the admiration of their hearers by a plausible display of subtle ingenuity, but, as they mystified and obscured the simplest truths, their lectures were vain and unprofitable.[7] Some of them were cynic philosophers, who went about with long beards and staves in their hands, clothed either in a coarse blanket, called a *tribon*, from its worn and threadbare appearance, or else in an *exormis*,—a garment which had a sleeve for the left arm only, leaving the right arm and shoulders exposed. They attempted to make an impression upon the public, not by any solid learning or purity of character, but simply by the peculiarity of their appearance.[8]

Besides the gorgeous exhibitions of which

[5] *Quod Christus sit Deus Lib.* § 14.

[6] *In S. Babylam Lib.* § 2.

[7] *De Lazaro Concio*, iii. § 3.

[8] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xvii. § 2; *De Virginitate Lib.* § 7; *De Verbis Habentes eundem Spiritum*, homil. i. § 3. Athenæus in similar language warns people against supposing that men were philosophers because they wore *tribons*, and uncut beards. (Lib. v. cap. xlvii.) Like St. Chrysostom, he plays upon the word *cynic*, and adds that these philosophers were mere men of words.—Lib. xiii. caps. xci. xcii.

an account has been given, there were many of an humbler description, confined to the lower orders, which were displayed in the open streets. At certain seasons, in particular, the plebeians were amused with the most absurd performances. The saturnalia of heathenism were still continued, and were only gradually giving way to Christmas festivities. At the commencement of the new year there was one custom, which was derived from antiquity, and has given rise to the waits in London and other cities. During the long winter nights at this privileged season musicians used to perambulate the city, and play serenades beneath the windows, that they might receive presents from the disturbed sleepers. Sometimes the performers were men disguised in female apparel, and wearing masks. Then in the day time there were actors of low comedy, who, instead of wearing masks, rubbed themselves over with smut. The performances of these fellows chiefly consisted of jeers and coarse fun thrown at the passers-by. There were also jugglers of various kinds: some carried with them swallows, which were taught to fly backwards and forwards, and take food out of their trainers' mouths.[9] Others would play,

[9] *In Kalendas Oratio*, § 1; *In Matt. Homil.* xxxv. al. xxxvi. § 3; *De Lazaro Concio*, i. § 1. See also an

dance, and perform so many curious feats, that they offered dangerous temptations to the idly disposed, and many a servant on his return home received a severe beating for lingering and gaping at such sights, instead of expediting his master's orders.[1] Here a man might be seen chewing nails or devouring shoes;[2] there others with cups, bowls, and cans fastened to their fingers, imitating cymbal players. Another would pipe and whistle vulgar tunes, sing of low amours at the top of his voice, and make the spectators laugh by sallies of buffoonery—all for a halfpenny or a dole of food.[3] Then there were some called *Titans*, who performed a kind of war-dance, feigned madness, frantically flourished swords, and ended, perhaps, by wreaking their artificial fury on a luckless dog which happened to be jogging by, and which they slaughtered on the spot.[4] Men, who anointed their bodies in a particular way, held snakes, which were then perfectly harmless.[5] Tumblers displayed extraordinary

allusion to a class of beggars called *Lotagœ*, *In Ephes. Homil.* xiii. § 3.

[1] *In Rom. Homil.* iv. § 4.

[2] *De S. Babylâ Homil.* § 8.

[3] *In* 1 *Thess. Homil.* xi. § 3.

[4] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* xvii. § 3.

[5] *In Coloss. Homil.* vi. § 4.

suppleness of limb, turning their body into the shape of a wheel, and then making a somersault upon the pavement, or tossing several knives into the air, and catching them again by the handles. One feat, frequently as it came under his observation, always amazed the Archbishop: a mountebank would stand balancing a pole upon his forehead, and keep it there as steady as if it were some large tree rooted in the ground. Nor was this all. He surpassed even the well-known London feat of balancing a donkey on a ladder, for at the top of the pole were placed two little children, who actually, when in that position, were engaged in wrestling with each other. Dancers upon the tight-rope were also to be seen; and if there was the slightest awkwardness on their part, or withdrawal of their attention, they must have tumbled down headlong, and inevitably perished. So regardless, however, were they of these perils, that they would dress and undress themselves upon the rope, as though they were sitting at their ease upon a couch.[6]

The arrangements made in the streets for promoting festivities remind us of scenes which are still witnessed in the East. The forum

[6] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xix. § 4. *In illud, Vidi Dominum,* homil. iii. § 2.

was crowned with garlands, numerous lamps were lighted, and before the shops were spread couches of green leaves, on which the citizens reclined, and gave themselves up to enjoyment.[7]

[7] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xxi. § 4. A description similar to the above is given of the Roman people at this period. Wherever the passer-by turned his eyes he might see numbers of females with braided hair,—some old enough to have reared families, if they had ever been married,—sliding along the pavement till they were thoroughly tired, and performing various evolutions which were imitations of the theatres. (*Ammianus*, lib. xiv. § 6.) "The common people—some of whom had not a shoe to their feet—called themselves by grand and imposing names. Their whole lives were spent in wine-bibbing, dicing, or frequenting loose houses, places of amusement, and the public spectacles. The Circus Maximus was their temple, their dwelling-house, place of meeting, and all the hope of the most covetous. And one might see small knots of them discussing matters in the forum, lanes, streets, and assemblies. Even men with hoary hairs and wrinkled features might be seen exclaiming that the State would be ruined if their champion in the next race did not get a good start, and bring his horses well in hand to the goal. So thoroughly rotten was the system of idleness that when the longed-for day arrived, before the sun was fairly risen they would hurry to see the contest, in thinking of which they had passed a sleepless night." (Lib. xxviii. § 4.) With regard to the lamps mentioned in the text, it may be observed that both Ammianus and Libanius say that Antioch was well lighted. The former declares that the lamps at night gave a light like the sun in the day.—Becker's *Gallus*, § vi.

It must be admitted that many of those by whom St. Chrysostom was surrounded, including a portion of his congregation, were a roystering set. The turf, the ring, dicing, the opera and play, formed their idea of "life," and were as much prized as they often are at the present time by men about town. The amusements, also, of the Constantinopolitan poor in the fourth century differed from those of to-day more in the names than in the reality. The idle youth, as he sauntered along the streets of Constantinople or Antioch, had as many inducements to delay as the whistling butcher's boy of London. Instead of the tempting invitation which has so often greeted the ears of the latter,—"One penny more, and up goes the donkey,"—the former probably heard the very similar words—"One obolus more, and up goes the youngster,"[8] only pronounced in sonorous Greek. The same might

[8] *In Hebr. Homil.* xvi. § 4. "Tell me what is more difficult than to fix a pole upon the face, and then that a child at the top should perform a thousand antics, and delight the spectators?" Petronius (*Satiric.* liii.) gives a similar account of the *Petauristæ* of Rome. "A mountebank," he writes, "stood with a ladder, and ordered a boy to dance a jig over the steps, and at the top; afterwards to pass through burning rings, and to hold a cask with his teeth."

be said of some of the other feats which we have detailed.

