

Durham E-Theses

*The Theological, ecclesiological and eschatological
perspective of the apostolic office according to St.
John Chrysostom*

Panagiotis Myrou

How to cite:

Myrou, Panagiotis (1996) The Theological, ecclesiological and eschatological perspective of the apostolic office according to St. John Chrysostom. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5378/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

PANAGIOTIS G. MYROU
Graduate of Theology and Ancient Greek Literature
University of Athens

**THE THEOLOGICAL, ECCLESIOLOGICAL
AND ESCHATOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE
OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE
ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM**

The copyright of this thesis rests
with the author. No quotation
from it should be published
without the written consent of the
author and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



A Dissertation
submitted to the
Faculty of Arts,
Department of Theology,
University of Durham
for the Degree of the Master of Arts

DURHAM 1996

1-4 MAR 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. The Apostolic Office and its bearers in modern research | 12 |
| 2. Data pertaining to the Apostolic Office in other Church fathers before Chrysostom | 15 |
| 3. John Chrysostom's background as proposition of his teaching on the Apostolic Office | 18 |
| 4. Data pertaining to the Apostolic Office and its bearers in the work of Chrysostom | 22 |

CHAPTER ONE: THE THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1.1. Introductory note | 27 |
| 1.2. The origins of the Apostolic Office | 27 |
| 1.3. The Apostolic Office as common energy of the Triune God | 31 |
| 1.3.1. The apostles belong to all three divine Persons | 32 |
| 1.3.1.1. The apostles receive the revelation of the mysteries from all three divine Persons | 34 |
| 1.3.1.2. The apostles are sent by all three divine Persons | 39 |
| 1.3.1.3. The presence of all three divine Persons in the acting apostles | 42 |
| 1.3.2. "Economic" distinction of divine energies in relation to the Apostolic Office | 44 |
| 1.3.2.1. God the Father as 'the beginning' (ἡ ἀρχή) and 'first cause' (αἰτία ἢ πρώτη) of the Apostolic Office | 46 |
| 1.3.2.2. The Son as fulfiller of the Apostolic Office | 49 |
| 1.3.2.3. The Holy Spirit as the fullness of the apostles and treasure of the apostolic gifts | 55 |
| 1.3.2.4. The Holy Spirit as elucidator of Christ's teaching | 58 |
| 1.3.2.5. The Holy Spirit transformer and inspirer of the apostles | 60 |
| 1.3.2.6. The Holy Spirit as the source of the apostolic dogmas and charismata | 61 |

1.4. Conclusions	64
CHAPTER TWO: THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE	
2.1. General consideration of the chrysostomic teaching about the Church	66
2.2. The Apostolic Office in the periods of the Church preceding the incarnation	71
2.3. The Apostolic Office in the historic period of the Church following the incarnation	75
2.3.1. The Church as a building and the Apostolic Office	75
2.3.2. The growth of the Church's body and the Apostolic Office	81
2.4. The Apostolic Office as is shown in the worshipping congregation	85
2.5. The Apostolic Office as contributor to the Church's unity	90
2.6. The Church is apostolic in its structure	94
2.7. Conclusions	98
CHAPTER THREE: THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE	
3.1. Basic elements of Chrysostom's eschatology	101
3.2. Jesus Christ's words to the apostles on the eschata	108
3.3. The mindedness and preaching of the apostles about the eschata	114
3.4. The exploitation of the "καιρός" by the bearers of the Apostolic Office	121
3.5. The Apostolic Office as ministry to the "bridal procession"	123
3.6. The place of the Apostolic Office in the Last Judgement and beyond	125
3.7. Conclusions	128
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY	135
1. Ancient Sources	137
2. Books and Articles	

PREFACE

Searching through the bibliography related to the Apostolic Office and the apostles, I noticed that in a vast number of books and articles, one would not be able to find any specific studies based on an examination of the works of the Church fathers. Having noticed that and taking for granted the importance of this office in ecclesiastical life and worship, I decided to embark on the study of this topic on the basis of the work of one of the Church fathers. My preference for John Chrysostom is to be attributed mainly to two reasons; first, to a broader view that Chrysostom is one of the most productive authors and authoritative interpreters of the Bible with a large number of references to the Apostolic Office and its bearers; second, to the fact that I am especially fond of this ancient ecclesiastical author, something inspired in me by my spiritual father Augustine, Metropolitan of Florina, Greece, from as early as my undergraduate years. Since then I have had the opportunity to study the chrysostomic work in its entirety from the original Greek text.

When I undertook the present work, I once again started to study the same texts. This time I focused my attention on texts most related to my topic, such as the expository homilies on the Gospels according to Matthew and John, on the Acts of the Apostles and on St. Paul's Epistles, as well as the homilies referring to the title of the Acts and to particular apostolic words. Furthermore, I have used the TLG electronic system to track down other relevant related concepts from the entire spectrum of the chrysostomic work.

In my attempts to improve the present work, I was assisted by several persons, to whom I should like to express my gratitude. First of all, I should like to thank father George Dragas, senior lecturer at Durham University and now dean at Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School in Boston, U.S.A., who, as my supervisor, substantially helped me in completing this work with his constant supervision, experienced guidance and suitable remarks. Alongside him, I should like to express my thanks to the rest of the staff of the Department of Theology in Durham, who kindly admitted me to the university community of Durham, as well

as to the staff of the Palace Green Library, who always helped me promptly. Furthermore, I wish to thank Stergios Sakkos, professor at the Faculty of Theology of Thessaloniki University, who contributed to my initiation into theology and more recently read through the longest part of the Greek text and made substantial and useful suggestions.

I should also like to express my gratitude to my special friend Athanasios Paparnakis, M.A., who assisted me with computers processing, to Philip Papadimitriou, B.A., M. Phil. and to Dawn Regan, B.A., Dip. Ed., who helped me with English.

Finally, a debt is owed to the Administration of the ERASMUS Scholarships Institution for supporting me financially for the first years of my studies as well as to my respected parents who carried most of the burden of the expenses of my stay in England and to my special friends who supported me in every way.

Durham, September 1996

ABBREVIATIONS

a. Bible books

Gen	Genesis
Ex	Exodus
Lev	Leviticus
Deut	Deuteronomy
Ps	Psalms
Is	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Mat	Matthew
Mark	Mark
Lk	Luke
Jn	Jonh
Acts	Acts of the Apostles
Rom	Romans
1Cor	1Corinthians
2Cor	2Corinthians
Gal	Galatians
Eph	Ephesians
Phil	Philippians
Col	Colossians
1Thess	1Thessalonians
2Thess	2Thessalonians
1Tim	1Timothy
2Tim	2Timothy
Tit	Titus
Philem	Philemon
Hebr	Hebrews
Jam	James
1Pe	1Peter
2Pe	2Peter
1John	1John
2John	2John
3John	2John
Jud	Jude
Rev	Revelation

b. Chrysostom's works

GEN	In Genesim
PSALM	Expositio in Psalmos
JER	Fragmenta in Jeremiam
MAT	In Matthaëum

JOHN	In Johannum
ACTS	In Acta Apostolorum
ROM	In Epistulam ad Romanos
1COR	In Epistulam i ad Corinthios
2COR	In Epistulam ii ad Corinthios
GAL	In Epistulam ad Galatas
EPH	In Epistulam ad Ephesios
PHIL	In Epistulam ad Philipenses
COL	In Epistulam ad Colossenses
1THESS	In Epistulam i ad Thessalonicenses
2THESS	In Epistulam ii ad Thessalonicenses
1TIM	In Epistulam i ad Timotheum
2TIM	In Epistulam ii ad Timotheum
TIT	In Epistulam ad Titum
PHILEM	In Epistulam ad Philemonem
HEBR	In Epistulam ad Hebraeos
ASC	De Ascensione
INCOMPR	De Incomprehensibili Dei natura
PAENIT	De Paenitentia
PENT	De Pentecoste
PHILOG	De beato Philogonio
PRINC	In principium Actorum
SACERD	De Sacerdotio
VIRG	De Virginitate

c. Reference books and periodicals

ABD	The Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. D.Freedman, N. York 1992.
AJTh	American Journal of Theology.
AvBλ	Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, Θεσσαλονίκη.
AsSe	Assemblées du Seigneur.
AThANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Basel/Zurich.
AThR	Anglican Theological Review, Evanston.
AuBR	Australian Biblical Review, Melbourne.
AMZ	Allgemeine Missions Zeit.
BEnBT	Bauer Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology, London.
BEΠEΣ	Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων καὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Συγγραφέων, Ἀθήναι.
BiRe	Biblical Research.
BiTo	Bible Today, Collegeville.
BiZ	Biblische Zeitschrift, Paterborn.
BJRL	Bulletin of John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Manchester.
ΒΛΜλ	Σ. Ἀγουρίδη, Βιβλικά Μελετήματα, Θεσσαλονίκη, vol. Α' (1966), vol. Β' (1971).
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra, Dallas.
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
CBG	Collationes Brigenses et Condarenses.
CBQ	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington DC.

CDTh	A Catholic Dictionary of Theology, London.
CECNT	Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, Edinburgh.
ChCt	Christianskoje Ctenije.
ChJATh	Churchman: Journal of Anglican Theology.
ChQR	The Church Quarterly Review.
CJT	Canadian Journal of Theology.
CIPhI	Classical Philology, Chicago.
ClRe	Clergy Review, London.
CoCR	Coptic Church Review.
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vienna.
CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly.
CurTM	Current in Theology and Mission, Chicago.
ΔBM	Δελτίο Βιβλικῶν Μελετῶν, Ἀθήνα.
DCG	Dictionary of the Christ and the Gospels (ed. J. Hastings).
DGRA	A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, 18903.
DPUCh	Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, Chicago.
DuRe	Dublin Review, Dublin.
EcRe	The Ecumenical Review, Geneva.
EDTh	Evangelical Dictionary of Theology (ed. W. A. Elwell), Michigan 1989 ³ .
ΕΕΘΣΘ	Ἐπιστημονικὴ ἑπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Ἀθηνῶν, Ἀθήναι.
ΕΕΘΣΘ	Ἐπιστημονικὴ ἑπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, Θεσσαλονίκη.
EnECh	Encyclopedia of Early Christianity (ed. G. Ferguson), N. York 1990.
EnRl	The Encyclopedia of Religion, London.
EnTh	Encyclopedia of Theology, (ed. K. Rahner,), N. York 1991.
ΕΦ	Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος, Ἀλεξάνδρεια.
EsBi	Estudios Biblicos, Madrid.
EvQ	The Evangelical Quarterly, Buxton, Derbyshire.
EuDo	Euntes Docete, Rome.
ExDNT	Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, (ed. W. B. Eermans), Michigan 1991-1994.
ExTi	The Expository Times, Edinburgh.
FrSt	Franciscan Studies.
FZPT	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie, Freiburg.
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller. Berlin.
GELNT	Grimm, Greek- English Lexicon of the New Testament, Edinburgh 1930 ⁴ .
GOTR	The Greek Orthodox Theological Review, Brookline MA.
ΓρΠ	Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμάς, Θεσσαλονίκη.
HerKor	Herder Korespondenz, Freiburg.
HPR	The Homeletic and Pastoral Review.
HTR	Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge MA.
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual, Cincinnati.
ICC	The International Critical Commmentary of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, Edinburgh.

IKZ	Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift, Frankfurt.
IrBS	Irish Biblical Studies, Belfast.
IRM	International Review of Mission, Geneva.
IJT	The Indian Journal of Theology, Calcuta.
JATh	Journal of Anglican Theology.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia.
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Cambridge.
JETS	Journal of Evangelical Theological Society, Wheaton.
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the N. Testament, Sheffield.
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies, Manchester.
JSOR	Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford.
ΛΑΕΓ	Ἰ. Σταματάκου, Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἀρχ. Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης, Ἀθῆναι.
MEE	Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία, Ἀθῆναι.
MeTh	Melita Theologica, Malta.
ΜΛΕΓ	Liddel and Scott, Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης.
MSR	Melange de Science Religiense.
NBD	New Bible Dictionary.
NCEn	New Catholic Encyclopedia, Sain Francisco.
NDCTh	A New Dictionary of Christian Theology.
NDTh	A New Dictionary of Theology, Leicester.
NEAH	Νεώτερον Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸν Λεξικὸν τοῦ Ἡλίου, Ἀθῆναι.
NIDNT	The New International Dictionary of the New Testament, Exeter 1975.
NovT	Novum Testamentum, Leiden.
NPNF	A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Ph. Shaff.
NTA	New Testament Abstracts 1 (1956)- 38 (1994).
NTS	New Testament Studies. An International Journal, Cambridge.
OChr	One in Christ. A Catholic Ecumenical Review, Turvey, Bedfordshire.
ODCC	Oxford Dictionary of Christian Church, Oxford.
ΠΑΑ	Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν, Ἀθῆναι.
PB	Pastor Bonus.
PG	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris.
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris.
PGL	G. W. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Oxford 1961.
POC	Proche Orient Chretien. Revue d' Etudes d' Informations, Jerusalem
ΠΘΣΜΘ	Πρακτικὰ Θεολ. Συνεδρίου Ἰ. Μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης, Θεσσαλονίκη.
RCIFr	Revue de Clerge Francais.
REn	Relencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, ed. G. Wissowa-W. Krall, Stuttgart.
RevBib	Revue Biblique, Paris.
RevByz	Revue des Études Byzantines, Paris.
REx	Review and Expositor. A Baptist Theological Journal, Louisville.
RInO	Religion Index One. Periodicals.
RInT	Religion Index Two. Books.

