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CHRYSOSTOM'S famous treatise on the Priesthood, though several times edited abroad, has been only once separately edited in this country. It is now nearly two hundred years since the appearance of that edition. Like the present, it was published at Cambridge, and printed at the Cambridge University Press.

The main object of the present edition is determined by the guiding principles of the series of Patristic texts of which it forms a part. It is primarily intended to meet the requirements of Theological Students: and to such students, even if we interpret the phrase in the widest sense, the present treatise may be said to be of peculiar interest. It has been well described as a work 'full of counsels and warnings which the clergy of every age may study with advantage': and previous editors (Bengel and Seltmann, for example) have also aimed at adapting their commentaries to the needs of candidates for Holy Orders.

In the second place, it may be pointed out that the de sacerdotio forms, by its subject-matter, its treatment, and attractive style, a fitting introduction to the study of the Fathers; and some of those who, without having any previous acquaintance with this branch of study, chance to take up the present volume, may thereby be induced to extend their knowledge of Patristic writings.
PREFACE

In preparing this edition, which has occupied the scanty leisure of the past three years, I have received much assistance from various sources. To Dr Mason, the editor of the series in which the book appears, I am indebted for constant help of the most practical kind, and for continued encouragement at every stage of the work. The Managers of the Hort Fund, by their generous grant made in 1904, facilitated my researches among the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. M. Henri Omont extended to me (as to so many others) the utmost courtesy and kindness while I was at work in that library. Mr Vincent Benson, Scholar of New College, Oxford, collated for me in full both the New College and the Corpus Christi College manuscripts of the de sacerdotio. The Rev. T. Allen Moxon rendered valuable assistance in the correction of the proofs, and also in the compilation of the indices, a task which naturally involved considerable labour. For help of various kinds I am also indebted to the following: the Archbishop of Sinai, Dr Bigg, Mr E. W. Brooks, Dr A. E. Cowley, Mrs Gibson, Dr Kenyon, Prof. J. E. B. Mayor, my colleague Mr C. W. Mitchell, Dr Swete, M. l'Abbé Toiton, and the librarians at Berlin, Munich, the Vatican, Vienna, and other libraries on the Continent. To each and all of those who have assisted me in a first and no doubt imperfect essay in the domain of Theology, I hereby express my hearty thanks.

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

MERCHANT TAYLORS' SCHOOL,

August 6, 1906.
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INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. ON THE CHARACTER, DATE, AND GENUINENESS OF THE DE SACERDOTIO.

John, surnamed Chrysostom, that is 'golden-mouthed,' from the splendour of his eloquence, was born at Antioch about 345 A.D. He was baptised about the year 368, certainly before 370: and became an ἀναγραφῶτης, or reader of the Scriptures, at the same time. In 374 or 375 he went to the mountains near Antioch, where he spent several years as a hermit. In 380 he returned to Antioch: and in the Church of Antioch he served as deacon from 381 to 386, and as presbyter from 386 to 398. In 398 he became Bishop of Constantinople. In 404 he was exiled from that city, and he died in exile in the year 407.

The occasion which eventually led to the composition of the de sacerdotio is described at considerable length in the opening chapters of this treatise: and a brief statement will suffice here. Chrysostom had been on the point of entering upon the monastic life in company with his intimate friend Basil, when he learnt that he and Basil had been chosen for consecration as bishops, though they were not yet even deacons. Chrysostom's deep sense of the weight and responsibility of the

1 For the chronology of Chrysostom's life see E. Preuschen in Hauck-Hertzog Encyklopädie iv 101—111 (1898). Gibbon's description of Chrysostom should be read: Decline and Fall ch. xxxii. Cp. also Tillemont vol. xi, and other works mentioned in § 7 (Bibliography).

2 Compare the account in DCB, article 'Chrysostom.'
priestly office, and of his own unworthiness, made him shrink from the idea of ordination. On the other hand, he considered that Basil was eminently fitted for the duties of a bishop: and he resolved that the Church should not lose the services of his friend.

When therefore Basil proposed that they should act in concert, and should together either accept or reject the proffered honour, Chrysostom pretended to acquiesce, while at the same time resolving to take separate action. Thus, when the time of consecration arrived, Basil was seized and brought before the bishops: and was duly consecrated, in spite of his reluctance. Chrysostom had meanwhile concealed himself, and was nowhere to be found. Basil, who at the time of his consecration had been assured that Chrysostom had already submitted to be consecrated, soon discovered the deception which his friend had practised. He visited Chrysostom in the hermit’s cell where the latter had apparently taken refuge. As he struggled with his emotion, Chrysostom burst into laughter, and expressed his pleasure at the success of his plot: but being reproached by Basil in language of great dignity and gentleness, he proceeded to defend and to explain his past conduct.

The defence, briefly put, is to the effect that the end justifies the means. Though it is difficult to read this part of the treatise (i 1 to ii 6) without being repelled by the duplicity which Chrysostom had shewn,—or, if the account is partly imaginary, was willing to be thought to have shewn,—it must not be forgotten that several of the Fathers take a view different from our own on the subject of ‘pious fraud,’ and that what Chrysostom carried out in practice had been advocated

1 de sac. i 1—4.
long before his time. He takes, however, much surer ground, when, in explanation of his conduct, he enlarges upon the heavy responsibilities of the episcopal office, combined with his own unfitness, as the cause of his desertion of Basil (ii 7 to vi 13). In these eloquent and moving descriptions of the dignity of the priesthood lies the main interest of the present work: it is these which have given it its title περὶ ἱεροσύνης, and which make it of permanent value to the clergy of every age.

The date when the events above described took place is probably 373; a year or so before Chrysostom left Antioch, and entered upon that life of monastic retirement which, as we have seen, lasted until 380.

The date of the composition of the de sacerdotio is a quite distinct question: and from ancient times different opinions have been held on this subject. Some have assigned the work to Chrysostom’s diaconate (381—386), others to an earlier period, that which he passed in retirement (374—380). It can, I think, be shewn that neither view is correct, but that the work was written after 386.

The evidence may be arranged thus:

I. External Evidence
   (a) hitherto available, and (b) first used in the present edition.

II. Internal evidence of the de sacerdotio.
   I (a) Socrates, the Church historian (fifth century), and George of Alexandria (seventh century), tell us that

1 See note on i 5 (el δὲ ὁμ. ἐκ νυκ.) with regard to the question of ἀξιωματία, as Chrysostom calls such deceit.

2 This is the date thought most probable by Bardenhewer Patrologie p. 283, Preuschen in Hauck-Hertzog l.c., and Venables in DCB i 520. Montfaucon places the date somewhere between 372 and 375 (see his Monumentum prefixed to the de sac.).

3 H. E. vi 3.

4 In his life of Chrysostom: see Savile’s edition of Chrysostom viii 176.

N. C.
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Chrysostom composed the *de sacerdotio* during his diaconate. On the other hand, Symeon Metaphrastes (tenth century) assigns the work to the earlier period 374—380.