Amongst loungers of high and low condition there was the same kind of jesting, and the same use of slang phraseology, as at present. The motto of such persons now is often "a short life and a merry one;" and they had also their mottoes then. As the prototypes of Dickens' inimitable novel tried to drive away care by such expressions as "Never say die," and "What's the odds as long as you're happy?" so the rakish Greek or Syrian would utter some barbarous proverb, which fell as harshly as the above on ears polite. One such saying was selected by St. Chrysostom to be the subject of a discourse. "If the rich man, when he dies," they would say, "should be punished, and make atonement in the other life, the one life would make up for the other; but if he should also enjoy the same honours there as he does here, then all that is said about both lives ends in nothing."[9] With this saying wild fellows argued against their own consciences, or thought to involve their pious and troublesome friends in a dilemma.

[9] ὅτι οὗτος ὁ πλούσιος ἂν μὲν ἀπελθὼν ἐκεῖ κολασθῇ καὶ δῷ τιμωρίαν ἓν ἓν γέγονεν· ἂν δὲ κἀκεῖ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύσῃ τιμῶν, δύο γέγονεν οὐδέν.—*De Lazaro Concio*, i. § 11.

It was the slang of the day, and might be heard amidst roars of laughter, not only in the circus and the theatre, but also in private houses, the forums, and places of business. There was in it a sort of logic which took amazingly with the persons who used it, and as such it was thought worthy of a grave and deliberate refutation by the Christian preacher.

CHAPTER VII.

CITY LADIES.

Treatment of the sex.—Idea of beauty.—Influence of its charms.—Safeguards against them.—Position of the sex before and after marriage.—Dress.—Equipages.—A fine lady.—Domestic occupations.—Servants.—Dancing.—Profligacy.—Wedding festivities.

It requires greater moral courage in a preacher to censure the vanities and condemn the vices of the female portion of a congregation than to visit with inflexible severity the offences of his male hearers. There are so many reasons for showing indulgence to weaknesses which in the fair sex often approximate to virtues; so many accusations of indelicacy are sure to be brought against the rash hand which ventures to raise the veil, and expose their private life; so natural is our dislike to see their actions forming topics of discourse in public, that he must indeed be a bold reformer who should dare to subject their vices to the lash of his eloquence. Yet St. Chrysostom was as impar-

tial as he was bold. No sentiments of gallantry, or fear of other's opinions, led him to conceal the glaring vanities and gigantic follies for which the fashionable ladies of his day were distinguished. He rebuked them with stern, yet paternal and considerate severity.

We do not, however, presume to say that even this ascetic preacher was altogether insensible to their charms. He felt as one who knew the world, and acknowledged that there was a legitimate influence which the sex ought always to exercise. He spoke of beauty and grace, not as a hermit who had never seen them, but as a man who was well qualified to form an opinion of them, and his estimate of their worthlessness, when unassociated with virtue, was the better appreciated. His descriptions, if taken without the context, might by some be thought too free. He discoursed to his congregation of eyes which were "dark, round, soft and rolling," of "handsomely and elegantly-shaped" hands, and of "teeth beautifully set." [1] He dwelt on the soft attractions of "bright eyes, a smiling cheek, red lip, straight nose, polished on either side, and finely proportioned open brow, and upright neck." [2]

[1] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* iv. § 3.
[2] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxx. § 3; xxxi. § 3.

He did not deny the lover's temptations, and the passion which seemed to burn up his soul. He admitted the existence of the flame, and only sought for arguments which might be thrown as water upon it to quench it. He therefore depicted the opposing charms of holy faith, and declared that the tears of martyrs were preferable to the most moving appeals of beauty.

The fact is—whether wisely or unwisely is not now the question—St. Chrysostom did not abstain from giving exact descriptions of the temptations by which susceptible minds are assailed, and of the vices to which they yield. In the present day we conceal these matters. Sins which are the most prevalent, and which St. Paul did not blush to specify, are now obscurely hinted at by moralists, or passed by in silence. By which plan virtue is the gainer —whether that adopted by the fathers, or that of modern divines, is most effective—I leave the reader to determine. I shall content myself with abridging and paraphrasing a very long passage, to show how St. Chrysostom fights the battle of religion with a sinner step by step, and inch by inch. He first produces all the arguments on his opponent's side, and then weighs them well. The invincible power of beauty is urged by the weak gallant; but

whence, asks the preacher, has it such power? Is not the fault really with those who are led by it into sin? Is it only from a fair countenance that the temptation springs? Certainly not, for in that case a beautiful maiden would have all men for her lovers. But in truth the temptation springs, not from beauty, but from the unchaste eyes which look upon it. From eyeing it too curiously admiration arises, and the gazer becomes enamoured. Do you say that when you see a charming woman, you cannot help admiring her, and that your love springs not from your deliberate choice, and depends not on yourself? Nay, but do not hide from yourself the root of the evil. Others admire, but are not enamoured. The eyes exercise more despotic power than any other parts of beauty, yet children fall not in love with their parents' eyes, for you will not plead the force of nature in this case, and act as the Persians do. Then, again, it is clear that not beauty, but a careless and wandering soul is the cause of men being led astray, for they often pass by most beautiful women, and give themselves to such as are plainer. What then is the cause of unlawful love? Do you say that the Devil is? This may frequently be true, but the cause is also in ourselves. Sinful

love is a distemper which rises from habit, from soft words, idleness, and having nothing to do. Habit obtains in the end such a tyranny over us that it becomes moulded into a necessity of nature. But the gallant says that habit has nothing to do with it, for he fell in love at first sight. Well, then it was indolence, self-indulgence, carelessness in the discharge of duty. As the earth, when left fallow, sends up weeds, so also the idle soul has wicked desires; and as the eye must see something, and will look at evil things, if good things are not set before it, so also the thoughts which are not profitably employed will be taken up with what is unprofitable. Occupation and business will certainly beat off the first assault of beauty. Look on it no more, and you are delivered. How can you resist your desire, you ask? I answer, give yourself to books, to business, to the care of the poor, to prayer, to spiritual studies. By these you can not only cure a recent wound, but also an inveterate one. If the woman you think of were to insult you, your love would be cured: much more, then, may it be by spiritual pursuits. Of course, if you are always conversing and associating with those who shoot love's arrows, you are seeking to be wounded.

There are some thoughts, also, which may serve you as safeguards; which may quench your fire. Remember hell—desire the kingdom. The beauty which you see is flesh and blood, which soon will putrefy. Let, then, your mind pass from these to true beauty. You say, in answer to this, that you cannot see what we call beauty of soul. Ah! yes you may, as well as you can see a beautiful form, although it is not actually before you. With the mind we admire angels and archangels, and—though we see them not—holy habits and virtue of soul. The beauty of the soul knows no decay; it blooms for ever, and in its old age many are enamoured of it. If you would gain such beauty, go and find those who have it; give your love to those whom Christ loves. You shall attain this beauty through the grace and love towards men of our Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

Continence, they are told, must not only be shown in action: they must guard their thoughts; they must be careful how they derive pleasure from looking at a beautiful face, for they may be drawn by it to eternal misery.[4]

It is quite obvious that licentiousness and

[3] *In 2 Cor. Homil.* vii. §§ 6, 7.