RITh	Revue Internationale de Théologie.
RQ	Restoration Quarterly, Abilene.
RSR	Recherches de Science Religieuses, Paris.
RThAM	Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Medievale, Louvain.
RTm	Revue Thomiste.
RW	Reformed World, Geneva.
SC	Sources Chrétiennes, Paris.
SeCe	The Second Century, Abilene.
SearTo	Searching Together, Dresser WI.
ΣΕγκ	Σύγχρονος Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία (Ἐλευθερουδάκη), Ἀθήναι.
SEv	Studia Evangelica, (E. A. Livingstone), Berlin.
SFLTThss	Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians.
SHO	The Sacrament of Holy Orders, Collegeville 1962.
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh.
ΣΟΘ	Σύναξις Ὀρθοδόξων Θεολόγων (Εἰσηγήσεις), 1971.
SP	Studia Patristica.
SPS	Sacra pagina Series, Collegeville.
STh	Studia Theologica, Lund.
StTh	Studii Theologicae.
ΣΘΘ	Σεμινάριο Θεολόγων Θεσσαλονίκης, Θεσσαλονίκη.
SvEA	Svensk Exegetisk Arsvok.
SVTQ	Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, N. York.
TB	Tyndale Bulletin, Cambridge.
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (G. Kittel, Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament).
ThG	Theologie und Glaube, Paterborn.
ΘHE	Θρησκευτική και Ἠθική Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία, Ἀθήναι.
ΘIM	Θεολογικαὶ καὶ Ἱστορικαὶ Μελέται.
ΘΜελ	Θεολογικὰ Μελετήματα, Θεσσαλονίκη.
ThQS	Theologische Quartalschrift, Tübingen.
ThS	Theological Studies, Baltimore.
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, California.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Leiptig-Berlin 1882.
UnRe	Unitarian Review.
UnSa	Una Sancta.
URE	Unsere religiösen Erzieher, Lieptig 1917.
VerCar	Verbum Caro.
VGT	Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London 1930.
Vox Ev	Vox Evangelica, London.
VSp	La Via Spirituale.
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary. Bible Commentaries.
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal.
WW	Wissenschaft und Weltbild.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin.
ZKTh	Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, Vienna.
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und der Alteren Kirche, Berlin.

d. Various

cf.	confer
ed.	edition
ff.	and the following pages
N. T.	New Testament
op. cit.	opposite cited
orat.	oratio
p.	page
pp.	pages
st.	saint
suppl.	supplementum
vol.	volume
vols.	volumes

INTRODUCTION

1. The Apostolic Office and its bearers in modern research

A mere skimming through the existing bibliography referring to the Apostolic Office and, mainly, to its bearers, the apostles¹, is enough to reveal that this topic is one of the most widely discussed in theological circles during the last one hundred and fifty years.

The interest in the apostles and their office was relatively rekindled in modern times by the English scholar Lightfoot, who in 1865 published his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* with an excursus on "The name and the office of an Apostle"². In it this distinguished Biblical scholar locates the origins of the term "apostle" in Greek and Jewish literature and concludes that in the New Testament there is a body of apostles wider than the circle of the Twelve. A little later the German historian A. Harnack, having taken into account Lightfoot's observations as well as the text of *Didache* that was published in 1883³, was led to a different conclusion. He denied any kind of authority, jurisdiction and administration to the apostles and considered them as gifted trumpets of the Lord, or as "enthusiasts", that is, men set in motion by the Spirit⁴.

After Harnack "it is impossible here to describe the animated story of the investigation into the concept of the apostle"⁵. Yet, it should be noted that since the beginning of the present century there have been many vigorous attempts to

¹ See, Bibliography of present work. Also, "Apostres" in, U. Chavalier, *Repertoire sources historiques du Moyen Age, 1894-1895*; "apostle" "apostleship" "apostolic" in, *Religion Index One: periodicals*, vols. 1 (1949)-25 (1993); *Religion Index Two: Books, 1960-1990*; *New Testament Abstracts*, 1 (1956)-38 (2, 1994).

² J. B. Lightfoot, *St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1865; latest impression Grand Rapids 1950) 89-97.

³ Φιλοθέου Βρυεννίου, *Διδαχή τῶν Δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, Κωνσταντινούπολις 1883.

⁴ See, A. Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*, 1884; E.M. Kredel, "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese", *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 78 (1956) 169-193, 257-305; G. Klein., *Die zwölf Apostel* (1961) 22-65.

⁵ R. Schnackenburg, "Apostolicity, the present position in studies", *One in Christ* 6 (1970) 244.

present Jesus' message as "eschatological"⁶ and this general trend has significantly influenced the research referring to the Apostolic Office and its bearers. At first, in the works of J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer and later on in those of J. Munck, C. K. Barrett and O. Cullmann, the apostles were considered as participants in Jesus' eschatological message⁷.

The investigation into my topic followed a new course with Rengstorf's article in *TDNT*⁸. He concludes that, rather than their being sent as representatives in the manner of Jewish history, the concept of the apostle mainly lies in imparting the Word, by whom the apostle is authorised, while at the same time he finds "the classical form of the apostolate in the person of Paul"⁹. It is mainly on this position that later on Schmithals bases his work on the office of apostle in the early Church¹⁰. As J.A. Kirk noticed, "Rengstorf's thesis has unleashed a torrent of articles and books, sustaining, modifying or rejecting his position"¹¹. In the large number of relevant works added to the list over the last decades, their authors move in effect within nearly the same framework. I should mention, however, the names of two contemporary theologians, whose positions appear differentiated. These are J. L. Leuba, a Reformed scholar, who tries to overcome the tension between the institutional apostolate of the Twelve and the spiritual apostolate of Paul¹², and J. D. Zizioulas, an Orthodox theologian, who attempts a synthesis of what he calls the "historical" and "eschatological" approaches¹³.

In general, we can say that basic positions recur from generation to generation with very few deviations, although particular trends do emerge as well. Some of the main trends in contemporary research into our topic are the following:

1. The gravity given to the philological examination of the term "apostle" is disproportionate to its content and essence. This accounts for the fact that in most

⁶ Ch. Voulgaris, "Ἡ ὑπὸ τὸ πρῖσμα τῆς ἐσχατολογίας θεώρησις τῆς ἐνότητος τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας" in his book, *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (1974) 41-60.

⁷ R. Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 245, where the relevant bibliography.

⁸ K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀπόστολος", *TDNT*, vol. 1, pp. 407-447.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 437-443.

¹⁰ W. Schmithals, *The Office of an Apostle in the Early Church*. (translated into English 1971).

¹¹ J. A. Kirk, "Apostleship since Rengstorf: Towards a Synthesis", *New Testament Studies* 21 (2, 1975) 250. where the relevant bibliography.

¹² J. L. Leuba, *L' institution et l' événement*, 1950, pp. 47-60.

¹³ J. D. Zizioulas, "Apostolic continuity and Orthodox Theology: Towards a Synthesis of two Perspectives", *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 19 (2, 1975) 75-108; "Apostolic Continuity and Succession" in his book, *Being as Communion* (1985) 171-208.

of the relevant articles and books a comparatively large part is devoted to the origin of the term "apostle"¹⁴.

2. Considering the New Testament texts as self-sufficient and independent from each other is invariably regarded as an unquestionable presupposition for the relevant investigation. Thus, some of our contemporaries locate the beginning of the use of the term "apostle" in Paul¹⁵, others in Mark¹⁶ and others in the primitive Church¹⁷.

3. The further we move away from the earlier researchers, the rarer the references to the works of the Church fathers are¹⁸. Yet, these works naturally lead us to the sources.

Having considered the many and remarkable efforts of many researchers to elucidate the matter, I could not agree with K. Giles, who, reiterating A. M. Hunter's comment on Christ's parables that "we may now claim to understand them better than any Christians since the Apostolic Age"¹⁹, argues that "the same thing may be said about our understanding of apostles in the New Testament"²⁰. On the contrary, I think that nowadays there is much more confusion and that Hans Dieter Betz's remark "since scholarship is still divided on many of the questions, the following definitions [of the Apostle] must be seen as a part of the argument and

¹⁴ See relevant articles in most of the Theological Dictionaries and Encyclopedias (Among the others, *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*; *Bauer Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*; *The Encyclopedia of Religion*; *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*; *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*; *New Dictionary of Theology*; *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* on which cf my Bibliography). Also, F. Gavin, "Shaliah and Apostolos", *The Anglican Theological Review* 9 (Jan 1927) 250-259; J. K. Kirk., *op. cit.*; H. Vogelstein, "The development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its Transformation in Christianity", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 2 (1925) 99-123; C. K. Barrett, "Shaliach and Apostle", *Domini Gentilium: New Testament Studies in Honor of David Daube* (1978) 82-102; F. Agnew, "On the Origin of the Term Apostolos", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976) 49-53; C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie neo-testamentaire, Supplement*, (1982) 54-63.

¹⁵ See, K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀπόστολος", *op. cit.*; J. Munck, "Paul, the Apostles and the Twelve", *Studia Theologica* 3 (1950-1951) 96-110; M. Sabre, "Enkele aspecten van het apostolaat bij Paulus", *Collationes Brigenses et Gondavenses* 3 (1957) 507-521; Ascraft, M., "Paul's understanding of Apostleship" *Review and Expositor* 55 (1958) 400-412; Ch. Dorsey, "Paul's use of Apostolos", *Restoration Quarterly* 28 (1985-1986) 193-200.

¹⁶ See, F. Agnew, "Apostle", *New Bible Dictionary*, p. 59.

¹⁷ See, B. Rigaux, "The Twelve Apostles", *Concilium*, 34 (1968) 4, "The term 'Apostle' is therefore a creation of the primitive Church and must be considered within the milieu where it originated".

¹⁸ W. Telfer, "The fourth century Greek Fathers as exegetes", *Harvard Theological Review*, 50 (2, 1957) 91, "In most Western Universities it could be rare to find references to patristic exegesis in lectures on the Old or New Testaments".

¹⁹ Hunter, A. M., *The Parables Then and Now*, (in K. Giles' book. See next footnote).

²⁰ K. Giles, "Apostles before and after Paul", *Churchman: Journal of Anglican Theology* 99 (3, 1985) 241.

not as final answers"²¹, holds true both in a broader sense and with regard to the other aspects of the topic under investigation. I would dare say that contemporary research into my topic often turns out to be a game of countless confrontations which transfer the centre of gravity from the essence of the investigated issue to a series of introductory comments on it. Could it not be the case that turning to the ancient Church fathers for a closer and deeper study of their relevant teaching might offer a real way out²²? Since the first indications we had from the study of relevant texts of Chrysostom and other patristic authors pointed to an affirmative answer to the above question, we undertook to pursue this path in the present research in a more thorough-going way.

2. Data pertaining to the Apostolic Office in other Church fathers before Chrysostom

Before coming to Chrysostom's work, with which I will especially concern myself, I consider it necessary to dedicate a few lines to the most important Fathers before Chrysostom in connection with the present topic. It is, I think, self-evident that in the present work, it is not possible to engage in an extended and detailed study of the data related to the Apostolic Office and its bearers in the Church fathers before Chrysostom. If one leaves the works of the apostolic fathers aside, the relevant references in most of the other great Church fathers are so many, that a whole series of special dissertations would need to be written. Yet, such works are missing from the contemporary bibliography²³. Therefore, I have confined myself to very general estimations, basing them chiefly on the data I collected by means of the *TLG data bank texts*²⁴.

²¹ H. D. Betz, "Apostle" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1, p. 309.

²² Impressive is the apostrophe of John Pearson, the 17th century Anglican bishop of Chester, to the students of Theology, written in Latin in his work titled *Conciones ad Clerum, the Minor Theological Works*, printed Oxford 1844, vol. 2, p. 6: "You who have devoting yourselves to the divine study of theology; you who are growing pale over the sacred Scriptures above all; you who either already occupy the venerable office of priest or aspire to do so; you who are about to undertake the awful care of souls; put away from you the taste of the times; have nothing to do with novelties that are in vogue; search how it was in the beginning; go to the fountain-head; look to antiquity; return to the reverend Fathers; have respect unto the Primitive Church, that is, to use the words of the prophet I am handling, 'ask for the old paths' (Jer. 6, 16)". This text is used as a heading in the book of professor J.J. Blunt, *Lectures on the Right Use of the Early Fathers*, 1857.

²³ Very few articles referring only to partial aspects of the Apostolic Office are an exception; see notes 30 & 32. Also, J. Danielou, "The Apostolic Tradition". *A History of Early Christian Doctrine*, vol. 2, pp. 139-156.

²⁴ *TLG* stands for "Thesaurus Linguae Graecae" and is a computer-based data bank with texts of ancient Greek writers.

Starting from the text of *The Didache* (2nd c. AD)²⁵, where the term "apostle" is found only four times, I note that this term is relatively rarely used by the apostolic fathers²⁶, since the number of times it is mentioned by them is only slightly higher than the number of times the same term appears in the New Testament²⁷. Characteristic of all apostolic fathers is their tendency to look upon themselves as distinct from the apostles, as Lightfoot pointed out²⁸.