(6) Chrysostom himself, in a sermon* preached at Antioch, the genuineness of which is beyond question, refers to a work on the priesthood which he intends to publish at a future date. This work cannot be other than the treatise *peri ierousin* which we possess. For not only is there no evidence that Chrysostom wrote more than one work on this subject, but the context of the passage in the sermon in question shews close similarity with the topics handled in the *de sacerdotio*, as the following analysis of the passage will prove. Chrysostom is speaking of the audacity of King Uzziah, who ‘transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense,’ and is led to speak of the office of the priest as greater than that of the king: *ierousin gar kal aitth tis basilieia thumotera, kai melizon estin arxh*. The throne of the priesthood is set up not on earth, like that of the king, but in heaven: *tis tauta phísin; autous o tovn ouranon basileivs; osa gar an diaton, phiw, en pl tis ge, estai dedemena en tois ouranois; kai osa an lysite epit tis ge, estai leuymena en tois ouranois*. Again, *o deuspotiph (i.e. God) epetai to doulov (i.e. the priest), kal apere an oucous kato kriyn, tauta ekeinos anw kuroi*. Then he adds *allá peri men ierow-

1 *ap. Savile viii 378.
2 *in illud vidi dominum v* (one of the six *Homm. in Osiam*) 132 C—133 A.
3 The reference, but not the conclusion based on it, is due to Bengel (*Leo-Bengel* p. xviii).
4 *Cp. de sac. iii 1* (notes).
5 *Cp. de sac. iii 5*, where the same passage of St Matthew (xviii 18) is quoted.
6 *Cp. de sac. iii 5* ἀπερ ἄρα ἐργασώμεθα κατω ολ λειψι, ταῦτα ὁ θεός ἄνω κυρίοι καὶ την τῶν δουλῶν γνώμην ὁ δεσπότης βλέπει. Note also the similar use of δεσπότης and δούλος in the two passages.
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σύνης, καὶ δοσὶν τῆς ἀξίας τὸ μέγεθος, ἐν ἐτέρῳ καιρῷ δηλώσομεν. Now the de sacerdotio (see footnotes) contains a comparison between the priestly and the kingly offices, in favour of that of the priest: it contains the same quotation from St Matthew's Gospel, used for the same purpose: and it contains the same remarkable expression that God 'confirms' above (in heaven) what the priest does, or decides, below (on earth). There seems to be no room for doubt that the treatise on the priesthood promised in the words περὶ ἱερωσύνης...ἐν ἐτέρῳ καιρῷ δηλώσομεν is the treatise which we possess.

II. The evidence afforded by the de sacerdotio itself supports the conclusion that it belongs not to the time of monastic retirement, but to a later period in Chrysostom's life. The maturity of thought and sobriety of tone which appear in this work, as contrasted with the characteristics of writings of undoubtedly early date, are proof that it marks a later development of Chrysostom's mind and outlook upon the world. This is particularly noticeable in what he says of the ascetic life of the monk. Towards monasticism Chrysostom adopts in the de sacerdotio a critical, not to say an antagonistic attitude, which does not harmonize with the view that he was himself a monk when he wrote this work, but is entirely consistent with the view that at the time of writing it he had already abandoned the ascetic life and had been ordained for the ordinary service of the Church.

Thus external and internal evidence combine to shew that the de sacerdotio is later than the time of his retirement (374—380). It is also later than his diaconate (381—386). For at Antioch, as we know

1 de sac. vi 5—7 (notes).
from Chrysostom himself, preaching was not part of the duty of a deacon: but was confined to the bishop and the ‘wiser of the presbyters.’ Hence the sermon in question is certainly later than Chrysostom’s ordination as presbyter. Bardenhewer places it in 386. Tillemont and Montfaucon incline to place it later still, in 388.

Thus 386 is the terminus post quem for the date of the de sacerdotio. The terminus ante quem is afforded by Jerome, who, in a work written in 392, refers to the de sacerdotio as already known to him. And we must apparently place the terminus ante quem earlier than 392 in order to allow the reputation of the book time to reach Jerome. Hence we infer that the de sacerdotio was written between the years 386 and 390.

The date of the work cannot perhaps be fixed with greater precision on the evidence now available. But if we may have recourse to à prori considerations, we shall incline to place the date at the beginning rather than at the end of this period (386—390). For the beginning of Chrysostom’s priesthood was the natural and fitting moment for him to publish a work in which the high claims of the priesthood are so strongly emphasized, and its prerogatives so glowingly described. Again, this was also a natural moment for him to set forth to the world the true motives of his action at the time of Basil’s consecration. His own conduct on that occasion had—as we may infer from the de sacerdotio itself—been misrepresented: and he may very possibly have felt that now, when he had been called to the higher office of priest, it was desirable to

1 Homm. in 1 Cor. 19 B: εκεῖ καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀφελετέρων τῶν πρεσβύτερων τούτω (i.e. τὸ βασιλέα) εἰρηνισμοί, τῶν δὲ διδακτικῶν λόγων τῶν σοφώτερων: and, for the bishop, Homm. in 1 Tim. 599 D.
2 Patrologia² p. 290.
3 xi p. 561 (ed. 1706).
4 Monitum to Homm. in Osiam.
5 See below, p. xvii and footnote 3.
strengthen his work and power for good by refuting the aspersions to which he had been exposed.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are led by all the evidence before us is that the *de sacerdotio* was published shortly after 386, and most probably in the year 387.

The scene of the dialogue is laid at Antioch, the birthplace of Chrysostom, and, as seems probable, of Basil also.

The contents of the six books into which the treatise is divided are, in the main, as follows:

BOOK I describes the events (already recounted) which preceded Basil's consecration: also his visit to Chrysostom, and Chrysostom's defence against his friend's reproaches.

BOOK II describes the heavy responsibilities of the priestly office: and shews that while Basil is fitted for that office, Chrysostom is unworthy of holding it. Those who nominated him, instead of resenting his refusal of the honour, may congratulate themselves that he did not bring discredit upon them by accepting it and then proving his unfitness.

BOOK III sets forth the dignity of the priestly office, and the faults of Chrysostom's character, which would have entailed disaster to him and others. The qualities for which we ought to look in a bishop, and his various duties, are also described.

BOOK IV shews that the priest, or bishop, must be a stalwart defender of the faith against heretics: and contains an eloquent eulogy of St Paul in regard to his skill in expounding Christian doctrine.

BOOK V emphasizes the need of careful preparation before preaching.
BOOK VI describes the duties of the priest as contrasted with those of the monk. The responsibilities of the priest are shewn to be greater, for the souls of others are in his keeping. The fierce character of the warfare carried on by Satan against mankind is also delineated. The book ends with a promise given by Chrysostom that he will assist Basil by his counsel in fulfilling the duties of his office.

It is not always easy to distinguish the various stages of Chrysostom’s argument, which is somewhat desultory and is at times interrupted by digressions. He occasionally returns to a subject which he seemed to have fully discussed already. Thus the Eucharist is twice described in much the same terms; the same may be said of the contrast between the priest and the monk, and the faults of Chrysostom’s character.

The genuineness of the de sacerdotio is attested by quotations made from it by the following authors:

(1) George of Alexandria (seventh century) quotes the passage in which Anthusa entreats her son not to leave her. The citation is somewhat free, but presupposes a text substantially as we now have it.

(2) Suidas (tenth century) singles out the de sacerdotio for praise on account of its admirable style and its lofty eloquence. He also quotes from it two passages of considerable length.

(3) ‘Anonymus Scriptor vitae Chrysostomi’ (after

---

1 At iii 4 and vi 4.
2 See iii 13—15 and vi 5—7.
3 See iii 8, 14 and vi 12.
5 τ.вать: οἱ περὶ λειτουργίας οὐκ ὑπερβάλλουσι λόγου τῷ τῇ φράσει καὶ τῇ λειτουργίᾳ καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ὠνομάτων.
6 From iii 16 and vi 4: see p. liv.
950) quotes the passage which is cited by George of Alexandria¹.