[4] *De Resurrectione Mortuorum Homil.* § 2; *De Resurrectione D. N. Jesu Christi Homil.* § 5.

depravity were not confined in that age to one sex: the female portion of society had their full share. Their position gave them considerable power for evil or good. Ladies were treated with more deference and respect than might have been expected in a city like Constantinople, which was originally Greek. The influence of Rome, where chaste matrons had been always venerated, and the diffusion of Christianity, had gained for them a consideration which in heathen Greece they never enjoyed. Yet it was necessary for St. Chrysostom to remind many of his hearers that although woman was made subject to man, her subjection must be rendered tolerable and mild by his affection. She must not be treated as a brute: she was made his helpmate, but she is no longer such if looked upon as a horse, a bullock, an ass, a mule—in fact, as a beast of burden.[5] True, man is lord of the creation, but woman shares his empire. God gave to both together dominion over all His works.[6]

Until the day of their marriage, which ordinarily was celebrated very early, ladies lived in oriental seclusion. The closest watch was kept over them as long as they resided

[5] *In Genes. Sermo.* iv. §§ 1, 2.
[6] *In Cap.* i. *Genes. Homil.* x. § 4.

under the parental roof: they were not permitted to frequent places of public resort, to take evening walks, nor even to associate with their relations.[7] Spending long hours in retirement, their occupation was to study embellishments of the toilette, or to look over their jewels, whilst reclining on soft tapestry, inhaling delicate perfumes, and waited upon by a numerous company of elegantly attired handmaidens.[8] To such a mode of life, and not to any natural infirmity of the sex, was to be attributed their extreme delicacy and weakness, both of body and mind.[9] For the most part they were a set of frivolous prattlers, except, indeed, when religious discussions were introduced. Their devotion, or sometimes evil passion, was then engaged, and if they did not always speak wisely, they were at least in earnest.[1] But when no such matters of absorbing interest engrossed their attentions, ladies were sad triflers. St. Chrysostom had

[7] *In illud, Propter Fornic. Uxorum Homil.* § 2; *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xii. § 5.

[8] *Quales ducendæ sint Uxores Lib.* § 7; *In Ephes. Homil.* xiii. §§ 3, 4. Matrons, even, do not seem to have frequented the theatres and banquets, as they did at Rome.

[9] *In Hebr. Homil.* xxix. § 3.

[1] *In Ephes. Homil.* xi. § 5. Socrates relates how eager the ladies were in discussing the Arian controversy.—*Hist. Eccl.* lib. 2, cap. 2.

often to complain in church of their garrulity, which he did not hesitate to remind them was an ordinary failing of the sex.[2]

He sometimes ventured to enumerate their vanities, and entered with so much minuteness into details that the reader now is induced to smile, and many a fair cheek must then have been suffused with blushes. He shows that the love of dress was their ruling passion: to set a cincture or a cap with taste was a matter of great moment.

The fashions were sometimes as indelicate as any that have been seen in modern ball-rooms, and ladies were earnestly exhorted not only to lay aside many superfluous ornaments, but to wear such a dress as would "cover them completely and decently."[3]

It must be admitted that St. Chrysostom not only had a sharp eye to detect finery, but in certain cases such a contempt for ordinary neatness, as we scarcely now-a-days think expedient in a moralist. Not but that he was guided by Christian prudence; for to ladies who occupied such a position as required them

[2] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* ix. § 1; *In Ephes. Homil.* xv. § 2.

[3] The light tunic, which is so frequently seen represented on statues, had such a wide opening for the neck, that when a lady stooped it slipped over her shoulder.—Becker's *Gallus*, § vi.

to make a figure in the world he recommended not only neatness, but handsome dress, provided useless finery was avoided.[4] Yet, on the other hand, we find him congratulating the Deaconess Olympias, not because she refused to wear gold and sumptuous apparel, but because she went about like a beggar woman. He was delighted to see that in her attire and movements nothing was studied, but in all such matters she was thoroughly careless—in fact what we should call slovenly.[5]

Considerable progress must have been made at this period in the manufacture of gloves, for they so exactly fitted the hands that "they appeared as if they were natural appendages."[6] But the attention of ladies, just as much as of gentlemen, was particularly devoted to their shoes. Neither square nor round toes were the fashion, but such as came to a sharp point. The fit was neat, the breadth of the sole being concealed as much as possible. They were polished with brilliant jet, and were ornamented

[4] *In Ephes. Homil.* xx. § 7.

[5] *Ad Olymp. Epist.* ii. §§ 6, 9.

[6] St. Chrysostom does not give us the name of these articles. He merely describes the way in which ladies covered their hands. *Manicæ,* or gloves, were worn in Persia, and had probably been introduced from thence at Constantinople.

with gold and jewels.[7] In short, women took as much care of their shoes as of their faces, and that, as we shall see, is saying a great deal.[8] At such an absurd degree of vanity in this article of dress had they arrived, that St. Chrysostom—although he felt that he might be charged with taking too much notice of trifles—yet made it the subject on more than one occasion of special remonstrance. His fair hearers evidently considered that his specification was impertinent: to have a fine bright shoe, they thought, was at the worst but a peccadillo. "Yes, yes," said he, "but these peccadilloes become weighty sins if they are neglected. Now just observe to what a height this evil has reached. It is enough to make one laugh to see you with silk in your shoes so fine that it is too good for your garments. St. Paul says that woman should not be adorned 'with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array,' but you adorn even your shoes in this way. And for the sake of them a ship is built, rowers, a pilot, and a captain are appointed, the sail is spread, and the merchant, leaving wife, children, and country, commits himself to the waves, and sails away to barbarous countries, that he may get you silk

[7] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* viii. § 2. [8] *In Kalendas Homil.* § 5.

to sew into your shoes, and show off the leather."[9]

Of course when such extravagance was indulged in ordinary articles of dress, jewellery was not neglected. The goldsmith's shop was the ladies' constant resort, and there they would sit to watch his labours, lest he should abstract any of the precious metal which they had given him to be made into ornaments.[1] Some wore earrings, which, if sold, would have realized a sum sufficient to feed thousands of poor people.[2] Husbands, from foolish sentiments of pride, encouraged this love of finery. In the flaunting ostentation of their wives they beheld a reflection of their own wealth, and were flattered.[3] They were, therefore, very properly told that it was their own fault if their spouses had jewelled fingers, "bits of gold" hanging at their ears and down their cheeks, or laid round about their necks and in their chambers.[4]

[9] *In Matt. Homil.* xlix. al. l. §§ 4, 5. These words were intended in the first instance for young men, but the preacher adds (§ 6) that they are also designed for matrons and young women.

[1] *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 7.

[2] *In Matt. Homil.* lxxxix. al. xc. § 4.

[3] *In Ephes. Homil.* xiii. § 4; *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 7.

[4] *In Ephes. Homil.* xx. § 7.