Subsequent ecclesiastical authors of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th century are much richer in relevant references²⁹. Irenaeus (140-202) and Tertullian (160-220) are among the first, and the former focuses his attention on the the notions of apostolic tradition (ἀποστολική παράδοσις) and apostolic succession (ἀποστολική διαδοχή)³⁰. A little later, Clement of Alexandria (150-215) employs the term "apostle" in a wider sense³¹, while at approximately the same time, Hippolytus of Rome (170-236), following Irenaeus, concerns himself specifically with the notions of Apostolic Tradition and Apostolic Succession³². Origen (185-254) is the next author to be considered not only because he refers frequently to the persons and work of the apostles, but also because he presents a more complete and theologically richer doctrine about the apostles and their office. In his works we find a general definition of an apostle³³, a clear distinction between "calling"

²⁵ The dates concerning both the text of *Doctrine* and the life of the fathers referred to below are taken from the *Patrology* by B. Altaner, 1960.

²⁶ The data supplied by TLG are: Clement of Rome 43; Ignatius 49; The Letter to Diognetus 5; The Shepherd of Hermas 5; The Epistle of Barnabas 1; Total 103.

²⁷ According to the data given by the *Concordance to the Greek Testament* by Moulton-Geden the term "apostle" is referred to 80 times.

²⁸ See, J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 95, "They [the Apostolic Fathers] all look upon themselves as distinct from the apostles. Several of them include St. Paul in the Apostolate".

²⁹ According to the data of TLG the references to term "apostle" made by the most important fathers before Chrysostom are as follows: Irenaeus 63 (only in his Greek texts); Tertullian 93; (Clement of Alexandria 327; Origen 1016; Eusebius of Caesarea 1071; Athanasius 665; Didymus the Blind 565; Basil of Casarea 681; Gregory of Nyssa 602; Gregory the theologian 54 (incomplete)).

³⁰ See, E. Molland, "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the apostolic succession", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950) 12-28; B. Reynders, "Paradosis. Le progrès de l' idée de Tradition chez Saint Irenée", *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 5 (1933) 155-194.

³¹ See, J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 96, "About the same time Clement of Alexandria not only calls Barnabas an apostle, but confers the title to Clement of Rome also (*Strom.* 2 and 4)".

³² See, P. Galtier, "La tradition apostolique d' Hippolyte", *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 11 (1923) 511-522; G. G. Blum, "Apostolische Tradition und Sukzession bei Hippolyt", *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1964) 95-109; M. Da Gl. Novak - M. Givin, *Tradicio Apostolica de Hipolito de Roma*, 1971.

³³ Origen, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* (ed., E. Preuschen,) 32,17,200-201, "Καὶ ἕκαστός γε τῶν πεμπομένων ἀπὸ τινος ἀπόστολός ἐστι τοῦ πέμψαντος".

(κλήσις) as a general and "mission" (ἀποστολή) as a special³⁴, a reference to "the office of mission (apostleship)" (ἀξίωμα ἀποστολῆς)³⁵ and an original and thorough examination of many of apostleship aspects³⁶. Here, then, a special study is much warranted. Eusebius of Caesarea (263-339) very often refers to the apostles, either recording their history and laying emphasis on Apostolic Succession³⁷, or basing his position on various theological themes on apostolic words³⁸. Athanasius (295-37), a little later, explicitly refers to the office of the apostles³⁹, its connection with the Son being sent by the Father⁴⁰, as well as to Apostolic Tradition⁴¹. Frequent references are also found in Didymus the Blind (313-398), who interpreted with distinctive originality a large part of the Bible, but most of whose works have been lost⁴². The Cappadocian brothers, Basil of Caesarea (330-379) and Gregory of Nyssa (335-395) frequently refer to the apostles and their words and stress both the theological and the ecclesiological dimensions of the Apostolic Office, laying special emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit⁴³ and the Apostolic Tradition of the Church⁴⁴. The third great

³⁴ Origen, *Commentarii in epistolam ad Romanos* (ed., K. Staab), 2,4, "Ὁ οὖν Παῦλος κληθεὶς καὶ κλητὸς γέγονε κατὰ τὸ γενικόν, ἔτυχεν εὐθὺς καὶ τοῦ εἰδικοῦ, τοῦτέστι τῆς ἀποστολῆς".

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 2,23, "Διὰ τοῦτό τε τὸ 'δούλος Χριστοῦ' πρὸ τοῦ 'ἀποστόλου' τέθεικε καὶ ἅμα διότι τὸ τῆς ἀποστολῆς οἷς ἂν προσεῖη ἀξίωμα χρείας ἄλλων ἔνεκα πρόσεστι".

³⁶ Origen is concerned with the theological as well as the ecclesiological and eschatological dimensions of the Apostolic Office. Cf. *Homiliae in Lukam* (ed., M. Rauer), 1,7d,14; *ibid.*, 1,7,14; *Fragmenta ex Commentariis ad Ephesios* (ed., J. A. F. Gregg), 1,1-12; *Annotationes in Deuteronomium*, PG 17,24,43; *Philocalia* (ed., E. Junod), 23,2,21; *In Jesu Nave homiliae XXVI* (ed., Baehrens, W. A.), 302,28; *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* (ed., C. Blanc), 10,29,181; *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* (ed., E. Klostermann), 15,24,67; *Fragmenta in Commentariis in epistolam i ad Corinthios* (ed., C. Jencins), 20,8-16. Cf. M. Hurl, "La 'bouche' et le 'coeur' de l'apôtre (chez Origène)", *Forma Futuri in M. Pellegrino*, 1975, 17-42.

³⁷ Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. G. Bardy), 3,36,1-4; 5,5-6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, *Commentarius in Isaiaem* (ed., J. Ziegler), 2,50; *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Stephanum*, PG 22,23.

³⁹ See, "ἀξίωμα γὰρ ἀπόστολον εἶναι Χριστοῦ" (*Expositiones in Psalmos*, 118,170, PC 27,508).

⁴⁰ Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, I,29,47,51,61 (PG 26,72C,112A, 120A,140C), II,7,8,14 (*ibid.*, 160C,164B,177A), III,23,38 (*ibid.*, 372B,405A)

⁴¹ Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* (ed., Opitz), 30,1; *De Synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleucia in Isauria* (ed., H. G. Opitz), 23,1-2; *Epistulae quattuor ad Serapionem*, PG 26,544; *Epistula ad Adelphinum*, PG 26,1080.

⁴² G. Florovsky, "Δίδυμος", *Θρησκευτική καὶ Ἠθική Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία*, vol. 4, p. 1205.

⁴³ Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* (ed., B. Pruche), 16,39; 27,66; 29,73; *Adversus Eunomium*, PG 29,612,652,717,740; Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae* (ed., G. Pasquali), 2,18; *De deitate filii et Spiritu Sancto*, PG 46,557; *De Spiritu Sancto*, PG 46,700.

⁴⁴ Basil, *De Spiritu sancto* (ed., B. Pruche), 27,66; 29,73; *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*, PG 31,612; *De baptismo* (dub.), PG 31,1516, 1569, 1573; Gregory of Nyssa, *De instituto Christiano*, (ed., W. Jaeger), 8,1,63-64; *Contra Eunomium* (ed., W. Jaeger), 3,2,98-99.

Cappadocian, Gregory the Theologian, seems to be more limited in relevant references, but this seems to be purely incidental.

Taken as a whole these references indicate that none of the Church fathers before Chrysostom is especially concerned with the Apostolic Office and its bearers as a self-contained topic. All of them refer to it incidentally in their various works, depending on the ecclesiastical and pastoral issues they have to deal with each time. Compared to the contemporary authors it is worth noting that the fathers are not so much concerned with the philological origin of the term "apostle"⁴⁵, as with its content and particularly the main theological dimensions connected with it and its bearers. Also worth noting is the fact that the fathers not only find their basic source in Holy Scriptures and, chiefly, in the New Testament texts, but assuming the inner unity of Holy Scripture consider the Scriptural texts not as unrelated to each other, but as placed in an organic unity interpreted and understood within the environment of the Church⁴⁶.

3. John Chrysostom's background as proposition of his teaching on the Apostolic Office

Chrysostom, with whose work we concern ourselves in the present thesis, lived and ministered the work of the Church during the second half of the 4th century and the first decade of the 5th century (354-407 AD)⁴⁷. For a better understanding and assessment of his work in general, and of the data related to the Apostolic Office and its bearers in particular, it will be useful to refer to those factors which contributed to the moulding of Chrysostom's personality, since his work bears its seal. Apart from the divine factors which have to do with the divine grace and which have discussed elsewhere⁴⁸, there are also two human factors

⁴⁵. Both Origen and Gregory of Nyssa seem to accept the Greek origin of the term. For Origen see footnote 33; for Gregory of Nyssa see, "Προσφυώς δὲ τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ νοήματι ἡ λέξις ἀποστολή ἐφηρμόσθη· τὸ γὰρ ἀποστελλόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ πέμποντος εἰς τὸν ὑποδεχόμενον μεταβαίνει" (*In Canticum Canticorum commentarius* (ed., H. Langerbeck), 6,281).

⁴⁶. Contrast Telfer: "The Bible took shape in the hands of a Church, and at times that process was determined by consideration far removed from the original meaning and purpose of the writings" (W. Telfer, "The fourth century Greek Fathers as exegetes", *The Harvard Theological Review*, 50 (2,1959) 105).

⁴⁷. As regards the year of Chrysostom's birth, there are two views. According to the first one he was born in 344 AD, while others believe that 354 AD was the actual year of his birth. The second view, suggested by his biographer Palladius, seems more probable. Cf., C. Baur, "Wann ist Chrysostomus geboren?" *ZKTh* 52 (1928) 401-406· G. H. Ettliger, "Some Historical Evidence for the Date of St John Chrysostom's Birth in the Treatise Ad Viduam Juniorem", *Traditio* 16 (1960) 373-380.

⁴⁸. B. Ioannides, "Οἱ θεῖοι παράγοντες εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ζωὴν τοῦ Ἰωάννου Χρυσοστόμου",

which shaped Chrysostom's personality: first, the general climate of his age and, second, a number of persons with whom he came into contact, either directly or indirectly.

As is well-known, the 4th century AD was marked by significant political and social processes⁴⁹. That was the first century after the great persecutions against the Christians had ceased. The liberal and tolerant politics from Constantine the Great onwards created the appropriate presuppositions, on the one hand for the intense activity of the Church within a vast empire, and on the other for the coming of large numbers of new members to her bosom.

Strangely enough this resulted in the downgrading of the moral life of a large part of the believers⁵⁰, and, simultaneously in the easier growth of heresy. Of these two burning issues, heresy was co-ordinately tackled right from the beginning receiving mortal blows, first at the Synod of Nicea (325)⁵¹ and then at the Synod of Constantinople (381), while the correction of moral aberration was mainly undertaken by the local pastors. It is with this latter task that Chrysostom came to be vigorously engaged to the extent that he was shaped by it and was made a model of a type.

As a pastor, then, Chrysostom had to tackle several acute moral issues bothering his flock, which he often describes with vivid colours in his homilies⁵². If we take into account the gentleness of his character, partly due to his lacking a father in his infancy and childhood as well as to the influence of his devoted mother, we can better understand his sensitivity to the social and moral issues prevailing in his work. Yet, it would be an inexcusable mistake betraying a superficial approach to his work if we gave the impression that Chrysostom is primarily a teacher of

Ἐπετηρίς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Ἀθηνῶν (1955-1956), pp. 179-208.

⁴⁹ See, S. Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization*, especially chs. V, VIII-IX; *St Chrysostom's Picture of his Age*, especially chs IV-VIII; J. F. D' Alton, "Life at Antioch and Constantinople" in *Selections from St John Chrysostom* (1940) 218-267; N. Bougatsos, *Κοινωνική διδασκαλία Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων*, v. 2 (St. Chrysostom's texts), Ἀθήναι 1982; S. Kyriakidis, "Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος ὡς λαογράφος" *Λαογραφία* 11 (1934) 634-641; A. C. De Albormoz, "Aspectos sociales des s. IV atures de las obras de Juan Crisostomo" *Razon y Fe* (1933) 204-217; 507-525. Also, M. Fouyias, *The social message of John Chrysostom*, Athens 1968.

⁵⁰ See, "For now indeed that we are in the enjoyment of peace, we are become supine and lax and have filled the Church with countless evils; but when we were persecuted, we were more sober-minded. and kinder, and more earnest, and more ready as to these assemblies and as to hearing" (2COR, 26,4, PG 61,580). Cf., W. Telfer, "The Fourth Century Fathers as Exegetes", *Harvard Theological Review* 50 (2, 1957) 93-94.

⁵¹ See, B. Feidas, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία*, pp. 356-469. 527-542 J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 205-254 G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, pp. 67-119.

⁵² *Ibid.*

ethics. On the contrary, Chrysostom is primarily a theologian and as such he confronts the crisis of his time. He has a definite and complete theology, richly expressed, but not easily discerned in its entirety since it is not systematised, but found scattered throughout his voluminous work which is dominated by references to social and moral issues⁵³.

It should be noted that several persons worth mentioning contributed to Chrysostom's theological moulding. First comes his mother Anthusa, who, being a widow from the age of twenty, devoted herself to her son's ecclesiastical upbringing and implanted through her own example the first seeds of Christian life and theology⁵⁴. Another person who influenced him considerably was Meletius, bishop of his birth place, Antioch, who baptised and ordained him deacon⁵⁵. Chrysostom's studying at an Ἀσκητήριον, a kind of school of theology in Antioch, gave him the opportunity to associate with the founder of the school and his own teacher, Diodor of Tarsus⁵⁶ as well as with his colleagues there, e.g.. Theodore, later bishop of Mopsuestia, Maximus, later bishop of Seleucia, and others, all of whom exerted a certain influence on him⁵⁷. The same should be said about the anonymous Syrian monk with whom Chrysostom spent two years in the desert and who inspired him to live a hermit's life for another two years in a cave in the same desert⁵⁸.