We also find references to the treatise in the following:

(4) St Jerome, writing in 392, tells us that he had read this work of Chrysostom. He knew Chrysostom by reputation as a prolific author².

(5) Isidore of Pelusium (fifth century), a disciple of Chrysostom, says that his master wrought this treatise to such a pitch of perfection that all who read it saw, reflected therein, their own virtues or failings³.

(6) Socrates, the Church historian (fifth century) states, as we have seen, that Chrysostom wrote the *de sacerdotio* during his diaconate.

§ 2. ON SOME POINTS IN THE TEACHING OF CHRYSOSTOM WHICH ARE ILLUSTRATED BY THE *DE SACERDOTIO*.

(a) The dignity of the priestly office.

Chrysostom’s deep sense of the dignity and importance of the office of priest pervades the whole of the *de sacerdotio*. We know that such views were characteristic of the Syrian Church: but they find in Chrysostom perhaps their most eloquent and convinced exponent. Yet he lays stress, not only on the dignity of the office,

¹ See Savile *ubi supra* viii p. 300.
² *de viris illustribus* 129: ‘Joannes...multa composuisse dicitur, de quibus *per hretosynh tantum legi*.’
³ *Ep. ad Eustathium* 156: οτιοι αυτὴν (τὴν *hretosynh*) λεπτὸς καὶ περιποίησεν, ὡστε πάντα...ἐν ταύτῃ τὰ ὀικεία εὐρέωσεν κατορθωμάτα τε καὶ σκόπιμα.
but also on its responsibilities. As Bishop Gore has well said:\footnote{The Church and the Ministry\textsuperscript{4} p. 146.} ‘Chrysostom is emphatic in asserting that orthodoxy is of no avail to justify a Christian body unless its priesthood is secured by proper ordination. But if he thus shews himself to be alive to the spiritual dignity of the priesthood, in virtue alike of its sacrificial and of its judicial powers, he is equally alive to its responsibility for individual souls, laying immense stress on the necessity for considerateness, for gentle and patient self-adaptation to the different characters and needs and weaknesses of men, whether of high or low estate.’

(b) The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

None of the Fathers takes a more exalted view of this Sacrament than Chrysostom. At the moment, he tells us, when the bread and wine are consecrated, the heavens open and the angels come down to earth: and he quotes with approval a report that angels had actually been seen within the sanctuary at the time that the Eucharistic sacrifice was being offered. The greatest purity, he argues, is therefore required of those who participate in that service, while the priest who celebrates far surpasses in dignity, by virtue of that fact, the High Priest of the old covenant:\footnote{\textit{de sac.} iii 4. It ought, however, to be remembered that ceremonial is not all in all to Chrysostom. He thinks more of the spiritual inwardness of the priestly office: thus we are reminded in reading him of the words of Dr Moberly in regard to the priesthood: ‘the formal celebration of the Eucharist may be the very highest of its administrative methods...yet priesthood itself is something more vitally inclusive than any mystery of formal executive privilege’: \textit{Ministerial Priesthood} p. 296.}.
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With regard to Chrysostom's doctrine of the Eucharist, there has been much discussion as to whether certain passages in the *de sacerdoto* favour, or do not favour, the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Thus, for example, he says to each of those present at the Eucharist: 'thou seest thy Lord sacrificed, and lying (before thee), and the priest standing over the sacrifice and praying, and all (around) reddened with His precious Blood....He that sits above with the Father is at the same time held in our hands, and suffers Himself to be held and clasped by all who wish.'

Chrysostom taught that there was complete identity of the consecrated elements with the Body and Blood of Christ. But this language, alike in the passage just quoted and elsewhere, fails to support the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which tries to explain on the basis of mediaeval scholasticism the manner whereby the bread and wine became, upon consecration, the Body and Blood of our Lord. 'When the Fathers asserted,' says Pusey, 'that what is consecrated, and what we receive, are the Body and Blood of Christ, they mean this not in any physical or carnal way, but spiritually, sacramentally, Divinely, mystically, ineffably, through the operation of the Word of Christ and of God the Holy Ghost. But in this meaning they do speak of the objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ as following upon the consecration.'

The Roman controversialists who cite this passage of Chrysostom, among others, in support of Transubstantiation have been effectively answered by Cosin, Bishop of Durham from 1660 to 1672. 'We deny not,' he says, 'that some things emphatical and even hyperbolical have been said of the Sacrament by Chrysostom, and

1 *de sac. iii 4.  
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some others: and that those things may easily lead unwaried men into error. That was the ancient fathers' care, as it is ours still, to instruct the people not to look barely on the outward elements, but in them to eye with their minds the Body and Blood of Christ, and with their hearts lift up to feed on that heavenly meat: for all the benefit of a Sacrament is lost if we look no farther than the elements. Hence it is that those holy men, the better to teach this lesson to their hearers, and move their hearts more efficaciously, spake of the signs as if they had been the thing signified, and, like orators, said many things which will not bear a literal sense, nor a strict examen. And Cosin cites the passage quoted above from the de sacerdotio as an example of such rhetorical expressions on the subject of the Sacrament.

I am indebted to the kindness of Dr Mason for an illuminating discussion of the actual wording of the passage in question (iii 4). Dr Mason takes, for example, the use of the word φωνασκομένους. This, he thinks, probably refers to being sprinkled with the blood, not as I have explained it ad loc. But at any rate it does not refer to the colour left upon the lips of the people by the Eucharistic species. It is, he remarks, in the same region as the word 'blood,' not in the region of the word 'wine': and is therefore not intended literally. The upholder of Transubstantiation would not say that the 'blood' of Christ literally 'reddens' those who receive. Then if one word in the passage is metaphorical, it is at least

1 See Cosin History of Popish Transubstantiation Book vi ch. 8 (English Translation of 1676); and cp. Schwane Dogmengeschichte (Rom. Cath.) vol. ii p. 783 sqq., and (for the sacrifice) p. 816 sqq. In the former passage Schwane gives his account of expressions which go beyond the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation (e.g. φωνασκομένου in iii 4, on which see above). Batiffol's criticism of Schwane (Études d'histoire et de théologie positive 3me série p. 260 sqq.) is also of importance.
possible to suppose that others also are, e.g. τεθυμένον καὶ κείμενον, περιπτόξασθαι καὶ περιλαβέων. Finally, Dr Mason points out that Chrysostom's glowing metaphors do not necessarily go any further than (for instance) Wesley's

'With joy unspeakable we feel
The Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven:
The altar streams with sacred blood,
And all the temple flames with God';

or George Herbert's

'At Communion-times, he is in a great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him.'

'Neither Herbert nor Wesley held the theory of Transubstantiation; and they had no fear (even after that theory had been formulated) of their words being understood to suppose it.' Their object was to impress, not to define.

(c) Penitence, Confession, and Absolution.

Penitence, as a system of discipline, had its origin and sanction in the New Testament: and primarily in the promise of Christ to which Chrysostom, as we have seen, makes reference more than once. Several passages in the de sacerdotio recognize the need of penitence: but Chrysostom also insists that the priest must study the varying characters of men in order that his discipline may be effective.