Perfumes of the most costly description from India, Arabia, Persia, and Ethiopia were lavishly employed.[5] Nor were ladies satisfied with the charms which nature had bestowed upon their faces, but they thought to heighten them artificially. Desiring to be better artists than their Creator, and discontented with His workmanship, they painted their cheeks, and stained their eyebrows black, and their lips red. St. Chrysostom indignantly exposes such follies. He argues hypothetically, supposing that some married woman asks what she can do, as she adorns herself with cosmetics, not because she cares herself about her appearance, but for her husband's sake, and in order that she may retain his affection. To this he replies, that God had made her either beautiful or plain: if beautiful, will her beauty be increased by smearing herself with red and white earth? As well might she overlay a golden statue with a daubing of mire. If she is plain, she deceives herself by supposing that nature can thus be improved. Her attempt to conceal ugliness is vain. Let her try a different plan, and make it her object to cultivate the meek and quiet spirit, which is far better

[5] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* ii. § 3.

than external charms.[6] She does not become attractive by having a mouth like a bear's when dyed with blood, eyebrows blackened as with the smut of some kitchen utensil, or cheeks whitened with dust like the walls of sepulchres.[7] Are smut, cinders and dust beauties or deformities? Cultivate that beauty of soul which is lovely in the sight of angels, desired of God, and delightful to your husbands; that of which Christ is a lover; and 'so,' as the Psalmist says, 'shall the king have pleasure in thy beauty.'"[8]

Distinguished matrons, when they left their houses, appeared in magnificent style. They either rode on mules, or drove in chariots drawn by mules, which were milk white, when such could possibly be procured. Their harness was inlaid with gold, and the animals' faces glistened with it. A cavalcade of slaves and eunuchs followed.[9] Ladies were so reluctant to appear in public on foot that many

[6] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* iv. § 3.

[7] This is precisely the way in which some Eastern courtesans are adorned, or rather disfigured. White, red, and black were the colours anciently used by Greek, and in later ages by Roman ladies.

[8] *In Matt. Homil.* xxx. al. xxxi. § 6; *In Joan. Homil.* lxix. § 3.

[9] *In Ephes. Homil.* xx. § 8; *In Rom. Homil.* xi. § 6; *In illud, Salutate Priscillam, &c. Homil.* i. § 3.

would not so much as cross a street unless they had their mules to draw them.[1] With bitter satire the preacher compares them to beggars who had lost the use of their limbs, and could not move about unless they were carried. He told them that if, when the lady wished to go out, her husband should require the mules for some other purpose, she was peevish, angry, or obstinately silent; or, if she had forgotten that they would be wanted for her own use, and had sent them away, then she was angry with herself, and consumed by ill-humour. Precisely the same results would follow when one of the mules had fallen lame, or when they were sent annually to grass: the poor lady was in a pitiable case; she was tied to the house, and could not go out, even if called by urgent business.[2]

We are enabled to form a pretty accurate notion of a fine lady of that day. Encumbered with a profusion of jewels, having her eyes stained, and face painted, or else washed with particular preparations, she had a mincing gait, an affected voice, a languishing and wanton look. The nicely-wrought girdle, well-fitting shoes, cloak, and boddice, were all put

[1] *In Matt. Homil.* vii. § 5.
[2] *De Virginitate Liber*, § 66.

on with the most scrupulous care.[3] Of course her husband suffered for all this. If one of their neighbours happened to appear in a costly mantle, his wife would urge him to procure a more costly one for her. Often did men stint and almost starve themselves that they might see their wives showily apparelled.[4]

So contagious had this rage for dress become, that even virgins who professed entire devotion to a religious life were not insensible to the suggestions of vanity. They were charged with exchanging the costume of the Church for that of the play-house, so as to imitate actresses and stage singers,[5] and sometimes with paying more attention to these trifles than did people of fashion; for although they could not wear silk, gold, or jewels, yet, by arranging homely materials with studious taste, they contrived to appear as elegant as the gayest.[6]

But now let us take a peep at a lady's domestic arrangements. If a good housewife, she retained the ancient custom of Greece, and might be seen, like Penelope, in the midst of her maidens, who were weaving in silence,

[3] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* viii. § 2; *In Philip. Homil.* x. § 3.
[4] *In Rom. Homil.* xi. § 6. [5] *In Rom. Homil.* xxx. § 4.
[6] *Ad Olymp. Epist.* ii.

or else she was setting to each of her domestics his appointed task, and superintending the performance.[7] Female slaves were very numerous, and the treatment which they received was often anything but gentle. It was no rare occurrence for the whole house to be filled with clamour, and if the street was narrow all the passers-by might hear the mistress rating her weeping handmaid. Another sound, still more disgraceful, was said to be sometimes heard. Then, said the plain-spoken preacher, "all the women round immediately look out at window, and ask, 'What is the matter there?' 'Such an one,' it is answered, 'is beating her maid.'" Some lashed their servants, and that with great ferocity. They would strip a luckless damsel, call their husband to help them, and then tie her to the bed-post, whilst they exhausted upon her their vocabulary of abuse, calling her by such choice phrases as "a Thessalian witch,"[8] "a runaway," "a prostitute." If a friend ventured to remonstrate with such a mistress, she would say in excuse, "The whole tribe of slaves become intolerable if

[7] *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxxvi. § 5.

[8] The people of Thessaly were ridiculed and despised for their superstitions. Horace writes with contempt of "Thessalian portents."—Epist. ii. 2, 208.

they are indulged: they are a troublesome, audacious, impudent, incorrigible race." She never suspected that kindness and encouragement might avail much more than flagellation and terror. Brutal dames had been seen to drag their maid-servants by the hair of their heads, and to swear at them roundly. All these particulars the preacher laid before his hearers. No wonder that he asked them why they all blushed, and hung down their heads.[9]

Some ladies were so unwise as to employ a vast number of female domestics, all of them being selected for their personal beauty. The consequence, perhaps, was, that their lords would pay too delicate attentions to some one who was handsomer than the rest, or, if a gentleman was innocent of any evil designs, still a chance expression in approval of his servant's charms would make the lady grieve that admiration was bestowed upon her servant rather than herself.[1]

St. Chrysostom gave his advice freely in all these cases, and impartial persons will admit that ladies ought to have congratulated themselves on having such a monitor. When we are angry with our servants, he says, we should

[9] *In Ephes. Homil.* xv. §§ 3, 4.
[1] *De Virginitate Lib.* § 67.

consider our own trespasses, and then we may learn from them a lesson of forbearance. When we chance to be in a passion, and abusive, our servant bears an insult quietly: we then are foolish; he is a wise man. And consider, that although he is a servant, he has an immortal soul. In this most important of all matters he is our equal. Yet, because we have some trifling human superiority, he bears our injuries with meekness; and we are not so wise through fear of God as he is through fear of us. Let us, then, speak gently to servants, considering our own transgressions, and the common nature of man.[2]

St. Chrysostom was occasionally very severe upon the gaieties of ladies, and especially upon dancing. When, indeed, we consider that throughout the East it has, according to immemorial custom, been pronounced indecorous for persons of rank or respectability to enjoy themselves in a dance, we are not surprised to find an Oriental bishop scandalized upon hearing that some of his flock were guilty of such an impropriety. Dancing was denounced by him as a work of the evil one. He called it "leaping, and bounding, and disgracing our common nature." By this, he said, Satan snared Herod

[2] *In Joan. Homil.* xxvii. al. xxvi. § 3.

so that he was ready to give up half of his kingdom for a dance, and for this now effeminate young men give up their souls.[3] God did not give us feet that we might jump about like camels,—for really women are as disagreeable as those beasts, when dancing,—but that we might walk orderly, and join the choirs of angels.[4] Shall a virgin dance before her fellows and yet feel no shame? It was bad enough to see these things at the theatre, but disgraceful to introduce them into the house.[5] However, when reading such strictures, we must keep in mind that in the East dancing has always been inseparably connected with immorality and licentiousness; and however much St. Chrysostom might have despised a modern ball-room, he would never have applied to it the above language.