Apart from the persons with whom Chrysostom came into direct contact, he was also influenced by earlier theologians and fathers, whom he got to know either through their writings or through other persons. Amongst them were the

⁵³. See, P. Christou, Πατρολογία, vol. 4, p. 292. It should be noted here that Chrysostom's interpretive speeches are usually divided into two parts, the one purely interpretative, the other moral-practical. Also, we should bear in mind that there is a series of purely theological Chrysostomic works, such as *Contra Anomoeos*, PG 48,701-812, *De resurrectione mortuorum*, PG 50,417-432, *De fato et providentia*, PG 50,749-774.

⁵⁴. See, *Ad Viduam juniorem*, b, PG 48,601. Cf., W. R. W. Stephens, *St. Chrysostom, his life and times*, pp. 10-14; P. Christou, Πατρολογία, vol. 4, p. 234.

⁵⁵. Cf. Chrysostom's encomium, *De sancto Meletio Antiocheno*, PG 50,515-520.

⁵⁶. J. F. D' Alton, *op. cit.*, p. 3. See, also, C. Baur, "In the school of Diodore" in, *John Chrysostom*, pp. 89-103; P. Christou, Πατρολογία, vol. 4, p. 234; *Laus Diodori episcopi*, PG 52,761-766.

⁵⁷. J. F. D' Alton, *op. cit.*; Baur, C., *op. cit.*; W. R. W. Stephens, *op. cit.*, pp.14-16.

⁵⁸. See, Paladius, *Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi* (ed., Coleman- P.R Norton), 5,18; C. Baur, "Chrysostom as a monk", *op. cit.*, p 104-114.; Th. Zisis, *Ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου*, pp. 40-44. T. R. McKibbens, argues that "From the influence of his mother and from his years as a monk John Chrysostom received two invaluable contributions as an interpreter of Scripture: love for the Bible and familiarity with every part of it" ("The exegesis of John Chrysostom's homilies on the Gospels", *The Expository Times*, 93 (1982) 265).

Antiochian bishops Ignatius and Eustathius as well as Lucian the martyr, to all of whom he dedicated a number of encomiastic homilies⁵⁹. As regards the Alexandrines, Origen was one whose biblical interpretations and theological positions Chrysostom must have known well⁶⁰. He was also well acquainted with the great Cappadocian fathers, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory the theologian, with whom he seems to have had much in common and indirect relations⁶¹. Yet we cannot place Chrysostom in one of the then existing Schools, since his theology, while exhibiting elements of all, does not coincide with any of them completely⁶². What may be said is that Chrysostom traces his own path in the way he expresses his theology⁶³.

Above all, however, I should once again point out that the starting point of Chrysostomic Theology is Ecclesiology. For Chrysostom the Church is not a mere historical organisation, but being Christ's Body, is a divine-human Reality living and acting within the world in which he himself resides. Furthermore, he himself is not only an eyewitness of her presence and power, but also her vital member. The local Church of Antioch revived him and brought him up spiritually by means of her pastors and faithful members. There he listened to the readings of the Scriptures and was initiated into the divine mysteries of the revelation in Christ⁶⁴. There he was taught piety to God and became acquainted with and loved the apostles and all the saints. Therefore, it is all too natural for Chrysostom to consider all different parameters with the Church as a basis and starting point. Using the present day theological terminology, we can say that it is through his Ecclesiology that he also sees his Triadology, Christology, Pneumatology and Eschatology. This is proved

⁵⁹ *In sanctum Lucianum martyrem*, PG 50,519-526; *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, PG 50,587-596; *In sanctum Eustathium antiochemum*, PG 50,597-606.

⁶⁰ I think that, when Chrysostom uses his favourite phrase "φασί τινες" (some say) (for example, *JOHN*, 18,3, PG 59,117; *ibid.*, 85,1, PG 59,459; *ibid.*, 86,1, PG 59, 469) to indicate well-known Bible interpreters without mentioning their names, he usually means Origen.

⁶¹ P. Christou, "Ο Ἰωάννης ὁ χρυσόστομος καὶ οἱ Καππαδόκai", *Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων*, 18 (1973) 13-22; C. Baur, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 96.

⁶² Worth mentioning is Grillmeier's remark referring especially to Chrysostom's Christology but valid in a broader sense: "This Antiochene so persecuted by the Alexandrines, is far more Alexandrine than Antiochene in his Christology—a new indication of the care, with which we must use a word like 'school'" (Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition* (1965) 334).

⁶³ See P. Christou, *Πατρολογία*, vol. 4, p. 292.

⁶⁴ Very interesting is the information given by Chrysostom himself: "Often, when I have taken the apostle into my hands, and have considered this passage, I have been at a loss to understand why Paul here speaks so loftily: 'I have fought the good fight' (2Tim. 4:7-8), but now by the grace of God I seem to have found it out" (2TIM, 9,2, PG 62,652). Here "apostolos" is the Church book which contains apostolic readings.

simply the indisputable fact that all his works were created within the Church and are directly connected with Church worship and life. Thus, his speeches, which constitute the great bulk of his work, are always delivered in worshipping assemblies for the benefit of the participating believers⁶⁵, while his treatises and epistles are written to tackle theological and ecclesiastical issues which concern the believers in whom he is primarily interested⁶⁶. There is nothing coming from Chrysostom which does not bear the seal of the church minister or is not related to issues of Church life. This is not merely to be seen in his complete mastery of, and amazing facility with the Bible, but chiefly in the very ecclesiastical purpose and life with which he approaches it⁶⁷. If one has not perceived this general and basic perspective of Chrysostom, one will probably find it too difficult to interpret him authentically and to appreciate his teaching adequately. It seems to me that it must be within this broader framework that we should see his more specific teaching about the Apostolic Office and its bearers.

4. Data pertaining to the Apostolic Office and its bearers in the work of Chrysostom

Saint Chrysostom interpreted almost the whole text of the New Testament and a few books of the Old Testament. In that task we can find a lot of important elements concerning the Apostolic Office and its bearers. To start with I want to point out that the term "apostle" is most frequently used in Chrysostomic texts, found in them approximately 2,000 times⁶⁸. If we take into account its meagre use both in the ancient Greek and Jewish literatures⁶⁹ and that in the earlier Church

⁶⁵ See, "Therefore, this is the very reason of our assembling you here... not simply that you should enter in, but that you should also reap some fruit from your continuance here" (*MAT*, 11,7, PG 57,200). Cf., J. Pelikan, *The preaching of John Chrysostom*, (1967) 13.

⁶⁶ See, "For I do not so much regard those without, as our own members" (*ICOR*, 2,3, PG 61,20).

⁶⁷ See, "Behold, we need much care, much watchfulness, to be able to look into the depth of the divine Scriptures" (*JOHN*, 21,1, PG 59,127); "And for the understanding of Paul's words there is needed also a pure life. For therefor also he said: 'You are become such as have need of milk, seeing you are dull of hearing (Hebr 5:11-12)"; (*ACTS*, 55,3, PG 60,384); "The one who will catch the truth must be clean of every passion" (*ICOR*, 8,2, PG 61,69); "We have need of much wakefulness, and many prayers, that we may arrive at the interpretation of the passage now before us" (*MAT*, 6,1, PG 57,61). Cf., T. R. McKibbens, "The exegesis of John Chrysostom", *op. cit.*, p. 270, "History, however, finds John of Antioch in the most important and influential ecclesiastical position in eastern Christendom during the late fourth century".

⁶⁸ The precise number given by *TLG* is 1996.

⁶⁹ See, F. Agnew, "On the origin of the term Apostolos", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976)49, "The emergence of the term apostolos in the theological language of the N.T. is a well-known enigma. Before its use in the Christian Scriptures the word had on extremely meagre

fathers it is found approximately 1,000 times⁷⁰, we readily understand that this term bears an important meaning in the theological thought of Chrysostom. This is the case notwithstanding the fact that the use of this term by Chrysostom is, to some extent, reiteration of the occurrence of this term in the New Testament, especially when New Testament texts are quoted and interpreted or used to support his positions.

As is shown by our relevant investigation, Chrysostom does not anywhere seem to connect the term "apostle" to the corresponding Jewish "shaliah"⁷¹. As regards the Greek meaning of the term, he seems to be taking it as a basis on which he constructs a new content⁷². This content is identical to that which is expressed by the same term in the New Testament, i.e., it is variable since, as is well known, that the word "apostle" in the New Testament has many different meanings inasmuch as it characterises many different persons⁷³. Thus, we find that as "apostles" Chrysostom characterises the twelve disciples of Christ⁷⁴, the Twelve and Paul⁷⁵, those who belong to the Seventy⁷⁶, Matthias⁷⁷, Stephen and Philip of the seven Deacons⁷⁸, Paul⁷⁹ and some of his partners⁸⁰, the authors of the Gospels

history in secular Greek both in classical and koine usage... LXX and Symmachus each have the word once, also in the sense messenger. Against this background it is something of surprise to discover the term apostolos 80 times in the N.T."

⁷⁰. For Origen and Eusebius see footnote 29.

⁷¹. It is true that Chrysostom did not know any Aramaic. However no one else at his times or before him related the term "apostle" to the Aramaic "shaliah". That means that there was no such tradition in the Church, of which Chrysostom could be well aware. Even though most of the modern scholars accept the Jewish term "Shaliah" as the forerunner of the "ἀπόστολος", yet there have been serious objections. For example see Munk's opinion: "In spite of all the similarities to the messengers of the churches whom we meet in the Epistles, there is a fundamental difference between them and the Jewish, and their tasks, owing to the great difference between the Jewish and Christian faiths. The Christian apostles are part of something entirely new and dynamic.... compared with this, the Jewish use of the apostolic idea as a rule far removed from the Christian usage as a diplomatic envoy from a missionary to the heathen" (J. Munck, "Paul, the Apostles and the Twelve", *op. cit.*, p. 100). See, also, B. Rigaux, "The Twelve Apostles", *Concilium* 34 (1968) 4.

⁷². See, "Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ Κυρίου αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν" (Jn 13:16), παρ' ἐμοῦ δὲ ταῦτα γέγονε, πολλῶ μᾶλλον χρή ταῦτα παρ' ὑμῶν γενέσθαι" (JOHN, 71,b, PG 59,387).

⁷³. See, H. D. Betz, "Apostle", *op. cit.*, p. 309, "The noun 'ἀπόστολος' is originally an adjective derived from the verb 'ἀποστέλλω' (to send), found in the N. T. with a considerable range of meanings". Also, K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀπόστολος", *op. cit.*, pp. 420-424; C. Dorsey, "Paul's use of 'Απόστολος", *Restoration Quarterly*, 28 (1985-1986) 193.

⁷⁴. For example see *Adversus Judaeos*, 1,4, PG 48,849; *Ad populum Antiochenum*, 3,2, PG 49,49,25; *PSALM*, 115,2, PG 55,322,5; *MAT*, 37,4, PG 57,424,51; *JOHN*, 51,1, PG 59,284,20.

⁷⁵. *GAL*, 1,10, PG 61,629. *Ibid.*, 1,11, PG 61,632.

⁷⁶. *1COR*, 38,4, PG 61,326.

⁷⁷. *Ibid.*

⁷⁸. *GEN*, 35,2, PG 53,323.

⁸¹, some later bishops and saints⁸² and even Jesus Christ himself⁸³, while apostolic signs are also attributed to Christian believers, men and women⁸⁴.

Where Chrysostom radically differs from the more recent investigators, coinciding with the Church fathers before him, is in the way he tackles the whole issue. While most of the more recent scholars try to determine the meaning of the term "apostle" by treating the New Testament texts as self-contained and independent from each other⁸⁵, he accepts and uses Holy Scripture as a unified organic whole⁸⁶. Thus, in some cases he finds the term used by the same author with different meanings⁸⁷ and in other cases different Bible authors using the same term with the same meaning⁸⁸. Another important point is that Chrysostom does not seem to be aware of any evolution of the meaning of the term "apostle" in the New Testament texts of even later on. He considers the polysemantic use of the word as stable and unalterable from the time of Christ's life on earth to his own days. He does not refer to, nor imply any change. As regards the semantics of the term "apostle", apart from the distinction he makes when the term refers to Jesus Christ, Chrysostom distinguishes two other basic meanings. The first of them, found in relatively few cases, is very close to the ancient Greek meaning of the word and in general indicates everybody who is sent by someone else or who undertakes to accomplish a mission of any kind⁸⁹. The second, which applies to the great bulk of the relevant cases, refers to the bearers of a special mission and ministry the origin of which lies in God himself⁹⁰.

In our investigation we have been considerably helped by the co-examination of two other terms derived from the same root, namely the adjective "apostolic"

⁷⁹. There are many texts of which see, *MAT*, 67,4, PG 58,637; *JOHN*, 4,4, PG 59,50; *ACTS*, 7,2, PG 60,66; *GAL*, 5,4, PG 61,669.

⁸⁰. *COL*, 1,1, PG 62,303.

⁸¹. *INCOMPR*, 5,353-354.