1 Hymns on the Lord's Supper lxxxix; probably suggested by this passage of Chrysostom and its application of the story of Elijah.
3 de sac. ii 4 (notes) and vi 4 πασχεῖν αὐτὸν εἶναι δεῖ κτλ. On Penance see Schwane Dogmengeschichte (Rom. Cath.) vol. ii p. 846, and Batiffol Études d'histoire et de théologie positive 1903.
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In regard to confession, Chrysostom taught that it might be made either mediatelly, to the priest, or immediately to God. Confession to the priest is implied in the de sacerdotio¹, confession to God is alluded to in other writings: for example, the de incomprehensibili Dei natura, where he says, ‘I do not bring you before an audience of your fellow-servants, nor do I compel you to reveal your sins to men. Unfold your conscience in the presence of God, shew Him your wounds, and seek relief from Him.’ Thus Chrysostom is not so strong an advocate of auricular Confession as e.g. Cyprian, Basil, or Gregory of Nyssa.

The power of absolution was entrusted to the Church by our Lord. Chrysostom refers to it when, after quoting the words in which Christ conferred the power of the keys, he adds, ‘that which the priests do (have done) below (i.e. on earth), God ratifies above (i.e. in heaven): and the Master confirms the decision of His servants.’ The absolution in the de sac. consists (in the case of the unbaptized) in admitting to Baptism: or (in the case of baptized persons who have undergone penance) in re-admitting them to Communion.

(d) Persecution of heretics.

Chrysostom held that heretics ought not to be persecuted on account of their beliefs, but should by gentle

¹ de sac. ii 1 ad fin. (notes).
² de incomprehensibili D. n. v 490 C odde γὰρ εἰς θεσπυρός σε ἅγιο τῶν συνδύων τῶν σωτ., odde ἐκκαθάρισε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀναγκάζω τὰ ἀμαρτήματα τῆς σωθείς ἄναπτυσσον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτῷ δεῖξω τὰ τραύματα, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν τὰ φάρμακα αἴρεις.
³ de sac. iii 5 ἄνευ δὲ ἐργάσωσαι κάτω οἱ λεπίθι κτλ. (quoted above p. xii n. 5). Chrysostom seems to take for granted the justice of the priestly acts referred to, and does not mean to commit God to a compulsory submission to what may have been an unjust sacerdotal act. See The Ancient Fathers on the Office and Work of the Priesthood p. 15 (note).
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measures be brought, if possible, to the true faith. This view is expressed by him not only in the present treatise\(^1\), but also elsewhere\(^2\). It is somewhat at variance with the practice which he occasionally adopted of employing imperial decrees for the coercion of heretics and pagans\(^3\).

(c) The office of the Bishop.

From the de sacerdotio we may derive considerable information with regard to the office of bishop in the fourth century.

Some care is, however, required to distinguish between passages which refer to the bishop, and those which refer to the priest; the same word ἱερέας being commonly employed to denote both\(^4\). In the following analysis I proceed according to the order in which the topics discussed appear in the article 'Bishop' in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

i. Title. Besides ἱερέας we find ὃ προστάτης\(^5\), ὁ ἐπισκόπος\(^6\), ὁ πατήρ\(^7\); besides periphrases such as ὃ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν λαχών\(^8\).

ii. Electors. We hear much of those who elected Chrysostom and Basil to the office which Chrysostom declined to fill. The electors, who are described some-

---

\(^1\) de sac. ii 4: cp. Creighton Hulsean Lectures (on Persecution and Toleration) 1894.

\(^2\) de anathemate 696 a τὰ γὰρ ἀλετρικὰ δῆματα...ἀναθηματίζειν χρῆ, καὶ τὰ ἀνεφθη δήματα ἄλγεις, τύσαν δὲ φειδὶ ἀνθρώπων ποιείσθαι, καὶ σχεθαι ὑπὲρ τὴν αὐτῶν σωτηρίας.

\(^3\) Theodoret, H. E. v 29, 31: see also Puech St Jean Chrysostome p. 103. We may compare the tone adopted in iv 4 ol τὴν Ζαβελλίου μανὸν μας, καὶ ol τὰ Ἄρεων λυτώσεις κτλ.

\(^4\) See note on τὴν ἱερωσύνην i 3. In Chrysostom's tenth homily on 1 Tim. iii (598 E) ἐπισκόποις is used, and ambiguity is thus avoided.

\(^5\) i 16. We also have ὃ προστάτων iii 6 (note).

\(^6\) i 15, 17.

\(^7\) i 17, 17.

\(^8\) i 15 (note), vi 8.
times as 'the fathers'\(^1\), sometimes as those 'who select' or 'who raise to honour',\(^2\) consisted probably of the metropolitan and the comprovincial bishops, in whom the choice was vested by the Council of Laodicea in 365. This Council, by denying the laity a voice in this matter, took the first step towards the ultimate practical extinction of really popular elections.

iii. Conditions of eligibility. (a) Status. It was laid down by the tenth canon of the Council of Sardica (343) that no one should become a bishop per saltum, but should previously go through the several offices of reader, deacon, and priest. At the time when it was proposed to make Chrysostom a bishop he was merely a reader (ἄρχονται). A similar exceptional case is mentioned by St Augustine (Ep. cxliii). Instances of deacons being made bishops are more common.

(β) Age. The Council of Neo-Caesarea (314) insisted that no one should be appointed bishop until he was at least 30 years of age. Special merits, however, and the precedent of Timothy, repeatedly set aside this rule in practice. Chrysostom, even if we put the year of his birth as early as 344, was not more than 29 at the time of the proposed consecration (373).

iv. Ordainers. Chrysostom seems to speak of Basil being consecrated by one bishop only\(^3\). Inasmuch, however, as the rule in the East and elsewhere required consecration by not less than three bishops, we may suppose that the one bishop mentioned in this con-

---

\(^1\) Ἰ ἦς τὰ τῶν πατέρων κλώει. For the word πατήρ used to designate the bishop see above.

\(^2\) Ἰ ἦς τῶν ἑλπιδών, Ἰ ἦς τῶν ημών κλώει. No one else is known as a reader.

\(^3\) Ἐν τούτῳ μελλοντός ἔχεις χειροτονήσεις ἐλθόσαν.
nexion is the metropolitan: with him, in all probability, were associated some of the comprovincial bishops.

v. *Place of Ordination.* The consecration of Basil took place in Antioch. From this we may infer that Basil’s see lay within the province which had as its metropolitan the Bishop of Antioch: for at this time the metropolitan see of a province was usually the place of ordination of bishops whose sees fell within that province. This has a bearing on the question which is discussed in § 5 as to the identity of the Basil of the *de sacerdotio.*

vi. *Removal by resignation.* Chrysostom argues in favour of voluntary resignation of his see by any bishop who is conscious of serious guilt. Examples of resignation are not wanting: for example, Gregory of Nazianzus, when archbishop of Constantinople, voluntarily resigned with the consent of the Council of Constantinople: so also Meletius, when Bishop of Sebaste in Armenia. At the same time the feeling of the Church ran strongly against resignation, as being tantamount to giving up work for Christ.

vii. *Removal by deposition.* This is contemplated as an alternative to voluntary resignation in the passage just quoted from the *de sacerdotio.* The grounds on which deposition is based in this passage seem to be those general irregularities which affected all clergy, and therefore inclusively bishops also: we may note that the 58th Apostolic Canon deposes for negligence

1 The home of Basil was (at this time, at least) in Antioch: and the bishop came thither for the ordination (cp. ἐδωκόσι in the previous note).
2 *de sac. iii 10 ἔχριν δὲ...μὴ περιμένει τὰς ἐκπρων κρίσεις, ἐὰν τοῦτο συμβαίνῃ καθαρίσεως λειτον ἐγκαταστάθη ἀμάρτημα, ἀλλὰ προλαβόντα ἐκβάλλειν ἐκείνων τῇ ἁρχῇ.
3 *DCA* ‘Bishop’ i 227.
in pastoral care. The special offences for which bishops, as such, might be deposed from their office do not seem to be in question.  

viii. The duties of a bishop. Those which call for notice in connexion with the *de sacerdotio* are the duty of preaching, the administration of discipline, the management of Church property, Church patronage, arbitration of lawsuits, and protection of the widows and virgins of the Church. The references given will enable Chrysostom's statements on these various subjects to be studied in detail. I will sum up these statements briefly.