It would have been well if he had found no more to condemn in the sex than what are sometimes indulgently styled their little weaknesses. By mentioning these, indeed, he raised against himself more determined and influential enemies than he could have done by a thousand declamations against sin. But he

[3] See *St. Mark* vi. 23.

[4] *In Matt. Homil.* xlviii. al. xlix. § 3.

[5] *In Coloss. Homil.* xii. § 4.

did not omit these latter also, and he lifts up the veil from a revolting state of female profligacy. That most sickening of all sights, a drunken woman, was not uncommon in high places at Constantinople, and mistresses, especially such as were advanced in years, might be seen rolling helplessly amongst their slaves.[6] Even from the lips of beauty would exhale the fumes of stale wine, and many a man found, when too late, that he had taken a glutton or a drunkard to be his partner for life. The proofs of her excess in eating and drinking were soon obvious in a florid countenance, flabby body of disgusting bulk, or bloodshot and distended eyes, contrasting strongly with the blooming faces of poorer women, who partook of spare diet and a frugal table.[7]

A great many of these evils were to be traced to the extravagance and dissipation which were indulged in at weddings.

Marriage was generally a matter of convenience. It was arranged for the young people by their parents. When a father thought that it was time for his son to marry, he would open a negotiation with the father or mother of

[6] *In Matt. Homil.* lvii. al. lviii. § 4; *In Tit. Homil.* iv. § 1.

[7] *In Ephes. Homil.* xv. § 3; *In* 1 *Cor. Homil.* xxxix. § 9.

some damsel. Both parties then agreed to hold a meeting, and at the appointed time witnesses for each would be in attendance. Usually there were frequent interviews and much haggling before the bargain was finally struck.[8] Then they drew up settlements, which were uniformly headed with the names of the consuls for the time being, and were not legally valid without them.

From the language of St. Chrysostom we conclude that marriage was not always viewed as a religious rite, for he only recommends, but does not enjoin, that priests should be invited, and the union sanctified by prayers and blessings.[9]

[8] *In Psalm.* xlviii. § 7; *In illud, Vidi Dominum,* homil. ii. § 3. The Greeks and Romans considered that children were at the disposal of their parents for marriage. It is curious to find Diodorus and Quintus Curtius recording with evident disapproval that in India there were regular courtships and love matches. They must have heard of that obsolete rite, the Svayamvara, according to which a Hindu maiden selected her husband from a number of suitors.—*Diod. Sic.* xix. 33; *Q. Curtius,* ix. 1.

[9] *In Genes. Homil.* xlviii.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CLERGY — CONCLUSION.

St. Chrysostom's idea of a Clergyman.—Bishops and Presbyters, what? — Patriarchs of Constantinople. — Wealth and rank of Bishops.—Character of Bishops.—Their worldliness.—Frivolous complaints of their conduct. —Eminent Prelates. — Country Clergy. — Election of Clergy.—Concluding reflections upon St. Chrysostom's influence as a Reformer.

As highly-flavoured descriptions of the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan laity have been served up to the reader, it is but fair that I should not conclude without offering him some accounts of the clergy as they are found in the Essays and Sermons of St. Chrysostom. But before we form any opinion of the clerical character as exhibited in that age, we should consider that the Patriarch of Constantinople was a severe judge; and certainly his ideal standard of what a clergyman ought to be was fixed higher than it would be by ecclesiastical reformers of the present time. A review of

such works of his as specially refer to the pastoral office satisfies us of this, and at the same time proves, that having reflected much upon the duties of that office, he was quite competent to give evidence of the way in which they were discharged.

He was of opinion that the priesthood must be ranked amongst the heavenly orders, and that, therefore, the man who is called to celebrate the holy mysteries of the Gospel ought to be as pure as are all who are admitted to stand in heaven.[1] The soul of a Bishop ought to be so bright and beautiful that it must at once delight and enlighten the souls of all lookers on; for the vices of ordinary persons are kept in comparative obscurity, and destroy only the perpetrators, but the crimes of an eminent and well-known individual are injurious to the many, by encouraging the negligent in indifference, and filling such as are earnest in religion with spiritual pride. Thus, the errors of obscure persons inflict no mortal wound upon religion, but as men judge of a sin according to the dignity of those who commit it, the sins of men in high station appear the more heinous.[2] Such will meet

[1] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 4; vi. §§ 2, 10.
[2] *Ib.* lib. iii. § 14.

with severer punishment than others, as they did under the old law, when the daughters even of priests were visited with the greatest severity for their offences, on account of their father's dignity.[3]

Hence a Bishop's life must be one of continual self-denial and watchfulness—more so even than a monk's.[4] He ought to have a hundred eyes, so as to watch, not for himself only, but for all his people. It is not asceticism which is required of him. That may be all very well for such as live in a cloister, but it will not lead a pastor's flock to make progress in grace. The minister of God who would bring them to this requires another species of self-denial. He must be ready to endure with good humour, scoffs, injuries, and groundless accusations. These trials are too severe for many who can submit to bodily hardships. But if a man indulges intemperate passion, anger without cause, and a violent disposition, he is wholly unfit to be a Bishop, although, on the other hand, the Church will suffer no injury if he is not conspicuous for austerity and bodily mortifications."[5]

[3] *Ib.* lib. vi. § 2; *Cf. Levit.* iv. 3, 14; xxi. 9.

[4] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi. § 4.

[5] *Ib.* lib. iii. §§ 12, 13; *In Joan. Homil.* lxxxvi. al. lxxxv. § 4.

A Bishop should be a fluent preacher, but he must be on his guard against the effects of the popularity which will follow upon this. Should he falter or break down when discoursing from the pulpit and rebuking sinners, they will endeavour to veil their own infamy by exposing his defects.[6] He must also be a man of learning and studious habits: as St. Paul says, he must "give attendance to reading," so that the word of Christ may dwell in him richly in all wisdom. If, when disputes arise, he is not able to convince the gainsayers, a most virtuous life will not save him from ridicule; and when his people see their leader confuted, they will probably fall into heresy or infidelity.[7] He should, moreover, have skill in composition, for it will be a great disgrace to him if he is detected preaching the sermons of others; and he ought to have such eloquence as may impress and bring to a better mind those who only attend sermons, as they would theatres, for amusement, and not for edification.[8]

[6] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. v. § 3.

[7] *Ib.* lib. iv. §§ 8, 9.

[8] *Ib.* lib. v. § 1. These passages are intended to guard against the error of many who rejected all study and mental culture for preachers, maintaining that everything must proceed from the operation of the Holy Ghost. St. Augustine opposes this error in some passages which are

Yet he must have a real contempt for popular applause, or else he will only preach such doctrines as gratify popular taste. He must drive like a skilful coachman, so as to avoid dull preaching on the one side and a love of applause on the other.[9] Let him endeavour to find sufficient compensation for all his labours in a consciousness that he has preached such doctrines as are pleasing to God.[1]

A Bishop must be very prudent in the management of his conduct, and especially avoid pride and arrogance.[2] He must have gravity without pride; be feared, and yet be courteous; apt to command, yet sociable; accepting no man's person, yet being as a servant; humble, yet not servile; fervent, yet gentle; a man of generous impulses, and yet having patience towards all. He must be a wise manager and good economist;[3] be careful to avoid all appearance of evil, and, like St. Paul, not disregard even the unjust suspicions of the multitude, but clear himself with meek-

collected by Neander, *Memorials of Christian Life*, part ii. chap. 4.