⁸². *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, 1, PG 50,588.

⁸³. *HEBR*, 5,2, PG 63,47-49.

⁸⁴. *PHIL*, 1,1-2, PG 62,184.

⁸⁵. See footnotes 15-17.

⁸⁶. Cf., I. Moiseskou, "Holy Scripture and its interpretation in John Chrysostom's works" (in Romanian), *Candela* 50-51 (1939-1940) 116-238. Also, C. Baur, "Chrysostom as an exegete" in his work, *John Chrysostom and his times*, vol. 1, pp. 315-326.

⁸⁷. Paul uses the term something denoting him who is sent by Jesus Christ and bears the special office (Gal. 1:1; cf., *GAL*, 1,2, PG 61,614), and sometimes the simple messenger of the local church (2Cor. 8:23; *2COR*, 18,2, PG 61,526).

⁸⁸. Paul as well as Matthew, Mark and Luke use the term "apostle" with this specific meaning for the Twelve (Mat. 10:2; Mark. 6:30; Lk. 22:14). Cf. footnote 74.

⁸⁹. See footnote 71.

⁹⁰. See first chapter of the present work, "The theological perspective of the Apostolic Office".

(ἀποστολικός -ή -όν) and the noun "apostleship" (ἀποστολή). The adjective "apostolic", very frequently used by Chrysostom⁹¹, mostly refers to Paul's apostolic signs⁹², many times to signs of the Twelve⁹³ and sometimes to signs of the apostles in general⁹⁴. Now, as regards the noun "apostleship", its use is rather limited in comparison to the terms referred to above⁹⁵, but very useful in helping us accurately receive the image of the Apostolic Office in Chrysostom's thought. We once more notice that, when the term "apostleship" is connected to particular persons, most of the times it refers to Paul⁹⁶ (occasionally along with the Twelve⁹⁷ and once with Barnabas⁹⁸) and then to the twelve disciples of Christ⁹⁹. Also, it once refers to Jesus Christ¹⁰⁰, once to the prophet Isaiah¹⁰¹, twice to the angels¹⁰², and once to Paul's disciple, Timothy¹⁰³.

Particularly worth noting is the fact that in most of the cases where it refers to Paul and the Twelve, the term "apostleship" bears the meaning of office, that is, of a particular authority and ministry, defined and granted by the Lord himself¹⁰⁴. Chrysostom uses the phrase "office of apostle" unaltered¹⁰⁵. In the rest of the cases the term is used meaning a limited mandate and its being accomplished by him who is sent¹⁰⁶.

On the basis of the data presented above, the fruits of my personal investigation, I have attempted to compose the present thesis. The material I collected has by itself led me to give my work precisely the structure in which it is presented below. This means that I dedicate three chapters to the meaning of the Apostolic

⁹¹ TLG gives us the number 289.

⁹² For example see, *PSALM*, 140,7, PG 55,439; *ROM*, 52,5, PG 60,429; *2COR*, 28,2, PG 61,592; *GAL*, 3,3, PG 61,651.

⁹³ For example see, *ACTS*, 9,1, PG 60,76; *Catechesis ultima ad baptizandos* (ed., Papadopoulos-Kerameus), 175,6-8.

⁹⁴ For example see, *De sancta Pentecoste*, 1,2, PG 50,456; *ROM*, 32,1, PG 60,675; *ITHESS*, 1,2, PG 62,395.

⁹⁵ TLG gives us the number 62.

⁹⁶ For example see *2COR*, 27,1, PG 61,584; *GAL*, 1,2, PG 61,614.

⁹⁷ See *MAT*, 61,1, PG 58,650.

⁹⁸ See *ACTS*, 26,3, PG 60,205.

⁹⁹ See *MAT*, 32,3, PG 57,380; *ACTS*, 11,1, PG 60,93.

¹⁰⁰ See *JOHN*, 5,4, PG 59,59.

¹⁰¹ See *In Isaiam* (ed., Dumortier, J.), 6,5,64.

¹⁰² See *ACTS*, 44,1, PG 60,307; *2COR*, 2,8, PG 61,403.

¹⁰³ See *PHIL*, 9,1, PG 62,245.

¹⁰⁴ See *2COR*, 25,1, PG 61,570.

¹⁰⁵ See *2COR*, 1,3, PG 61,386; 11,2, PG 61,476; *ITHESS*, 1,1, PG 62,393. The term 'office' is also rendered by terms like 'dignity', 'honour', 'worth' (PG 51,191,3; PG 51,278,14; PG 51,321,32; PG 55,199,26; PG 60,435,62).

¹⁰⁶ See *1COR*, 14,1, PG 61,114.

Office, examining its main dimensions. In the first of them I examine the theological perspective of the Apostolic Office, in the second chapter the ecclesiological perspective and in the third one the eschatological perspective. Every chapter is followed by a brief summary, which all lead to the general conclusions attached to main body of my work.

As regards writing the present thesis, I must say that I originally used the Greek language and then translated the Greek text into English, and that is precisely why several parts of the text have retained a Greek nuance (in expression). This should be attributed to the fact that I find it considerably easier to express theological concepts in my native language. Concerning the most quotations of Chrysostom's texts I used the English translation, *A select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (ed. by P. Schaff, W. M. B. Eerdmans, publishing Co), which I modified in places where I judged appropriate. Quotations from the original texts that do not exist in English were translated by me. The reader is likely to find Chrysostomic texts that are repeated in various parts of this thesis. In spite of my effort to avoid this it was made necessary by both the richness of meanings the Chrysostomic texts contain and the different points of view from which I approached the issues that I dealt with.

CHAPTER ONE

THE THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

1.1. Introductory note

There are two factors in the chrysostomic texts, a primary and a secondary, that, respectively, refer to the Apostolic Office¹ and define it. The primary factor focuses on the sender, i. e. on God who summons and sends his chosen ones to the world so that they accomplish his work. The secondary factor refers to those sent, i. e. to the people who freely accept this calling of the divine sender and undertake their mission with devotion. These two major factors determining the Apostolic Office are pointed out by theologians before Chrysostom², as well as by modern scholars³. More particularly with regard to the divine sender, Chrysostom stresses specific points which illuminate the chief aspects of our topic.

1.2. The origins of the Apostolic Office

First of all, one important point is that the Apostolic Office does not originate in man but in God himself. Chrysostom draws this conclusion from the life and action of the apostles as recorded in the *New Testament* texts.

Commenting on the beginning of the prologue of the *First Epistle to Timothy*, "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God, our Saviour" (1:1), he points out: "Great and admirable is the office of an apostle, and we find Paul constantly setting forth the causes of it, not as if he took the honor to himself, but as intrusted with it, and being under the necessity of so doing. For when he speaks of himself as 'called' (Rom. 1:1), and that 'by the will of God' (1Cor. 1:1) and

¹ See *Introduction* of this work.

² Origen, *Commentariorum in evangelium Joannis*, tomus 32, PG 14,785. Basil the Great, *De fide*, PG 31,681. Gregory the Theologian, *Carmina*, liber 2, PG 37,962.

³ F. Agnew, "On the origin of the term 'apostolos'", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976) 49-53; R. D. Culver, "Apostles and Apostolate in the New Testament", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 134 (1977) 131-143; Ed. J. Kilmartin, "Apostolic Office: sacrament of Christ", *Theological Studies* 36 (1975) 243-264.

again elsewhere, 'a necessity is laid upon me' (1Cor. 9:16) and when he says 'for this I was separated' (1Rom. 1:1), by these expressions all idea of arrogance and ambition or removed"⁴. In another case, while interpreting the *Epistle to the Galatians*, he regards as a feature of apostolic consent the fact that, in referring to a hypothetical future preaching of the Gospel to the Galatians, that is, a gospel different from the one he preached to them originally, Paul curses even his own self (Gal. 1:8). Chrysostom explains: "to obviate the objection that he was prompted by vain glory to applaud his own doctrine, he includes himself also in his anathema"⁵. Again, when in his commentary to Isaiah's book he compares the beginning of Paul's Epistles with the beginning of the prophetic books of the *Old Testament*, he notes: "Just as he who says 'vision and Word of God', does not speak of his own, so he who calls himself an apostle, does not teach of himself, but what his sender commanded". And further down he categorically declares: "For the apostle's office (ἀποστόλου ἄξιωμα) means that he can not introduce anything by himself. Therefore Christ said: 'Do not call anyone on earth rabbi for one is your teacher, who is in heaven' (Mat. 23:8-9)⁶ and showed that all the beginning of our dogmas has its root from above, from the Lord of heaven, even though they who serve the sayings are people"⁷. While the first phrase of the last of the above texts being thus formulated could be considered as a partial Chrysostomic definition of the Apostolic Office, since it presents us with one of its most significant features, namely its origin and source, it is characteristic that, Chrysostom, having formulated his definition in such a way that only the negative aspect of this truth is stressed, immediately refers to the positive aspect, and clarifies it.

It is important to note that the prevailing element in the previous citations as well as in the last one is the apostolic word and dogma with which Chrysostom especially correlates the apostolic office⁸. As seems to be the case, this word and the dogmas of the apostles constitute the linking ring between the bearers of the

⁴ *1TIM*, 1,1, PG 62,503. See, also, "everywhere in his writings Paul adds the name of apostle, to instruct his hearers not to consider the doctrines he delivered as proceeding from man. For an apostle can say nothing of his own, and by calling himself an apostle he at once refers his hearers to him that sent him" (*ibid*)

⁵ *GAL*, 1,7, PG 61,624.

⁶ The quotation is probably cited by heart and is a synopsis of two successive verses. The exact text is the following: "But you do not be called, Rabbi; for One is your Teacher, the Christ, and you are all brethren. And do not call anyone on earth your father; for One is your Father, He who is in heaven".

⁷ *In Isaiam* (ed. J. Dumortier.), 1,63-69.

⁸ See *COL*. 4,2, PG 62,327; *2TIM*, 3,1, PG 62,213; *TIT*, 2,2, PG 62,673.

Apostolic Office and God, who has sent them. This relationship can be located in the fact that the word and the dogmas come from God and are expressed through the apostles. We should also note the use of two indefinite distributive pronouns, absolute in terms of meaning, namely "not anything" (μηδέν) as regards the negative and "all" (πάντα) as regards the positive aspect. This shows the emphatic and categorical manner in which Chrysostom teaches that the origin and root of the Apostolic Office are to be found in God and not in man.

Exactly the same truth is expressed in the beginning of the speech on the fourth Gospel, where Chrysostom, talking about John the evangelist, says in advance, "Seeing, then, it is no longer the fisherman, the son of Zebedee, but he who knew 'the deep things of God' (1 Cor. 2:10), the Holy Spirit, I mean, that strokes this lyre, let us hear accordingly. For he will say nothing to us as a man, but what he said he will say from the depths of the Spirit, from those secret things, which before they came to pass the very angels knew not"⁹. This text shows the inaccessible height of the Apostolic Office, since everything revealed through it was unknown even to angels. That is why the people, whom the apostles appeal to, are called "unto obedience of faith" (Rom. 1:5). Again Chrysostom observes, "He says not to questioning and parade of argument but to obedience. For we were not sent, he means, to argue, but to give those things which we had trusted to our hands"¹⁰. In the last analysis, this obedience, for Chrysostom, does not refer to the apostles but to God himself: "For he that believes the apostles, believes not them, but God"¹¹.

As can be clearly seen in the *Acts* and in the *Epistles* of the *New Testament*, all apostles are deeply aware of the mission which they have undertaken¹². They are particularly aware of the fact that the office which they bear does not originate in themselves, but in God. That is why they consider God as a great Benefactor and express their gratitude to him in multiple ways. Chrysostom, interpreting Paul's words, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to faith" (Rom. 1:5), points out: "See the gratitude of the servant. He wishes nothing to be his own, but all his Master's... 'Grace and apostleship', that is, it is not we that have

⁹ JOHN, 1,2, PG 59,26. Cf. M. F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, pp. 47-49.

¹⁰ ROM, 1,3, PG 60,398.

¹¹ JOHN, 69,1, PG 59,377.

¹² Cf. Acts 2:32; 4:19-20; 5:29; 22:21; Rom. 1:1; 1Cor. 12:28; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 4:11; 1Pe. 1:1.

achieved for ourselves, that we should become apostles. For it is not by having toiled much and laboured that we had this dignity (ἀξία) allotted to us, but we received grace, and the successful result is a part of the heavenly gift"¹³. The word "dignity" (ἀξία) is used here by Chrysostom to imply the office and particularly stresses its magnitude and gravity, both to be attributed to the fact that this office is not the result of the apostle's human efforts, but God's offer to the ones he chose. Thus the conclusion is readily drawn that the Apostolic Office is clearly God's gift to certain people and not God's debt to them¹⁴, as is also the case with any other gift¹⁵.

Apart from the above conclusion, we should, I think, additionally mark a deeper and more significant account by Chrysostom pertaining to the location of the origin of the Apostolic Office in God and not in man. Chrysostom, interpreting a Christological passage from the *Epistle to the Philippians* (2:5-11) and looking for examples from the human reality of Christ's divine office, concludes: "But here, examples fail me, for there is no natural pre-eminence amongst us, for no good thing is naturally our own; but they are inherent in the nature of God"¹⁶. This position of Chrysostom is also clearly shown in another case, when he talks about masters and slaves: "Here 'slave' and 'free' is a difference of words; but there is an actual reality, for by nature he was Lord and we were servants, yet even this"¹⁷. The same opinion concerning the distinction between the offices of God and man can also be found in Origen¹⁸.