(a) The bishop, according to Chrysostom, ought, if possible, to be a good preacher: and whether he be so or not, he must take pains with the preparation of his sermons. The high standard which he sets, and which he followed in his own practice both at Antioch (as presbyter) and at Constantinople, is in accordance with the duty of teaching, upon which he lays so much stress.

(β) In the administration of discipline the bishop took the lead, the presbyters holding a subordinate place under him, and forming his Council. The bishop, however, was the chief and ordinarily the sole judge in the first instance in cases of excommunication: and this is borne out by the *de sacerdotio*, apart from a mass of other evidence.

(γ) The income and offerings of the Church, and its alms, were in the first instance under the disposition of

---

1 DCA i 228.  2 DCA i 231.  3 See book v passim.  4 *This is assumed in de sac. ii 4, for instance: cp. iii 18 τι δὲ τις λέγει τὰς λύσεις ἃς ὑπομένουσιν ἡμικαὶ δὲν δὲν τια τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας περικόφαι πληρώματοι;
the bishop, to be dispensed either by himself or by his proper officers: with, however, the general sanction of his presbyters. But the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341) forbids the bishop to deal with Church revenues without the consent of the presbyters or deacons: and orders him to render an account of those revenues to the provincial synod. Chrysostom dwells upon the necessity of taking precautions against a possible charge of misappropriation of the funds of the Church: and his own later experience illustrates the importance of the advice.  

(8) The right of Church patronage was vested in the bishop. He, as a rule, collated to the benefices within his diocese, conferring, by ordination to a particular 'title,' the spiritual jurisdiction which drew with it the temporal endowments.

In filling up the various ecclesiastical offices which fell vacant the bishop was assisted by the body of presbyters acting collectively. According to Chrysostom the appointments to these offices were made at the 'public festivals': and often caused acute dissension between the bishop and the presbyters.

(e) The bishop became a judge or arbitrator in secular causes between Christians: but only by the consent of both parties, and by an authority voluntarily conceded to him. This judicial authority, which attached to the bishop as a matter of Christian feeling, became gradually an authority recognized and enlarged by State law. Chrysostom tells us that it imposed a heavy burden upon the bishop, and exposed him to unpopularity with disappointed claimants.

1 de sac. vi 9 (notes).  2 de sac. iii 15 (notes).
3 de sac. iii 18 (notes).

N. C.
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(ζ) The office of protecting all that were distressed and helpless was assigned to bishops. Among these were included widows, virgins, minors, orphans, prisoners. Chrysostom describes at length the difficulties and anxieties entailed by the protection of widows¹ and virgins² in particular.

(η) Finally, various other details of the bishop’s duties may be briefly alluded to: thus he was expected to shew hospitality to strangers. The virtue of hospitality is strongly inculcated in the New Testament, and was practised most liberally by the early Christians. Presbyters, and afterwards bishops, were specially expected to excel in this respect. Thus Chrysostom praises Flavian, bishop of Antioch, for keeping open house for the benefit of strangers and travellers, whom he entertained so generously that it might be doubted whether his house was the travellers’ home instead of the bishop’s³.

The bishop was also expected to visit not only the sick, but also those who merely desired to gratify their own self-importance by entertaining him. The description of the ordeal which he often had to face in such houses is vivid, and not without a touch of humour. Every trifling action on his part is carefully scrutinized: men scan his countenance, striving to read his thoughts: the very ‘quality of his laugh’ does not escape notice, and if he bestows too genial a smile upon anyone it is likely to provoke resentment in someone else⁴.

Nowhere, probably, have the responsibilities of the Episcopal office been more fully set forth than in the

¹ de sac. iii 16 (notes).
² de sac. iii 17 (notes).
³ DCA i 78, alluding to in Genesim i 4.
⁴ de sac. iii 18 ἡδὲ δὲ καὶ βδέλυματος εἰδόθαι υπέχουσι κτλ.
present treatise: yet no one, on the other hand, has described with greater eloquence than Chrysostom the privileges of that office, and the opportunities for good afforded to him who holds it.

§ 3. OTHER ANCIENT TREATISES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

The _de sacerdotio_ may be considered the most celebrated treatise, at least of those written in ancient times, on the subject of the priestly office and priestly duties. But Chrysostom is by no means alone in dealing with this subject. 'The majority of the Fathers,' as Dr Swete has said, 'were not only writers and preachers, but diligent and experienced guides of souls.' Thus Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Theodoret all have contributed to that body of _Pastoralia_ which has, in recent years especially, done much to stimulate and encourage the pastoral activities of men placed in the midst of a civilisation very different from that for which those Fathers wrote.

The set treatises, nevertheless, on the pastoral life are not numerous. The most noteworthy are the _de fuga_ of Gregory of Nazianzus, the _de officiis ministrorum_ of St Ambrose, St Jerome's letter to Nepotianus, the _regula pastoralis_ of Gregory the Great, and the _de moribus et officio episcoporum_ of St Bernard.

1. The second oration of Gregory of Nazianzus, named _de fuga_ from the fact that it was written to explain his reasons for voluntarily withdrawing from the priest-

---

1 The most important passages from patristic writers on the subject of the priesthood have been collected in a work styled 'The Ancient Fathers on the Office and Work of the Priesthood': London, Skeffington and Son, 1891, which is an English translation of a portion of a work 'du sacerdoce': Paris, Vivés, 1857.

2 Swete _Patristic Study_ (Longmans) p. 178.
hood (in 362), though he afterwards returned to his duties, has long been regarded as closely akin to the \textit{de sacerdotio}: for Gregory takes the opportunity of describing the importance and the responsibilities of the priestly office from the same point of view as that which we find in Chrysostom. An examination of the \textit{de sacerdotio} and the \textit{de fuga} side by side shews many close parallels and resemblances both of subject-matter and of phraseology which can scarcely be entirely due to accident. Thus the topic of voluntary retirement\footnote{Greg. Naz. xxxv 407 sqq. (Migne): \textit{cp. de sac.} iii 10.} is handled in both of these works in the same way: in both we find a list of the chief heresies\footnote{Greg. Naz. xxxv 444: \textit{cp. de sac.} iv 4.} prevailing in the fourth century: in both the suggestion that ill-regulated violence against any given heresy may drive us into a heresy of opposite tendency\footnote{Greg. Naz. xxxv 445: \textit{cp. de sac.} iv 4.}: in both a long and elaborate encomium upon the character and work of St Paul\footnote{Greg. Naz. xxxv 461—468: \textit{cp. de sac.} iv 6.}. The \textit{de fuga} dates from 362; and the \textit{de sacerdotio} (as we have seen) is about a quarter of a century later. The question of an indebtedness of the later to the earlier work cannot, perhaps, be definitely decided: but it seems at any rate probable that Chrysostom was acquainted with the \textit{de fuga}. He probably knew of and sympathized with the action of Gregory of Nazianzus in resigning his see in 381, a few years before the \textit{de sacerdotio} was written: and, if so, this sympathy may have turned his thoughts towards the work in which Gregory had defended in theory the action which in 362 he did not finally carry out, but which he did effectually carry out by his resignation in 381.