[9] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. v. §§ 2, 3.

[1] *Ib.* lib. v. § 7.

[2] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi. § 3; *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* x. § 1; *In Tit. Homil.* ii. § 2.

[3] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 16.

ness and condescension.[4] He must be guarded even in his dress, so as not to disgust people by the coxcombry or the negligence and disorder of his attire.[5]

In short, St. Chrysostom's treatise on the priesthood might be entitled "The Ideal of a Bishop." Although the author was not so visionary as to expect perfection in ecclesiastics, yet he represented perfection as the standard which they ought to follow; and this must be kept in mind when we discover the grief and indignation with which he exposes their shortcomings and offences.

The members of the clerical body were distinguished from the laity, inasmuch as the latter were styled "seculars," or men involved in the affairs of the world.[6] The greatest respect was paid to Bishops: on some occasions they were treated with more reverence than the Emperor.[7] They were called "rulers," "masters," or "fathers;"[8] and the seats which they occupied in Church were styled "thrones."[9] It was their duty to examine all

[4] *Ib.* lib. vi. § 9. *Cf.* 2 *Cor.* viii. 20, 21; *Rom.* xii. 17.
[5] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. vi. § 3.
[6] *De Lazaro Concio*, iii. § 1; *In Rom. Homil.* xxiii. § 1.
[7] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. iii. § 2.
[8] *Ib.* homil. iii. § 1.
[9] *In Coloss. Homil.* iii. § 4.

candidates for holy orders,[1] and to them the power of conferring ordination was exclusively confided;[2] so that St. Chrysostom was of opinion that the Presbyters who were said by St. Paul to have laid their hands upon Timothy must have been of episcopal degree. Chrysostom, indeed, declared that formerly the only difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter was, that the latter had not the power of ordination.[3]

The Presbyters were the Bishop's council, and as such gave their opinion of his conduct with the utmost freedom.[4] A Bishop in writing

[1] *De Decem. Mill. Talent. Homil.* § 4.

[2] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* xi. § 1.

[3] *In* 1 *Tim. Homil.* xiii. § 1; *In Philip. Homil.* i. § 1. Neander (*Church History*, vol. iii. § 2) writes:—"Yet a Chrysostom and a Jerome still asserted the primitive equal dignity of the Presbyters and Bishops; very justly believing that they found authority for this in the New Testament;" and he refers to the 11th Homily on the 1st Epistle to Timothy. But certainly this statement is quite incorrect. Chrysostom's words are:—"Ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐταὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει. Τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους." Whether rightly or wrongly is not the question, but he undoubtedly declares that there was some, although only a slight, difference between Bishops and Presbyters, and that only the former could ordain.

[4] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 15.

to a Presbyter, or even to a Deacon, subscribed himself "your Fellow-Presbyter," or "your Fellow-Deacon"[5]—so far was he from having learnt the modern rule, which places such a wide gulf between the higher and lower ministers of Christ. However, there were sad divisions and disunions between the episcopacy and presbytery.[6]

The See of Constantinople had at this time, with the assistance of the Eastern emperors, arrived at a degree of magnificence and pre-eminence which none of its prelates had before claimed. When Constantine the Great made Byzantium his seat of empire, the Bishops of this new metropolis acted upon the principles for which the Bishop of Rome had already become distinguished, and claimed rights and privileges commensurate with the dignity of their capital. At the suggestion of Theodosius the Great, the Council of Constantinople held in the year 381 decided that that See, or, as they called it, New Rome, should rank next after Rome, and consequently be superior to the Sees of Antioch and Alexandria. Nectarius was the first Bishop who enjoyed these new and invidious honours, and thus his

[5] *In Philip. Homil.* i. § 1.
[6] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 15.

successor John Chrysostom had the misfortune to find himself in a position which naturally excited the jealousy and opposition of the Bishop of Alexandria.[7] On this account a faithful discharge of his duties was a work of real danger, and the prelates by whom he was surrounded were the better able to resist his reforming energy.

The wealth and dignity of the Bishops and clergy generally had of course been augmented by the rise and progress of the Patriarchal See, and the worldly advantages which were thus held out induced many to press into clerical offices who had not reflected upon their importance.[8] Not but that great holiness and devotion were often exhibited, and some earnest souls were so depressed by a feeling of their infirmities that they shrank from the responsibility of pastoral duties. "I am struck with astonishment at those who desire so great a burden," said Chrysostom. "Wretched and

[7] Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, Cent. IV.

[8] The Emperor Julian saw and admired this assumption on the part of Bishops, but he made no distinction between their temporal and spiritual claims. He said that the heathen priests "should take a lesson from the Christian Bishops, and assert their dignity as superior to all earthly rank, claim respect from all officers of the state, and never humble themselves in their presence."—*The Emperor Julian and his Generation*, by Neander, § iii.

unhappy man, do you see what it is that you desire? If you are by yourself, unknown and undistinguished, though you commit ten thousand faults, you have only one soul for which to give an account, and for it alone will you be answerable; but when you are raised to this office, consider for how many persons you are obnoxious to punishment."[9]

Others besides St. Chrysostom have given their testimony to prove the degradation of the clergy in this century. His predecessor Gregory complained bitterly of the state in which he found them, and, after retiring from the See, indulged his feelings by writing a poem upon Bishops, from which we conclude that unless the devout Nazianzen has woefully exaggerated the evil, his Prelates were both vicious and contemptible. "I am weary of the struggle with envy, and with the *holy* Bishops," he writes satirically, "who destroyed all chance of union on public spirited grounds, and sacrificed the cause of the faith to their private squabbles."[1]

[9] *In Tit. Homil.* i. § 3.

[1] Ullman's *Life*, translated by Cox, Sec. iv. chap. 1. It may be interesting to see how a heathen also viewed the divisions, avarice, and luxury of Christians, and how patronizingly he could write of the humbler clergy. Ammianus (lib. xxvii. § 3) records the accession of Juventius

The moral courage of St. Chrysostom never shone in such bright colours as when, under a strong conviction that his interference was called for, he exposed the vices of his own order, and exhorted Bishops to set better examples to their flocks. He felt that he was

to the Præfecture of Rome, and then proceeds thus:—Damasus and Ursinus were inflamed with such an unnatural desire of seizing the episcopal chair, that with opposite designs they contended furiously. The partisans of each proceeded so far as to inflict wounds and death on one another. Juventius was unable to restrain or conciliate them, and was driven by violence into the suburbs. In the contest which followed, the party of Damasus was victorious, and it is certain that a hundred and thirty-seven bodies of the slain were found in one day in the Basilica of Sicininus, where there is a conventicle for Christian worship. And I do not deny, when I consider the pomp and display of the city, that they who covet such things ought to wrangle with all their might for the sake of obtaining the object of their desires. For when they have gained them they may be quite at their ease, be enriched with the offerings of matrons, ride in carriages, be neatly dressed, and have such extravagant banquets as exceed even royal tables. They might be equally blessed, if, despising the civic greatness which they injure by their vices, they would live in imitation of some provincial Bishops, whose modesty and purity are commended to the eternal Deity and his true worshippers by their abstinence in eating and drinking, their simplicity in dress, and the humility of their demeanour." It will be seen that Ammianus confirms in this passage all that Chrysostom says regarding the excessive luxury and avarice of urban Bishops, and the rustic piety of the country clergy.