Although in the points presented above no direct reference to the apostles is made, we can, I think, consider this Chrysostomic conclusion as a general principle and thus accept that it also applies to the Apostolic Office. To be more specific, I think that the above drawn conclusion covers the well-known distinction

¹³ ROM, 1,2, PG 60,398. Cf. C. E. B. Granfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1:5.

¹⁴ *De Virginitate* (ed. H. Musurillo, - B. Grillet,) 42,8-10, where Chrysostom notes about Paul: "If God was not this merciful, not only I could not have become an apostle, but also a faithful person".

¹⁵ "For to each one of us is given the manifestation of the Spirit, he says, to profit withal; and from all being watered from the same Spirit and from what is bestowed being a free gift and not a debt" (*ICOR*, 32,2, PG 61,266).

¹⁶ *PHIL*, 7,1, PG 62,229.

¹⁷ *JOHN*, 71,1, PG 59,386.

¹⁸ See, Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam*, ed. M. Rauer, 174,13-15, "Those who were born not of blood nor of the will of flesh nor of the will of man, but of God (Jn 1:13). Saying this, now, he does not put us on the same level with God's nature, but he transmits grace and endows his office; for he advises us to call God as Father".

between created and uncreated being. Thus, man, being created, cannot possess any kind of office by nature and from the beginning, but only whatever has been given to him. On the other hand God, being uncreated, is the holder and the source of everything by his own nature. This is exactly the case with the apostolic office¹⁹; it springs from God and is offered as a gift to particular people chosen by him. As Chrysostom notes, referring to the incident where Peter defends himself for having baptised Cornelius, a gentile, "The Spirit', he might say, 'having sent (me), God having commanded, on the one part having summoned (me) through the angel, on the other urging (me) on, and solving my doubt about the things, what was I to do?' He says none of these things, however, but makes his strong point of what happened last, which even in itself was an incontrovertible argument... Then, why did not this happen alone? Of superabundance this is worked by God, that it might be shown that the beginning too was not from the apostle"²⁰. All the above citations make clear that Chrysostom pin-points the origin of the Apostolic Office not from man but from God.

1.3. The Apostolic Office as common energy of the Triune God

In contrast to the majority of our contemporary scholars who confine the origin of the Apostolic Office to the person of Jesus Christ²¹ or, more rarely, extend it to the Father²², Chrysostom considers it as originating from the common act of the

¹⁹ Cf., "And the government is on his shoulders (Is 9:6), that is, in him, in his essence, in his nature. It is not the same with kings. For their government is the multitude of soldiers. It is not also the same with apostles. For even their government was brought in them from outside" (*PSALM*, PG 55,272).

²⁰ *ACTS*, 24,2, PG 60,486.

²¹ R. D. Culver's statement is characteristic: "The initiative of becoming Jesus' apostle, however, came entirely from the Master himself: 'He called unto him his disciples; and of them chose twelve, whom also he named apostles' (Lk 6:13; cf. Jn 15:16)" ("Apostles and Apostolate in the New Testament", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, (April-June, 1977) 134). Cf., also, E. M. Kredel, "Apostle", *Bauer Encyclopaedia of Biblical Theology*, vol. 1, p. 33; W. J. J., "Apostles", *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology*, vol. 1, p. 125.

²² J. A. Buhner accepts that Paul "as an apostle of Jesus Christ, is at the same time also sent by God (Rom. 15,15f, 2Cor. 5,18-20). Paul combines the terminology of heavenly glory, which unites God and Christ (2Cor. 5,19) and is given to the apostle as well (4,4-6), with the juridical model of substitution" ("Απόστολος", *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1, p. 143. Cf. also, K. H. Rengstorf, "Απόστολος", *TDNT*, vol. 1, p. 443; K. Giles, "Apostles before and after Paul", *Journal of Anglican Theology* 99 (1985) 242; F. Klostermann, "Apostle", *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. 1, p. 679. Schmithals believes that "Yet the placing of Christ and God on the same footing in Gal 1:1 indicates that Paul apparently had no interest in restricting the call particularly to Christ" (*The office of Apostle in the Early Church*, p. 24). A little later he not only does not refer to the Holy Trinity, but also draws an arbitrary conclusion: "The grouting of apostleship upon the call from Christ therefore does not rest upon certain theological requirement, but is simply determined by the event of the call itself or by Paul's traditional

three divine and consubstantial Persons. Interpreting the 12th chapter of the *First Epistle to Corinthians*, he speaks of the charismata, including the apostleship, and says: "For what 'a gift' is 'a ministration', that he calls 'an operation' also. 'Thus fulfil your ministry' (2Tim 4:5) and, 'I magnify my ministration' (Rom 11,13), and writing Timothy, he says, 'Therefore I put you in remembrance that you stir up the gift of God, which is in you (2Tim 1:6). And again, writing to the Galatians, he said, 'For he that worked in Peter to the apostleship, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles' (Gal 2:8). Do you see that he implies that there is no difference in the gifts of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit? Not confounding the Persons, God forbid! but declaring the equal honour of the essence. For that which the Spirit bestows, this he says that God also works; this that the Son likewise ordains and grants. Yet surely if the one were inferior to the other, or the other to him, he would not have thus set it down nor would this have been his way of consoling the person who was vexed"²³. In this text what Chrysostom is aiming at is to elucidate the equal honor of the essence of the Three Divine Persons. However, at the same time he seems to relate the Apostolic Office with common energies of Triune God. His position will be presented below, analysing its general aspects and systematising them.

1.3.1 The apostles belong to all three divine Persons

God the Father is first referred to by Chrysostom as the holder of the apostles, but at the same time the Son is considered to be their holder, too. Commenting on the words of the Lord's sacerdotal prayer, "They were yours, and you gave them to me" (Jn. 17:6), Chrysostom attempts to prove that this does not imply a sort of human transaction, but that "here, [the Son] desires to teach that he is greatly loved by the Father. That he did not need to receive them is obvious from this; namely, that he made (ἐποίησε) them and that he cares for them continually. How then did he receive them? This, as I said before, showed his unanimity with the Father. Now if someone chooses to enquire into the matter in a human manner, and as the

understanding of it". There are some authors that refer to the relation between the Apostolic Office and the Holy Trinity, but very briefly; see G. Patronos, *Ἡ Βιβλική θεμελίωσις τῆς ἀποστολικότητος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 28; Ch. Voulgaris, *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, pp. 206-207.

²³ ICOR, 29.3, PG 61,244.

words are spoken, they will no longer belong to the Father. For if when the Father had them, the Son did not, it is evident that when he gave them to the Son, he withdrew from his dominion over them. And again, there is a yet more unseemly conclusion; for they will be found to have been imperfect while they were yet with the Father, but to have become perfect when they came to the Son. But it is mockery even to speak thus"²⁴. It is also worth mentioning that in another case Chrysostom uses for the relationship between God the Father and the apostles the verb "to make" (ποιεῖν) which he uses here for the relationship between the Son and the apostles. "For is there anything that God did not do for us? ...he made (ἐποίησεν) them prophets and apostles for us; he gave his only-begotten Son for us, he punishes the devil for us"²⁵.

In the above extracts it is shown that the apostles belong to both the Father and the Son not only because they are sent by both of them, but also because they are created by both of them. Of course, this creative activity of God does not refer to the bearers of the Apostolic Office as mere human beings, but as bearers of a mission entrusted to them. Therefore, we may claim that, according to Chrysostom, the Apostolic Office itself originates in a creative act of the Father and the Son and that, because of this, the apostles being its bearers are upheld of the divine Persons. This also applies for the additional reason that the father is equal in honour to the Son, as is stressed in the following extract: "Did you see the equality of honour? For lest on hearing, 'You have given me', you should deem that they were alienated from that of the Son, he removed both difficulties by speaking as he did... So that the 'You have given', is said only for condescension; for what the Father has is the Son's, and what the Son has is the Father's... And the 'have given me', and the like expressions, are to show that he did not come as an alien and draw them to him, but received them as his own"²⁶. This equality of honour between the Father and the Son constitutes the basis for the common holding of the apostles by the divine persons, while at the same time also it is confirmed through the Chrysostomic interpretation of the "economic" transaction between the Father and the Son. What the holy father writes about Paul in his interpretation of the prologue of the *Epistle to Titus*, is characteristically clear in

²⁴ *JOHN*, 81.1, PG 59,437.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, PG 59,434.

²⁶ *JOHN*, 81.1, PG 59,438-439.

this context: "You observe how he [Paul] uses these expressions indifferently, sometimes calling himself the servant of God, and sometimes the servant of Christ, thus making no difference between the Father and the Son"²⁷.

The divine Person not clearly referred to in this connection is the Holy Spirit, since here reference is particularly made to the relationship between the Father and the Son. Chrysostom does speak elsewhere of the relationship between the Father and the Holy Spirit. He compares the revelation received by Moses with the one received by the apostles and observes: "Pay attention to this; it was not possible for all to know from the stones, but from the apostles all became living tablets, running around the world and carrying in themselves the letters of God, which were engraved not by pen or with ink, but by God himself. Observe here the equality of honour between the Father and the Spirit; those stones were engraved by the finger of God, and these by the grace of the Spirit"²⁸. But reference to him is not limited to that, since, for Chrysostom, "Wheresoever one Person of the Trinity is, there the whole Trinity is present. For it is undivided in itself and has a most entire Oneness"²⁹. Therefore, to a much higher degree, this applies to the case we are discussing, where the participation of two divine Persons is clearly testified to. Thus we may claim that Chrysostom, following the common tradition of the Alexandrian and Cappadocian fathers³⁰, perceives the Apostolic Office as originating in a common action of the Triune God.

1.3.1.1. The apostles receive the revelation of the mysteries from all three divine Persons

²⁷ *TIT*, 1,1, PG 62,664; cf., also, *PSALM*, 109,1, PG 55,268.

²⁸ *JER*, 31,33, PG 64,981.

²⁹ *ROM*, 13,8, PG 60,519. In an other chrysostomic text we can see the equality of honour between the Son and the Holy Spirit: "He (the Holy Spirit) will glorify me' (Jn 16:14). How? In my name he will grant his inward workings For since at the coming of the Spirit they (the apostles) were about to do greater miracles, therefore again introducing the equality of honour, he said, 'He will glorify me'" (*JOHN*, 78,2, PG 59,424). Basil the Great, concerning the Holy Spirit, in particular, points out "the Holy Spirit is incapable of being parted from the Father and the Son... in every operation" (*De Spiritu Sancto*, 37, PG 32,133).

³⁰ See, "When mention is made of the Father there is included also his Word and the Spirit who is in the Word" (Athanasius, *Ad Serapionem*, ed. H. G. Opitz, 1,14). "The one who conceived the Father and conceived of him apart by himself has at the same time mentally accepted the Son also; the one who lays hold of the Son does not mentally dismember the Spirit from the Son, but in duesequencce forms within himself the faith that is a blending of the three... So if he lays hold the Son, he draws Father and Spirit, and so likewise if he holds the Father, he draws Son and Spirit" (Basil, *Epistola* 38,4, PG 32,332).

According to Chrysostom, the Holy Trinity is not simply the creator of the Apostolic Office, but also the supplier of its content, which is the revelation of "the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid" (Eph. 3:9). Chrysostom explicitly records the content of this revelation of the Triune God in Christ to the apostles, referring to all its important elements. "And yet, even now, they [the apostles] learned things that were much greater than this. And that you may see that this is strictly the case, look how many things I shall enumerate. What, I pray you, was greater than their having learned what they did learn? Thus, they learned that there is a Son of God, and that God has a Son equal with Himself in dignity (Jn. 5:17-20); they learned that there will be a resurrection (Mat. 17:9); that when He ascended he sat on the right hand of God (Lk. 22:69); and what is still more stupendous, that the flesh is seated in heaven, and adored by angels, and that he will come again (Mk. 16:19); they learned that they shall then sit and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Lk. 21:27); they learned that the Jews would be cast out, and in their stead the gentiles should come in (Mat. 19,28)... Paul learned 'things which it is not lawful for a man to utter' (2Cor. 12:4); things that were before the world was made, he learned them all"³¹. The above text shows that the content of the divine revelation offered to the apostles in general refers to God, to the creation and to the whole spectrum of the divine plan for the salvation of the world. The fact that Paul "learned all things that were before the world was made" means that the revelation to the apostles should refer not only to God in relation to the creation of the material world and of the spiritual world of the angels, but also to God alone.

While, however, Chrysostom explicitly mentions the main contents of the revelation in Christ, he never ceases to stress the point that this revelation always remains an inexplicable mystery. One reason for this is that everything revealed to the apostles in Christ was unknown even to the angels: "How then does he call it 'a mystery'? Because neither angel nor archangel, nor any other created power knew of it before it actually took place. Wherefore he says, 'That now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. 3:10)'"³². Another reason is that all the above realities, even after being revealed, were not made absolutely known to the people:

³¹ ACTS, 2,1, PG 60,25-26.

³² ICOR, 7,1, PG 61,55.

"And for this cause a man would not err, who in this respect also should entitle it a mystery, the utterance whereof is forbidden (ἀπόρρητον). For not even unto us, the faithful, has been committed entire certainty and exactness. Wherefore, Paul also said, 'We know in part, and we prophesy in part, for we now see in a mirror darkly, but then face to face' (1Cor. 13:12). For this cause he said, 'we speak wisdom in a mystery, the hidden wisdom'"³³.