\footnote{Mign (xxxv 406) asserts that both the \textit{de sacerdotio} and the \textit{regula pastoralis} (see below) are a mere expansion of the \textit{de fuga}.}
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2. The de officiis ministrorum of St Ambrose, in three books (date about 391), is a manual of Christian ethics which derives great importance from the noble character, wide experience, and statesmanlike views of its author. The form of the treatise is suggested by Cicero's de officiis, to which it presents an interesting and instructive contrast.

Resemblances to Chrysostom have been detected in a work de dignitate sacerdotali, attributed to St Ambrose. This work, however, is spurious and of late date.


4. The regula (or cura) pastoralis of Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome 590 to 604) was written by him for the instruction of his clergy, and is of special interest to Englishmen because King Alfred thought so highly of it that he himself translated it for the use of the English clergy of his time. The original work, which at one time was given to every bishop at his consecration, resembles the de sacerdotio in the emphasis which it lays upon the necessity of the study of individual temperaments by the priest, and the value of a knowledge of human nature.

5. St Bernard of Clairvaux, who died 1153, wrote a work entitled de moribus et officio episcoporum, which he addressed to Henry, Archbishop of Sens. The de consideratione also presents many points of resemblance to the work of Chrysostom.

---

1 See Bengel's notes to his edition of the de sac. (passim).
2 It has been edited (with an English translation) by H. R. Bramley (Parker, Oxford); and translated by Dr Barmby in the Nicene and Post- Nicene Fathers.
3 See notes on de sac. ii 4.
§ 4. THE STYLE OF THE DE SACERDOTIO.  

The treatise is cast in the form of a dialogue (on the model of those of Plato) between Chrysostom and Basil: but Chrysostom has by far the larger share allotted to him, and in the later books Basil is for the most part a mere listener.

The style of the de sacerdoto is highly elaborated, and bears clear traces of the care which Chrysostom took with its composition. Its long and often complicated periods are constructed on the basis of the rules of Greek rhetoric. One sentence may be cited at length in illustration of this: καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ σωμάτων ἔρωντες, ἐκεῖ μὲν ἄν πλησίον εἶναι τῶν ἐρωμένων ἐξῆς, χαλεπωτέραν τοῦ πάθους τῆς βάσανος ἔχουσιν, ὅταν δὲ ὡς πορροτάτω τῶν ποθομένων ἐαυτοῦ ἀπαγόρευσι, καὶ τῆς μανιαν ἀπήλασαν, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ταύτῃς ἐπιθυμοῦσι τῆς ἀρχής, ὅταν μὲν πλησίον αὐτῆς γένονται, ἀφόρητον γίγνεται τὸ κακὸν, ὅταν δὲ ἀπελπίσωσι, καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμήματος μετὰ τῆς προσδοκίας δεσβεσαν. In this sentence we have as careful a use of παρίσωσις and παρομοίωσις as in Isocrates himself.

Other traces of the influence of the rhetorical training of Chrysostom upon his writings may be seen in the repetition of words for the sake of emphasis, and in the use of two almost synonymous words to express a single idea.

1 In this and the next section I am largely indebted to a dissertation "de Joannis Chrysostomi dialogo qui inscribitur τερεσποτίη" by A. Cognet: Paris, 1900.
2 de sac. iii 11 (quoted by Cognet loc. cit. p. 75). Libanius, his teacher, confessed that Chrysostom would have deserved to succeed him as head of his school of rhetoric had he not been stolen away by the Christians: Gibbon ch. xxxii.
3 See note on μάτηρ καὶ εὗρ ἕν. 2.
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The frequent use of similes and metaphors is characteristic of the Syrian school: and no one employs them more frequently than Chrysostom.

The vocabulary of the de sacerdotio contains, as befits the elevation of the subject and style, certain words which are more frequent in poetry than in prose. Here again we are reminded of Plato.

The treatise contains several references, which are here collected, to classical authors.

(a) Homer is once alluded to (but not by name): and once a phrase is borrowed from him. In a third passage it is possible that Chrysostom imitates a Homeric simile.

(b) Sophocles may possibly be referred to in one passage: but this is uncertain.

(c) Euripides almost certainly suggests to Chrysostom a sentiment on the subject of invalids.

(d) Aristophanes seems to be imitated in one passage. There is some reason to believe that Chrysostom was fond of reading Aristophanes, who probably at-

---

2 Cognet Lc. p. 69. The similes in vi 12 are probably too elaborate and highly coloured for the taste of most modern readers.
3 e.g. καλαύρος, σκότελος, περίδαιρος, ἀγών, ἀτσγαμάτης: Cognet p. 68.
4 de sac. iii 9 (σκότελος) δι’ οἱ μυθοσῳχισμένοι τηρατιζόμενοι: cp. Od. xii 73.
5 δυσκόλως άδεξαι (vi 10): cp. Il. xxv 75.
6 vi 12 καὶ ἄνοιξασθεῖα μὲν ἠλπὶ τῶν δεκατον ἀνάλογον: cp. Il. xxvii 135 (Cognet p. 69).
9 Milton's Areopagitica (Ed. Cotterill, Macmillan) p. 6: 'holy Chrysostom, as is reported, nightly studied...the same author, and had the art to cleanse a scurrilous vehemence into the style of a rousing sermon.' For the source of this statement see the Editor's note.
tracted him by his vivacity, exuberance, and literary sense, however great the difference between them in other respects.

(e) Isocrates, Demosthenes, Thucydides, and Plato are mentioned by name in one passage as being, each in his own way, masters of prose style.

(f) Vergil seems to be echoed in one passage, probably unconsciously.

§ 5. THE IDENTITY OF THE BASIL OF THE
DE SACERDOTIO.

The following historical personages have been identified with the Basil of the dialogue. I put first the view which seems to me most probable.

(1) The Basil who became Bishop of Raphanea, a town in Syria not far from Antioch. This suits the conclusion of the dialogue where Chrysostom promises to visit his friend from time to time. In this there would be no difficulty if one was at Antioch, the other at Raphanea. We find a Basil bishop of Raphanea present at the Synod of Constantinople in 381, eight years after the probable date of the consecration of the Basil of the de sacerdotio.

This is the view which seems to have gained general acceptance. It is adopted, for instance, by Fronto Ducæus, Baronius, Tillemont, Montfaucon, Bardenhewer.