making enemies, but he also knew that the wound, having become gangrened, it was absolutely necessary to apply the knife. And the Christian hero did not rebuke a set of persons who were without friends and influence, and were held in contempt. He spoke his mind manfully of Bishops who enjoyed more honour than consuls and præfects. "If you enter the palace," he said, "who has the first rank? If you visit matrons, or the houses of the nobility, no one is preferred to the Bishop."[2] To move in the highest circles was, he thought, little creditable to them, although they set much store by it. "All things," he exclaimed, "have gone to ruin, and become corrupt. I say not this with a wish to shame you, but to restrain your eagerness." His words were especially aimed at such Presbyters as were anxious to obtain the episcopal dignity before they had weighed its burdensome responsibilities. He reminded them that the duties were truly arduous if discharged conscientiously. They must be really useful. If they

[2] St. Jerome writes in the same way of Bishops. "It is disgraceful to see consuls, lictors, and soldiers watching before the doors of a priest of the poor and crucified Christ, who himself used to live upon strangers' food: or to know that the judge of the province had rather dine with you than in a palace."—(*Ep. Ad. Nepot. De Vitâ Clericorum.*)

were not so, gentleness of demeanour was not sufficient, nor even blameless lives and liberal manners. The troubles in which the Church was involved arose because they did not aim so much to preside over brethren as to gain honour and repose. "I speak as I feel," he added; "I do not think that many in the priesthood are such as shall be saved.—I believe that many more are appointed to perdition; and for no other reason than because their office requires an enlarged mind." The qualities which might have made them respectable in private life were often unequal to the duties of their high office, and they yielded to its strong temptations. He did not refer to those who actually oppressed the poor, but who were such as are spoken of by Ezekiel:—"Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves. Should not the shepherds feed the flocks?" Which of them had attended to their flocks as Jacob did to Laban's, and could say, "In the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night; and my sleep departed from mine eyes"? "Consider what Simon Magus suffered; for what difference is it if you do not actually pay money, yet scheme, design, and give flattery instead of gold. 'Thy money perish with thee,' said Peter to him; and he

would say also to such as these, 'Your anxiety perish with you, because you have thought that the gift of God may be possessed by human circumventions.' But is there no such person as this? Would there were not. I do not wish to apply to you anything that is said, but we have fallen into this style in the train of our discourse. For when we attack avarice we do not speak to you, nor to any one person. Do not think that anything we have said proceeds from any hostile feeling; it is for edification. 'A brother that is helped by a brother,' says the Scripture, 'is as a strong city.'[3] Be not indignant, then, for neither do I despise your sermons, but I would wish to be set right by you, and to learn from you."

But the great Archbishop fell a victim to his zeal for the Church's purity, and his honest endeavours to reform the Bishops and clergy. "You know why they are going to depose me," he said to his congregation: "It is because I have not laid down any carpets, worn silk dresses, encouraged their gluttony, offered them gold and silver."[4] And when his friend Olympias was anxious lest he should fall into

[3] *Prov.* xviii. 19, according to the Septuagint. Our version is different.

[4] *Antequam iret in Exsilium Oratio*, § 1.

the hands of the barbarous Isauri, he wrote: "I fear no one else as I do the Bishops, with the exception of a few."[5]

At the same time he was conscious that many charges often brought against Bishops are extremely frivolous. They were the common butt of the people's satire. "If they used too much authority, they were called hard-hearted; if too little, they were cold and indifferent: by the one line of conduct they incurred hatred, by the other contempt.[6] "The Bishop is distracted on every side, and is expected to do many things beyond his power. If he knows not how to speak, there is great murmuring; and if he can speak, then he is accused of being vain-glorious. If he cannot raise the dead, he is of no worth: they say—such an one is pious, but this man is not. If he eats a moderate meal, for this he is accused: he ought to be strangled, they say. If he is seen at the bath, he is much censured. In short, he ought not to look upon the sun! If he does the same things that I do: if he bathes, eats and drinks, wears the same clothing, has

[5] *Ad Olymp. Epist.* xiv. § 4.

[6] *In Acta Apost. Homil.* iii. §§ 4, 5. I have taken liberties with the arrangement of this long lecture to Bishops and Priests: many passages are transposed, and others omitted; but I believe that the sense is correctly conveyed.

the care of a house and servants, on what account is he set over me? But he has domestics to serve him, and an ass to ride upon. Why then is he set over me? But say, ought he then to have no one to wait upon him? Ought he to light his fire himself, to draw water, cleave wood, go to market? How great a degradation would this be! Even the holy Apostles would not that any Ministers of the Word should attend upon the widows' tables, but they considered it a business unworthy of them; and would you degrade them to the offices of your own domestics? Why do not you who command these things come and perform these services? Tell me, does not he minister a better service to you than yours, which is bodily? Why do you not send your domestic to wait upon him? Christ washed the feet of His disciples: is it a great thing for you to give this service to your teacher? But you are not willing to render it yourself, and you grudge it to him. Ought he, then, to draw his livelihood from heaven? But God wills not so."

In other passages he remarks that the mere inadvertencies and failings of a Bishop are patent to all. "When once he takes a false step,—which must sometimes happen, as he is

a man, and liable to human failings,—all his former virtues will not be able to secure him from the evil tongues of his accusers; but this single error will cast a cloud over the rest of his excellencies. Nor will the generality of men judge favourably of a Bishop, or consider him as clothed with the same nature as themselves; but censure him as if they had expected him to be an angel, exalted above human infirmities."[7] By poverty and riches; by elegance and negligence in dress; by his affected and simple behaviour; in short, by all the things which are above mentioned, a war will be kindled in the mind of the looker on, and artifices will surround him on every side."[8]

Chrysostom tells his congregation that he will permit them to accuse a Bishop, if he has not those qualities which St. Paul requires; if he is not blameless, sober, orderly, hospitable, and apt to teach, or if he is a striker, violent, cruel, or unmerciful. If he is luxurious, too, he should be censured; but let them not accuse him because he takes care of himself, in order that he may be more useful in ministering to them.[9]

Again, the Archiepiscopal reformer had no

[7] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 14. [8] *Ib.* lib. vi. § 3.
[9] *In Tit. Homil.* i. § 4.

sympathy with those who grudge the clergy an ordinary competency. He says that many persons who are building houses and buying estates think themselves in bad circumstances; "but if any Priest is clothed in a brighter dress than usual, and enjoys more than what is necessary for his sustenance, or has an attendant, that he may not be forced himself to act unbecomingly, they set the matter down for riches." They should remember, that if he had followed any other calling, he might have been richer than he is. "He might, it is true, if he had wished, have led a trader's or a merchant's life, and then would surely not have lacked. But he would not. Tell me then, what is he profited by being a Priest? Does he wear silken robes? Does he proudly clear his way through the forum with a troop of followers? Is he borne along on horseback? Does he build houses, although he has where to dwell? If he acts so, I too accuse him, and spare him not, but declare that he is unworthy of the priesthood. For how can he exhort others not to spend all their time on their superfluities, who cannot advise himself? But if he does wrong in having sufficient for support, would you have him lead a vagabond life, and beg?"