When Chrysostom goes to the deepest aspect of the revelation in Christ which has to do with God, he points out that this revelation does not refer to "what his being is" (πῶς ἐστί) but to the fact "that he exists" (ὅτι ἐστί): "Thus, as regards the knowlede of God, we are not totally ignorant of it for we know that he exists and he is lover of mankind and good and generous and tolerant and omnipresent, but we are ignorant as regards what his being is and what the extent of what is said of him is, or how he is omnipresent"³⁴. This conclusion is significant for Chrysostom because, "if his [God's] riches are unsearchable even after his appearing, much more is his essence"³⁵.

Chrysostom's interpretation of Christ's promise to the apostles concerning the sending of the other Paraclete (Jn. 14:26) makes clear the presence of all three divine Persons in the process of the revelation to the apostles. He writes: "For since he [Jesus] had told them that 'he [Holy Spirit] shall teach you, and bring to your remembrance' (Jn. 14:26), and shall comfort you in your afflictions... and that 'he shall lead you into all truth' (verse. 13); lest hearing these things they should suppose the Spirit to be the greater, and so fall into an extreme opinion of impiety, therefore he said 'he shall receive of mine', that is, 'whatsoever things I have told you, he shall also tell you'. When he said 'he shall speak nothing of himself', he meant, 'nothing contrary, nothing of his own opposed to my words'. As then in saying respecting himself, 'I speak not of myself' (14:10), he meant that he spoke nothing beside what the Father said, nothing of his own against him, or differing from him, so also with respect to the Spirit. But the phrase 'of mine', meant, 'of what I know', 'of my own knowledge'; 'for the knowledge of me and of the Spirit is one'"³⁶.

³³ ICOR, 7,2, PG 61,56.

³⁴ PSALM, 138,2, PG 55,414. Cf., INCOMPR, 5,386,388, 394; HEBR, 22,2, PG 63,157.

³⁵ EPH, 7,1, PG 62,50.

³⁶ JOHN, 78,2, PG 59,422-423.

Here, Chrysostom is clear as to the fact that all persons of the Holy Trinity, being consubstantial, not only have exactly the same knowledge, but also carry out in common the revelation to the apostles. What Chrysostom is often concerned about and wants to assure his audience of is the equality of honour of the divine persons. In the text above he argues for equality on the grounds of their common knowledge, which, according to his interpretation, is clearly shown in that they reveal to the apostles the same truths. The method he uses to show the common knowledge of the three Persons is that of two at a time being identical within a trinity. Getting even deeper in another case, he points out that the three Persons in a way reveal each other: the Father reveals the Son and the Son reveals the Father, "just as through the Spirit also we are brought unto him (the Father)"³⁷. The mutual revelation of the Father and the Son is also clearly stated in his exposition on the grounds of Peter's confession, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mat. 16:16): "Did you see how the Father reveals the Son, how the Son the Father? For 'neither any man knew the Father', said he, 'except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him'. It cannot therefore be that one should learn the Father of any other than of the Son. So that even hereby, their sameness of honour and of substance is manifest"³⁸. With this last sentence the relation of the mutual revelation of the divine persons to the fact that they are equal in honour and consubstantial is explicitly stated. And this fact constitutes for Chrysostom the grounds upon which he bases the common revealing activities of the Holy Trinity. The consubstantial nature and equality of honour is for him a very important and fundamental reality from which he is led to the unity of the divine activities. Commenting on the Lord's words about the Holy Spirit, "he shall glorify me" (Jn. 16:14), he says "How? In my name he will grant his energies. For since at the coming of the Spirit they were about to do greater miracles, therefore, again introducing the equality of honour, he says 'He shall glorify me'"³⁹. Thus, Chrysostom follows the tactics of the other Cappadocian fathers, about whom G. L. Prestige

³⁷ 2COR, 8,3, PG 61,457.

³⁸ MAT, 54,2, PG 58,534. See, also, JOHN, 73,2, PG 59,398.

³⁹ JOHN, 78,2, PG 59,423. Cf., also, "'Be partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel according to the power of God, who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began' (2Tim. 1:8-9). That is, it was determined without beginning that these things should be done in Christ Jesus. This is no light consideration, that from the first he willed it" (2TIM, 2,1, PG 62,608).

wrongly claimed that they considered the identity of the divine essence to be of secondary importance⁴⁰.

As regards the Holy Spirit, Chrysostom reminds us of Paul's words, "for the Spirit searches all things, the deep things of God" (1Cor. 2:10). But before citing this biblical extract, Chrysostom comments: "Not then simply by our receiving the knowledge, does he describe the honour vouchsafed to us, nor by our receiving it with angels, but, what is more, by his Spirit conveying it to us; then to show its greatness he says, if it had not revealed them, we should not have learned them. Such an object of care was the whole subject to God, as to be among his secrets"⁴¹.

The participation of the three divine Persons in the revelation to the apostles is clearly shown and proven on the basis of the Bible in the following Chrysostomic text: "Did you see the invariableness in the Trinity? For of the Spirit, he says, 'But we all with unveiled face reflecting in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory even as from the Lord the Spirit' (3:18). And of the Son, 'That the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them' (verse. 4). And of the Father, 'He that said Light shall shine out of darkness shone in your hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ'⁴².

It is worth observing that all biblical extracts used here to prove the participation of all three persons in the divine revelation belong to the same conceptual unit (2Cor. 3:4-4:6) where Paul attempts to prove himself and the other apostles "ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the Spirit" (2Cor. 3:6). This particularly underlines the relationship of the Apostolic Office to all Persons of the Trinity. Additionally, it shows that this relationship is chiefly expressed through the revelation in Christ⁴³.

In the same text the way the Persons of the Holy Trinity reveal each other to the apostles referred to above is vividly recorded. From a number of significant

⁴⁰ This opinion of G. L. Prestige (*God in Patristic Thought*, pp. 242-243) has been disputed by J. McIntyre ("The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 7 (1954) 358).

⁴¹ *1COR*, 7,4, PG 61,59.

⁴² *2COR*, 8,3, PG 61,457.

⁴³ Chrysostom stresses this fact mainly for Jesus Christ and he considers his revelation to the apostles as an indication of friendship. "Since he also himself made this a sure proof of great friendship, viz. the revealing his secrets unto us, where he says 'Henceforth I call you not servants, for all you are my friends; for all things which I have heard from my Father I have told unto you (Jn 15:15); that is, I have had confidence towards you" (*1COR*, 7,6, PG 61,62).

details we should note the following points. Firstly, the revelation to the apostles is revelation of God's glory which is associated with the divine essence and common to all Persons of the Holy Trinity⁴⁴. The apostles are nothing other than those mirrors which receive the divine glory and reflect it back so that people can see it. Second, there is a particular procedure in the whole revelation process in which all three divine Persons take part. The glory of God the Father is revealed 'in the Person of Christ'. The glory of the Son is associated with the fact that he is "the image of God" revealed to the apostles through the Holy Spirit. Finally, the apostles receive and reflect back one and the same divine image which comes from the glory of the Master Spirit. Even more analytically, this glory (of the Holy Spirit) leads them from the glory (of the Son) to the glory (of the Father). Hence, once more the 'invariability of the Trinity' is placed on that same basis which refers to the identity of the divine essence, since the latter remains undivided. However, it should be pointed out here that, according to the general Chrysostomic teaching, the apostles as created beings that receive the grace of the Spirit do not participate in the essence of God, but in his uncreated energies⁴⁵.

1.3.1.2. The apostles are sent by all three divine Persons

Although superficial study of the biblical texts may lead to the conclusion that the apostles are sent for the accomplishment of their mission only by Jesus Christ⁴⁶, Chrysostom is convinced that this mission is generated by all Persons of the Holy Trinity. He expresses his conviction with lucidity and founds it upon the interpretation of biblical passages. Such is the one referring to the Lord's word to the apostles: "Receive the Holy Spirit; to whom you remit sins, they are remitted and to whom you retain sins, they are retained" (Jn. 20:23). Thus explaining that in this

⁴⁴ See, "He that does not honour the Son, does not honour the Father, who has sent him, either (Jn 5:23). Do you see how the honour of the Son is connected with that of the Father? What of that? says one. Do we see the same in the case of the apostles? 'He', says Christ, 'who receives you, receives me' (Mat. 10:40). But in that place He speaks so, because He makes the concerns of His servants His own; here, because the essence and the glory is one (with the Father's)" (*JOHN*, 39,2, PG 59,221). Cf., K. Pruem, "Der Abschnitt die Doxa des Apostolats 2 Cor 3,1-4,6 in des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus", *Biblica* 30 (1949) 161-196. 377-400. J. J. Navone, "'Glory' in Pauline and Johannine Thought", *Worship* 42,1 (1968) 48-52."

⁴⁵ "What does the phrase 'God does not give the Spirit by measure' mean? He want to show that we all have received the power of the Spirit by measure. Spirit here means the energy, for this is the one which is shared, but He countlessly has all the energy intact. If the energy is countless, the essence is far more countless than this" (*JOHN*, 30,2, PG 59,174).

⁴⁶ One may draw such conclusions by focusing on several New Testament extracts out of their context, e. g. Mat 10:5,16; Mark 3:14; Jn 17:18; 1Cor 1:17.

case the apostles did not receive all spiritual gifts but only "some authority and grace", he goes on referring to the coming of the Holy Spirit and observes: "This comes to pass, that you may learn that the gift and the power of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, is one. For things which appear to be peculiar to the Father, they are seen also to belong to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. 'How then', did he say, 'no one comes to the Son, unless the Father draws him?' (6:44). Why this very thing is shown to belong to the Son also? 'I', he said, 'am the way; no man comes unto the Father but by me' (14:6). And observe that I belonged to the Spirit also; for 'no man can call Jesus Christ Lord, but by the Holy Spirit' (1Cor. 12:3). Again we see that the apostles were given to the Church at one time by the Father, at another by the Son, at another by the Holy Spirit, and that the 'diversities of gifts' (1Cor. 12:4) belong to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit"⁴⁷.

As can be seen in the final part of the above Chrysostomic extract, the apostles and, it follows, their Apostolic Office are an offer of the Triune God to his Church. And both the mission of the bearers of the office and the various gifts by which it is accompanied are common energies of all Persons of the Trinity. This is the case because the authority of the three Persons is one, as one is their nature⁴⁸. This is the same manner which St. Basil approaches the issue correlating the common energies of the Trinity over the apostles with the essence of the three Persons⁴⁹.

In his first homily on the interpretation of the *First Epistle to Timothy*, Chrysostom explains that Paul's apostolic office is associated with all three divine Persons even though in neither the *Acts* nor the *Epistles* is there any indication that not only the Son, but also the Father orders him: "Now, it does not appear that the Father anywhere commanded him. It is everywhere Christ who addresses him.

⁴⁷ JOHN, 86,3, PG 59,411.

⁴⁸ Chrysostom associates the authority with the essence of the divine Persons when he refers to the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit: "'From whence they were committed to the grace of God' (Acts 14:26). 'And the Spirit said', but he knows what refers to the Spirit, because He is the Son's; for there is one authority between the Son and the Spirit, as one is their nature" (ACTS, 31,2, PG 60,230); cf. also, "He showed that there is a lot of kinship and unity of essence, that knowledge (of them) is identical, that authority is equal. For God would not have in his bosom one of another essence" (JOHN, 15,2, PG 59,99).

⁴⁹ Cf., "If the Holy Spirit can perform, through the apostles, the same things as those that the name of the Father and of the Son performs to the Gentiles who believed, and the name of the Lord to the Jews who repented... how, then, is it not clear that the Spirit is of the same essence and energy with the Father and the Son" (Basil the Great, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG 29,720). Also, "The Holy Spirit is of the one and same essence and authority with the Father and the Son" (Damasus, *Anathemata*, in Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. 5.11.1).

Thus 'he said unto me, Depart, for I will send you far hence unto the gentiles' (Acts 22:21)⁵⁰; and again 'You must be brought before the Caesar' (Acts 23:24). But whatever the Son commands, this he considers to be the commandment of the Father, as those of the Spirit are the commandments of the Son. For he was sent by the Spirit, he was separated by the Spirit, and this he says was the commandment of God. What then? Does it derogate from the power of the Son, that his apostle was sent forth by the commandment of the Father? By no means! For observe, how he represents the power as common to both. For having said 'according to the commandment of God our Saviour', he adds, 'and Lord Jesus Christ our hope' (1Tim. 1:1). And observe, with what propriety he applies the titles. And indeed, the Psalmist applies this to the Father, saying 'The hope of all the ends of the earth' (Ps. 64,5)⁵¹.

As can be seen, Chrysostom persists in making his audience firm on the basic truth of the revelation in Christ pertaining to the Trinity, as that truth had been formulated in the Synods until then. Undoubtedly, he was aware of the theological disputes which had already taken place and of their reverberation, still noticeable in his era. And it is characteristically thorough of him that in his attempts he makes use of the Bible, the *Old* and the *New Testament* as a whole, and exploits successfully several combinations of its passages. Because he confronts the heretical positions chiefly by going deeper into the apostolic experience of revelation expressed by their words, he is often led to conclusions which smash existing interpretations. Thus starting with Paul's mission, as the apostle himself describes it in the beginning of his epistle to the Galatians, and combining it with his "being set apart" by the Holy Spirit, he concludes: "From this passage it is manifest that the power of the Son and Spirit is one, for being commissioned by the Spirit, he says that he was commissioned by Christ. This appears in another place, from his ascription of the things of God to the Spirit ... Thus he ascribes indifferently the things of the Spirit to God and the things of God to the Spirit"⁵². Therefore, the use of the name of one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in relation to the mission of the apostles in the *Holy Scriptures* does not mean that the activity attributed to that person is exclusively his, but that it comes simultaneously from all Persons of the

⁵⁰ This citation is a combination of Acts 22:10 and 9:15.