1 in ὑπὲρ δὲ εἰ μὲν τὴν λείπητα Ἰσοκράτους ἀκρίβως κτλ. (see note). For Demosthenes see also notes on pp. 26, 1 and 69, 3: for Plato, note on p. 17, 2.
2 in 6 τίς γὰρ τόσο τῆς οἰκουμένης...τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ δίκαιος ἄθλους ἥρρησεν; cp. Verg. Aen. i. 459.
(2) Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. This view is thought to gain support from a passage in the historian Socrates: but Socrates' words, rightly considered, merely prove that Chrysostom was intimate with Basil of Caesarea: they have no reference to the de sacerdotio. The great Basil, who was born in 331 (according to others in 327), was at least 13 years older than Chrysostom, and therefore could scarcely have been (as the Basil of the dialogue certainly was) Chrysostom's fellow student. Moreover the consecration of Basil as bishop of Caesarea would naturally take place at Caesarea, not at Antioch; and if, as seems certain, the de sacerdotio was written after 380, it would scarcely have been possible for Chrysostom to exclude all reference to Basil's noteworthy episcopate at Caesarea (370–379) had the Basil of the dialogue and Basil the Great been identical.

(3) Basil, bishop of Seleucia, who took a leading part in the Council of Constantinople (held 448), in which Eutyches was condemned. This view was held by Photius1, who comments on the similarity which he discerned between the writings of Chrysostom and those of Basil of Seleucia. But this Basil, who was alive in 458, cannot possibly have been in his youth a comrade of Chrysostom, who was much senior to him.

(4) Maximus, bishop of Mopsuestia, who was according to Socrates induced by Chrysostom to abandon a career of worldly ambition. No reason, however, has been given for the change of name from Maximus to Basilius. It is clear from the dialogue itself that the

1 Bibliothecae ex chreia tων εκκλησίων Χρυσοστομός λόγων καὶ νοημάτων, καὶ μάλιστα των κατὰ τὴν ἤλιον γραφήν, εἰ τοῖς τοῦ Βασίλειου λόγων ἑπισφάλειαν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς προηγή τῶν μαθημάτων ἀριστερὼν ἄρθρω τὰ πρόσφορα.
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circumstances in which Chrysostom deceived his friend were widely known and had been freely canvassed: and the change of name would have been quite purposeless. The distance between Antioch and Mopsuestia (in Cilicia) is another argument against this view, which has indeed nothing to recommend it.

(§) It has also been held that the character, and therefore the name, of Basil is a pure figment of Chrysostom’s imagination. It is surely beyond question that the episode on which the de sacerdotio is based is an historical one, not merely invented: and so it has been taken by an overwhelming majority of those who have written on the subject.

§ 6. HISTORY OF THE TEXT¹.

I. List of the most important Editions.

1. The de sacerdotio was printed separately long before the appearance of the first complete edition of the works of Chrysostom in the original Greek. In 1525 the editio princeps of the de sac.² was issued from the printing press of Froeben, at Basle. It contained the Greek text, with a prefatory letter addressed by Erasmus to Wilibald Pirkheimer, the learned humanist

¹ See F. W. Lomler Joannis Chrysostomi opera praestantissima Graece et Latine (Rudolstadt, 1837) Tom. i pars 1 (no further portion of this work was ever issued): the introduction contains a useful list of early editions of the de sacerdotio. Bardenhewer Patrologie² p. 301, Hoffmann Lexicon Bibliographicum ii 544 sqq., Fabricius-Harles Bibl. Gr. (Hamburg, 1801) viii 454—583, should also be consulted.

² The title of the book is Quod multae quidem dignitatis, sed difficile sit, episcopum agere—dialogi sex: Graece.
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of Nürnberg, and the host, friend, and adviser of almost all the scholars of Germany.\(^1\)

The text of this edition is admirable from a typographical point of view. It has, however, no critical value.

2. The next edition is equally void of critical importance. In 1529 the publisher Rutgers Rescius brought out, at Louvain, a text of the de sacerdotio, of which the editor was Nicolas Clenard.\(^3\)

3. In the two editions just named no mention is made of the manuscripts on which the text is based. In 1599 a step in advance was made, when David Hoeschel published an edition of the de sacerdotio\(^4\) based on the readings of certain specified manuscripts: viz. the Palatinus (in the Palatine library at Heidelberg), the Augustanus (in the library at Augsburg), the Coloniensis (at Cologne), and others of less importance. Hoeschel regarded the Palatinus and the Augustanus as especially valuable: the former of these seems to have disappeared, a fate which will not appear remarkable to those who remember the vicissitudes of the Palatine library in the Thirty Years’ war. The Augustanus is now in the Hof- und Staatsbibliothek at Munich.

Hoeschel’s preface is addressed to ‘Albertus a Steten, Reipublicae August. Consul,’ and from it we learn the

\(^1\) On Pirkheimer see Bp Creighton, History of the Papacy (ed. of 1903) vol. vi pp. 18, 19.

\(^3\) Quod multae guidem dignitatis, sed difficile sit episcopum agere: a Nicolao Clenardo. Graece. Lovanii per Rutgers Resciun.

\(^4\) S. Ioannis Chrysostomi de sacerdotio libri VI. Graece et Latine. DCC amplius locis emendati aucti illustrati ope librorum MSS ex bibliothecis Palatina et Augustana, opera Davidis Hoeschelii. Augustae Vindeliciorum [i.e. Augsburg] 1599. A life of Chrysostom occupies pp. 483—499, and notes on text pp. 500—539 of this work.
principles by which the editor was guided in the formation of his text. He states that he made a careful collation of the Palatinus and Augustanus, removing their errors, filling up their lacunae, and appending an apparatus criticus which he had compiled from the readings of these manuscripts.

There is no copy of Hoeschel’s edition in the British Museum; and I have been unable to obtain one from any other source. However, through the kindness of my friend Mr Vincent Benson, scholar of New College, Oxford, I have secured a transcript of the most important of the critical notes, and I am satisfied that nothing of importance has escaped his attention and acumen.

The chief value of Hoeschel’s edition lies not in the text, which seems to contain little to justify the somewhat confident statement on the title-page (see previous page, footnote 3), but in the marginal readings, derived from the manuscripts above mentioned. It should, however, be added that many of these marginalia are of little or no value, and that Hoeschel seems to have made no attempt to estimate the relative importance of his two best manuscripts.

4. After Hoeschel no separate edition of the de sacerdotio appeared for more than a century. But in 1610, eleven years after the publication of Hoeschel’s book, there appeared the first volume of the great edition in Greek of the complete works of Chrysostom by Sir Henry Savile. This work has justly earned for Savile a reputation as one of the most eminent Greek

1 'libros diligentem contuli, errata sustuli, lacunas explavi, lectionem varietatem annotavi.'
2 Τοῦ εὐ ἄγιος πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἸΩΑΝΝΟΤ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινο-πόλεως τοῦ ΧΡΤΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΤ τῶν εὐαγγελίων Τόμοι πρώτοι κτλ. δι’ ἐπιμελείας καὶ ἀναλωμάτων ΕΡΡΙΚΟΤ τοῦ ΣΑΒΙΑΙΟΤ ἐκ παλαιῶν άντιγράφων ἐκδοθεὶς. Ετοιμα 1612 etc.
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scholars that this country has produced; and in many respects it exhibits a scientific conception of the duties of an editor which it would be difficult to parallel until quite recent times. Savile spared neither labour nor expense to make his edition perfect. He gave occupation to a whole army of scribes, whom he engaged to copy the manuscripts of Chrysostom in the various libraries of Europe. He was assisted by many eminent scholars: e.g. Jacques de Thou, Andreas Schottus, Isaac Casaubon, Janus Gruter, David Hoeschel: and the influence of James I, whose interest in theological studies is well known, was exerted to enlist the active cooperation of foreign princes and English ambassadors on behalf of Savile's enterprise. Every precaution was taken by both editor and printer—John Norton, the king's printer—to ensure accuracy. The preparation of the edition is said to have cost Savile £8000: and, as a result, this sumptuous undertaking has been called by Hallam, not unreasonably, the first work of learning on a great scale published in England.¹

Savile tells us that as the basis of his own text of the de sacerdotio he used that of Hoeschel: but had corrected it with the aid of two manuscripts at Oxford, one in the library of Corpus Christi College, the other in that of New College. The amount of new material that he utilized in the case of this treatise was thus comparatively small: but his extensive knowledge of patristic Greek, and his sound judgment, helped him no less in the de sacerdotio than in other portions of his edition. His text is one of the most trustworthy that has appeared: and I have never differed from him without hesitation.