It must be admitted that the great Prelate's position was impregnable when he thus pleaded, not for clerical luxury and display, but for competency; yet even this was assailed by the selfish and ungenerous inhabitants of Constantinople. They quoted against the clergy our Lord's words: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, neither two coats, nor yet staves;" but he suggested that these curious searchers out of motes should cast out the beam from their own eyes. St. Paul said not to the clergy only, but to all: Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content."[1]

But although the clergy were aimed at in the jibes of the vulgar, and the haughty sneers of the great; although the Archbishop passed such a severe and doubtless accurate judgment upon his order, yet just before, and during the time in which he lived, the highest ecclesiastical dignities were held both at Antioch and Constantinople by men of blameless lives and eminent piety. Where amongst living men shall we find their equals? The praise of the heavenly-minded Gregory Nazianzen has been in all the Churches. His successor, and the immediate predecessor of Chrysostom, was the mild and devout, though weak Nectarius. At

[1] *In Philip. Homil.* ix. § 4.

Antioch Eustathius had left a high reputation. His successor Meletius was intensely revered; and *his* successor, Flavian, the patron and friend of Chrysostom, was one of the noblest, most disinterested, diligent and spiritual prelates that ever lived.[2] Diodorus, also, Bishop of Tarsus, who preached the Gospel, and presided over the Church in that part of Antioch which was on the other side of the river Orontes, and who subsequently suffered martyrdom, was an orthodox prelate, whose life was self-denying and apostolic.[3] Even their exalted rank afforded such men as these opportunities of displaying the reality of their religion. Such Bishops were the advocates of the poor and the oppressed, and often exercised in their behalf a salutary influence upon despotism. Thus the aged Flavian left his beloved sister on her death-bed, and undertook a fatiguing journey that he might intercede for the citizens of Antioch with the enraged Emperor Theodosius. Standing before the potentate he said:—I am come from the common Lord of angels and men, to address these

[2] *In S. Eustathium Homil.; In S. Meletium Homil.; Sermo cum Presbyter fuit ordinatus.* This Meletius must not be confounded with the Bishop of Lycopolis, who caused the Meletian schism in Egypt.

[3] *In Diodorum Tarsensem Oratio*, § 4.

words to your most merciful and most gentle soul: 'If ye forgive men their debts, your heavenly Father will forgive you your trespasses.' Remember then that day when we shall all give an account of our actions!" The impetuous but generous Emperor could not resist the appeal of the weeping prelate. He forgave the rebels, and added, "I know that their souls are still agitated, and that there are many relics of the calamity left. Go, give them consolation! If they see the helmsman, they will no longer remember the storm that has passed away; but all recollection of these sorrowful events will be effaced!"[4]

The picture which St. Chrysostom draws of the country clergy about Antioch is curious. They were far from being men of refinement and education. Their language was not the Greek which was spoken in the city, but vulgar Syriac. They were engaged in agriculture—at one time following the plough, at another taking their turn in the pulpit; at one time hedging or cutting thorns with a bill-hook, at another sowing the seed of the word;

[4] *Ad Pop. Antioch.* homil. xxi. §§ 3, 4. This, too, was the age in which Basil of Cæsarea interceded with the Emperor Valens for the people of Cappadocia, Theodoret for the poor with the Princess Pulcheria, and Augustine with the wealthy Romulus for his oppressed country-people.

being able to boast of a very small modicum of worldly learning, but yet fairly acquainted with the Holy Scriptures.[5]

The people certainly had a voice in the election of their clergy. Before proceeding to the ordination of presbyters, the Bishop called upon communicants to give their votes and assent by acclamation. St. Chrysostom expressed his anxiety that the laity should assist the Church with their counsels, and should not throw all care and responsibility upon the priesthood.[6] Bishops were elected by the assembled Presbyteries; but the elections were very much subjected to imperial influence.[7]

After contemplating St. Chrysostom's picture of his age, and knowing that his efforts to correct and improve it were bold, earnest, and sustained, the question has been suggested—Did he make any lasting impression upon that generation, and was it in any way revolutionized by his words and works? Persons of prudence and moderation are apt to believe that he defeated his own object—that he

[5] *Ad Pop. Antioch. Homil.* xix. § 1.
[6] *In 2 Cor. Homil.* xviii. § 3.
[7] *De Sacerdotio*, lib. iii. § 15.

knocked his head against a wall. We are told that "in the tedious and delicate office of ecclesiastical reform, that zeal which is not tempered with moderation, and qualified by due regard for existing circumstances, will commonly ruin the advocate without benefiting the cause. The disposition of Chrysostom was naturally choleric and impatient, and his noblest intentions were frustrated by his passionate imprudence."[8] Here it is assumed that his labour was vain, and that he accomplished nothing. But, it may be asked, what are we to suppose that Chrysostom might have done? He might, indeed, if he had manœuvred, and employed *finesse*, have acquired and retained the favour of the Court and High Prelacy; he might have even induced a few to renounce their vanities and vices; but would he then have exhibited that grand spectacle—a champion of the Gospel fighting with the Hydra of Sin, a David, going out as with a sling and a stone, in the name of the Lord of Hosts, to contend with the Goliath of the World? Above all, would he, as he did, have trained renowned warriors of the Cross who were inferior only to himself in ability

[8] Waddington's *History of the Church*, chap. ix. To the same effect writes Cave in his *Life of St. Chrysostom*, § ii.

and determination? It was his noble character, and not only his instructions, which formed his pupils, Palladius Bishop of Hellenopolis, Isidore of Pelusium, Nilus, Mark, and Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus, all of whom exercised great influence over the Church of their day, and left illustrious examples to posterity.[9]

Do we think that he might have wrought a sanctifying reform in the people of his age and nation? If so, we have expected much more than any individual has yet performed. The Son of God Himself did not thus reform even the people of the small country in which He lived and laboured. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not."

"The deaf may hear the Saviour's voice,
The fetter'd tongue its chain may break;
But the deaf heart, the dumb by choice,
The laggard soul that will not wake,
The guilt that scorns to be forgiven;—
These baffle e'en the spells of heaven."

How, then, can it be supposed that any individual could purify a vast empire? Constantinople and its dependencies formed an immense but tottering ruin, and it was utterly beyond the power of man, by placing a prop here and there, or by rechiselling a few stones, to convert the ruin into a strong and substan-

[9] *Life* by Cave, sec. ix.

tial edifice, and, by removing the causes of political decay, remove also its moral degradation. Yet we believe that no Christian father exercised more influence upon his own and succeeding generations in East and West than did St. Chrysostom. He overthrew no Church, left no name of a sect behind him, like Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and others. His work was construction. No one was more devoted to the Catholic faith, but his aim was to establish holiness rather than orthodoxy. Such a rigid teacher as he was could never please for long any but the "little flock." The world hated him, but succeeding generations admit that in this respect, as in his whole career, St. Chrysostom followed the path which had been first trodden by "the Great Shepherd of the sheep." And he did more than reform his age; he left an imperishable name as a guiding star to the end of time for all those who are resolutely seeking holiness and truth.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.