¹ See the article on Sir Henry Savile in the Dictionary of National Biography.
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At the end of the eighth and concluding volume of Savile's edition there are Latin notes, both critical and explanatory, on the de sac. They are by the editor and certain of his English friends—John Boys, Canon of Ely, Richard Montagu, and others.

5. While in England the edition just described was being passed through the press, the French Jesuit Fronto Ducaeus (Fronton du Duc) was engaged in Paris on a similar task. His edition, which included a Latin translation of the Greek original, was left unfinished at Fronto's early death: but was completed in six volumes by Federicus and Claudius Morellus. In 1636 an edition in twelve volumes was published, and this was reprinted at Frankfurt (1697), Mainz (1702), and again at Frankfurt (1723).

Variant readings and notes, in Latin, are to be found at the end of volumes 1, 4, and 6 of the original edition. The Latin translation, which was by Fronto himself, was based on that of Germanus Brixius (1534). According to Fuller, in his Worthies of England, the Latin text was derived from proof-sheets of Savile's work, which had been secured by fraud. But though Savile's text seems to have been employed, there is no evidence that it was fraudulently obtained.  

1 The title of the fourth volume is: S. patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitanis de sacerdotio libri VI etc. nunc primum Graece et Latine consimiliter editi—[edidit] Fronto Ducaeus, Societatis Jesu Theologus—Lutetiae Parisiorum apud Claudium Morellum 1614. See Seltmann p. xii: the number of this volume, according to Seltmann, was given as X in his copy; this must be a mere misprint, for there was no teth volume of the work until 1636.

2 See the article on Sir Henry Savile in the Dictionary of National Biography. But it would rather appear from Fuller's words that it was the Greek text of Savile that was thus used by Fronto. 'The papists in Paris had their emissaries in England, who surreptitiously procured this knight's [Savile's] learned labours and sent them over weekly by the post into
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For the text of the de sacerdotio, Fronto used the Augustanus of Hoeschel, adding readings from two 'Regii libri': of these one was bought by Francis I (this is styled by Fronto 'F'): the other was bought by Henry II (Fronto styles this MS. 'H'). He also had before him 'membranae nobilissimi viri Fr. Olivarii' ('O'): and the vetus interpretatio, which he consulted in the edition published at Paris in 1524 by Petrus Gromorsus. The editio princeps to which Fronto refers is not that of 1525, but the Louvain edition of 1529, which he usually cites as L or Lo.

6. In the year 1710 John Hughes, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, brought out an edition of the de sacerdotio, 'typis academicis, impensis Edm. Jeffery'. The book contains the Greek text of the treatise, with Latin translation. Prefixed to the text are valuable dissertations on the Christian priesthood: also a life of Chrysostom taken from Cave's historia litteraria, which had in turn been borrowed from the life by Savile included in his edition of the works of Chrysostom. Notes, chiefly of a critical character, conclude Hughes' work.

In the first few sentences of these notes Hughes explains the principle in accordance with which he had prepared his text; he followed, he tells us, Savile's

France.... Then Fronto Ducaeus....caused them to be printed there with implicit faith and blind obedience....only joining thereunto a Latin translation and some other inconsiderable additions': cp. J. G. Scheidt de optimis Chrysostomi editionibus (Dissert.) Wittenberg p. 35.

1 Jeffery was a bookseller. The title of this edition is: S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani de sacerdotio libri VI, Graece et Latine: accessisse dissertationes quaedam provemiales de dignitate sacerdotali, item S. Chrysostomi vita e celeberrimi Cavii historia litteraria desumta. Editionem adornavit, praelectionemque adexit Ioannes Hughes A.M., Collegii Jesu apud Cantabrigiensis socius. Cantabrigiae...1710.
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edition, as being the best of all: but in a few passages he had adopted the readings of Hoeschel and Fronto. Occasionally he had differed from all three editors, and had used for the correction of the text the manuscript evidence accumulated by Fronto. Hughes' text is in no respect better than those of his predecessors: but in his notes he often advocates the true reading, and supports his views with considerable learning and judgment.

7. It is convenient to reckon as an independent edition that of S. Thirlby, which appeared in Cambridge in 1712: but this does not profess to be more than a second edition of Hughes' work, upon which Hughes himself was engaged at the time of his death. Besides the de sacerdotio, however, Thirlby's edition of Hughes contained the oratio apologetica de fuga of Gregory of Nazianzus, the subject of this oration being, as we have seen, closely akin to that of Chrysostom's treatise on the priesthood 1.

As regards the text, Thirlby tells us that the first two books, and part of the third, of the de sacerdotio remained unchanged. He had, however, taken steps, by a fresh collation of manuscripts—these manuscripts are not specified—to ensure greater correctness in the text of the remaining portion of the work.

8. We now come to that which is generally regarded as the standard edition of Chrysostom. I refer to the edition by Dom Bernard de Montfaucon, a Benedictine monk of the order of St Maur. From 1718 to 1738 Montfaucon was engaged on this work; and considering his advanced age (eighty-three) at the time when it was completed it certainly bears testimony to his indefatigable activity. There is no doubt that Montfaucon was energetic in the collection of new material; and a number of homilies by Chrysostom were for the first time published in his edition. His prefatory remarks prefixed to each treatise, and the life of Chrysostom with the diatribae, or dissertations, in his concluding volume, although of a somewhat unmethodical character, are nevertheless very valuable. It is, however, impossible to be satisfied with the way in which he has dealt with the problems of textual criticism.

For a long time scholars have been aware of the unsatisfactory nature of the critical side of Montfaucon’s otherwise useful edition; and I am thus relieved from the necessity of demonstrating its inadequacy in regard to the text of the de sacerdotio in particular. I need only refer to the clear and convincing proof of Montfaucon’s remissness given by Dr F. Field, one of the most eminent editors of Chrysostom, in his edition of the Homilies on St Matthew: and with this statement I entirely

1 It seems hardly worth while to give the long and rather pretentious title of this work, which, thanks to reprints, may be found in most libraries.

2 See Field’s ed. of Homm. in Matt. (Cambridge 1839) Praefatio pp. xiii sqq.: thus (p. xiv) ‘‘codices non modo non contulit bonus monachus, sed interdum ne inspexit quidem...’ ne unum quidem (codicum) nominatim appellat, sed ‘unum;’ ‘duo,’ ‘alios;’ hoc vel illud legere monens, umbrosis ac simulacris lectorem ludit’’ etc. For illustrations of the unsatisfactory nature of Montfaucon’s apparatus to the de sac., see Journal of Theol. Studies, July 1906, p. 588.