⁵¹ *1TIM*, 1,1, PG 62,503-504.

⁵² *GAL*, 1,1, PG 61,614.

Holy Trinity. Quite simply, this manner of expression is the result of the inadequacy of human language which cannot cover all aspects of a reality.

1.3.1.3. The presence of all three divine Persons in the acting apostles

Chrysostom shows clearly the relation of the Holy Trinity to the Apostolic Office by pointing out the presence of the three Persons in the life and action of the apostles. Interpreting the words of the sacerdotal prayer of the Lord "and the glory which you gave me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one, I in them and you in me..." (Jn. 17:22-23), he comments: "How did he give the glory? By being in them, and having the Father with him, so as to weld them together. But in another place he does not speak so; he did not say that the Father comes through him, but, that the Father himself comes, and makes his abode with him', there removing the suspicion of Sabellius, and here that of Arius"⁵³.

Chrysostom associates the Apostolic Office with the orthodox dogma at the Trinity, which he clarifies with the condemnation of the completely opposing heretical beliefs of Sabellius and Arius⁵⁴. Thus, he claims that in the acting apostles both the Father and the Son are present without being confused as Persons or differentiated as essence. This is clearly stated when Chrysostom uses the same tactic for the refutation of the also opposing heretical position of Sabellius and the Pneumatomachians. "For the marvel of his discourse is this, that it has stricken down contradictory heresies with the same blow; for by saying 'another' (ἄλλον), he shows the difference of Person, and by 'Paraclete' (Παράκλητον) the connection of substance"⁵⁵.

Chrysostom is led to the same conclusions, even when he uses different images, as when he interprets Christ's parable about the vine and its branches (Jn. 15:1-17): "Did you see how he introduced himself as tending the branches? 'I have cleansed you', he said; yet above he declared that the Father does this. But there is no separation between the Father and the Son. 'He that abides in me, and I in him'. Did you see that the Son contributes not less than the Father towards the care of

⁵³ JOHN, 82,2, PG 59,444.

⁵⁴ See, M. Simonetti, "Sabellius, Sabellianism", *Encyclopedia of the early Christianity*, vol. 2; G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, pp. 30-42.

⁵⁵ JOHN, 75,1, PG 59,403.

the disciples? The Father purges, but keeps them in himself... But still the 'purging' also has been shown to belong to the Son, and the 'abiding in the root' to the Father, who also begot the root. Did you see how all is common, both the 'purging', and the enjoying the virtue which is from the root?"⁵⁶.

The image of the vine and its branches is effectively used by Chrysostom when he stresses the organic relationship between the Apostolic Office and God, something which leads us to the conclusion that in Chrysostom's thought there prevails the reality of the ecclesiastical body. The bearers of the Apostolic Office do not act in an independent manner but within the body of the vine, which is organically associated to the Persons of the Trinity. In addition to that, the common energies of the two Persons are vividly described referring both to the preparation and perfection of the apostles and to their continuous communion with the Father through the Son.

Together with the Father and the Son, the presence of the Holy Spirit is always implied. This is shown by the fact that in other cases Chrysostom relates the apostles and their office to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as it is exactly the case in the following extract: "By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith' (Rom. 1:5). See the gratitude of the servant. He wishes nothing to be his own, but all his Master's. And indeed it was the Spirit that gave this. Wherefore he says, 'I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now. Nevertheless, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth' (Jn. 16:12); and again 'Separate me Paul and Barnabas' (Acts 13:2). And in the *Epistle to the Corinthians*, he says that 'to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge' (1Cor. 12:8,11)... You see he calls the things of the Spirit the Son's and the things of the Son the Spirit's"⁵⁷. The communion on the one hand between the Father and the Son and on the other between the Son and the Holy Spirit in their energies pertaining to the Apostolic Office is, I think, sufficient testimony to offer firm grounds for the position that all Persons of the Holy Trinity are present in the work and mission of the apostles⁵⁸ for the salvation of the world. Finally it should be noted that Chrysostom connects

⁵⁶ JOHN, 776,2, PG 59,411.

⁵⁷ ROM, 1,2, PG 61,398.

⁵⁸ St. Basil had formulated the same truth in general terms and epigrammatically: "If the Spirit is co-ordinate with the Son and the Son with the Father, it is obvious that the Spirit is also co-ordinate with the Father" (*De Spiritu Sancto*, 43, PG 32,148).

the common energies of the Holy Trinity to the common will of the three divine Persons "Do not suppose his words are other than mine, for those words are mine, and confirm my opinion. For one is the will of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"⁵⁹. Therefore, all divine energies referring to the Apostolic Office originate in one and the same will of the three divine Persons and contribute to their common glory. Dragas' conclusion concerning the teaching of the Cappadocian fathers about the divine glory, in my opinion, also includes Chrysostom: "Through the great Cappadocian fathers, the Greek patristic view of Christian theology reaches its ultimate notion in a doxological way, the revelation of God's glory into which man participates through praise and worship"⁶⁰.

1.3.2 "Economic" distinction of divine energies in relation to the Apostolic Office

While on the one hand Chrysostom emphatically stresses the common participation of the three Persons in the operations of the Trinity in relation to the Apostolic Office, on the other hand, following other fathers of the Church,⁶¹ he marks the corresponding distinguishing economic operations of each one of them. He explains that although the divine operations always remain common for the three Persons springing from the same divine essence, several of them are more prominent as a kind of tactics or economy used by God in revealing himself to people in general⁶² and to the apostles in particular. So, referring to Christ's promise to his disciples that he will send the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, (Jn. 14:26) he first asks and then explains: "But why does he say 'I shall send him?' It means 'I shall prepare you before hand to receive him'. For, how can that which is everywhere be sent? Besides, he also shows the distinction of the Persons. On these two

⁵⁹ JOHN, 78,3, PG 59,425. Cf., also, GAL, 1,5, PG 61,619-621, where Chrysostom identifies the will of the Father and of the Son.

⁶⁰ G. D. Dragas, *The meaning of Theology*, p. 84.

⁶¹ St. Athanasius often uses the formula: "From the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit" (*Ad Serapionem*, ed. H. G. Opitz, 1,30). St. Basil makes a clearer distinction: "The original cause (the Father), the creative cause (the Son), and the perfecting cause (the Holy Spirit)" (*De Spiritu Sancto*, 38, PG 32,136; And elsewhere: "God works the differences of operations, and the Lord the diversities of administrations, but all the while the Holy Spirit is present of his free will dispensing distribution of gifts" (*ibid.*, 37, PG 32,133).

⁶² See, "'From Him that called you in the grace of Christ' (Gal 1,6). The calling is from the Father, but the cause of it is the Son. He it is who has brought about reconciliation and bestowed it as a gift, for we were not saved by works in righteousness: or I should rather say that these blessings proceed from both; as he says, 'Mine are thine, and thine are mine' (Jn 17:10)" (*GAL*, 1,5, PG 61,621)

accounts he speaks thus; and also, since they were hardly to be drawn away from himself, exhorting them to hold fast to the Spirit and in order that they might cherish him (the Spirit). For he himself was able to have wrought these things, but he concedes to the Spirit the working of miracles that they might understand his dignity. For as the Father could create beings, yet the Son did so, that we might understand his power, so also is it in this case. On this account he himself was made flesh, reserving the energy for the Spirit, shutting up the mouths of those who take the argument of his ineffable love for an occasion of impiety"⁶³.

As can be seen in the above extract, the distinguishing energies of one of the Persons of the Trinity are not denied to the other two Persons, something which -in contrast- happens with their hypostatic characteristics⁶⁴. That is why all three Persons can carry out any grant related to the Apostolic Office, each one of them undertaking several particular operations in addition to the common ones. The significance of this revealing tactic on the part of God is, according to Chrysostom, economic-practical. And one of the reasons he mentions is the distinction of the divine hypostases. In this way it is revealed to the apostles that the Persons of the Trinity are clearly distinguished from each other, even though their energies are common⁶⁵. This, of course, does not mean that these distinguishing operations can define the "Person" in the Trinity⁶⁶.

Another reason justifying this "economic" plan also related to God's revelation in Christ is that God wants the three Persons of the Trinity to be equally known, as well as their being equal to each other. Chrysostom notes in his homily on the Gospel according to St. John: "Since, then, they had heard many things of the Father and had seen the Son work many things, but as yet knew nothing clearly of the Spirit, that Spirit does miracles and brings in perfect knowledge. But (as I said before) that he may not thence be supposed to be greater, on this account Christ

⁶³ JOHN, 78,3, PG 59,423.

⁶⁴ See, ICOR, 29,3, PG 61,244 (footnote 23). Also, "For is not the name of the Father sufficient to show the priority of the Father? For apart from him, the Son has the same things. For this honor is not capable of passing from the Father to the Son" (PHIL, 7,1, PG 62,229). Cf. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, p. 244.

⁶⁵ In the same way Chrysostom accounts for the use of the name of the Trinity in the sacrament of baptism in the Church: "Therefore, in the case of baptism also the Trinity is included. The Father is able to effect the whole, as is the Son, and the Holy Spirit; yet, since concerning the Father no man doubts, but the doubt was concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, they are included in the rite, that by their community in supplying those unspeakable blessings, we may also fully learn their community in dignity" (JOHN, 78,3, PG 59,424).

⁶⁶ See J. McIntyre, "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 7 (1954) 359.

says whatsoever he will hear, that he will speak and he will show you things to come"⁶⁷.

Based on the Chrysostomic texts cited above we reach the conclusion that the holy father designates the relationship between the Persons of the Holy Trinity on the one hand and the apostles and their office on the other within the relevant framework set by the theology of the Cappadocian fathers⁶⁸. Furthermore, he seems to be clear in his own thoughts as to the distinction between God's essence and the divine operations as well as the economic use of these divine energies⁶⁹. We will deal with the latter below.

1.3.2.1. God the Father as 'the beginning' (ἡ ἀρχή) and 'first cause' (αἰτία ἡ πρώτη) of the Apostolic Office

The basic position of Chrysostom about God the Father in general, is briefly formulated in his homily on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*: "He is the beginning (ἡ ἀρχή) of all other good things and the first cause (αἰτία ἡ πρώτη), who has begotten one so great in power and in achievements"⁷⁰. In another of his homilies on the *Epistle to the Ephesians* he states that to God the Father particularly belongs "the beginning" (ἡ ἀρχή), "the intention" (ἡ πρόθεσις), "the counsel" (ἡ βουλή) and "the original impetus" (ἡ πρώτη ὀρμή)⁷¹. All these generally obtain and chiefly refer to the divine operations for the plan of the divine economy and the creation of the Church. More particularly and as regards the Apostolic Office, the special operations of God the Father are to be found in the initiative for the mission of the Son and the sending of the Holy Spirit to the apostles.

⁶⁷ JOHN, 78,3, PG 59,424.

⁶⁸ As McIntyre observes, "Basil defines more precisely than did Athanasius the nature of God's creative activity; on the one hand by distinguishing the original cause (the Father), the creative cause (the Son) and the perfecting cause (the Holy Spirit); and on the other hand, by seeing in this joint creativity the pattern of their fellowship together (*De Spiritu Santo*, 38)" ("The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 7 (1954) 359).

⁶⁹ After the Synods of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381) the problem of the relation between God and the world appears to be solved on the basis of the distinction between essence, which is common in the three Persons, and energies, which are common, but in which each Person participates in peculiar manner. See, Th. Zisis, *Ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου*, pp. 58-59.

⁷⁰ ICOR, 39,5, PG 61,340.

⁷¹ EPH, 1,4, PG 62,15.

Paul in his *Epistle to the Hebrews*⁷² calls Jesus Christ "apostle and high priest of our profession" (3:1)⁷³. In the beginning of the first chapter of the same *Epistle*, recording the plan of the divine economy, he gives us the content of this plan condensed in two sentences: "God who at sundry times and in diverse manners spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son" (1:1)⁷⁴. Exactly the same arrangement of the divine plan had already been revealed by Jesus Christ through the well known parables of the husbandmen (Mat. 21:33-41) and of the marriage feast (Mat. 22:1-14)⁷⁵. Working on these extracts Chrysostom interprets them within their connections and associates them with the mission of the Son by the Father. He begins his homily on the interpretation of the first parable as follows: "Many things does he [Jesus] intimate by this parable, God's providence, which had been exercised towards them from the first; ...that even when prophets had been slain, he had not only not turned away from them, but had sent his very Son"⁷⁶. In the second case attempting a combination of the two parables, he notes: "Behold absolute love. He had planted a vineyard. He had done all things and finished. When his servants had been out to death, he sent other servants. When those had been slain, he sent the Son. And when he was put to death, he bids them to the marriage"⁷⁷. Interpreting the above parables in this way, Chrysostom offers us the framework for the correct understanding of that first mission of the Son by God the Father which, as will be shown, is directly connected with the mission of the apostles.

Jesus Christ, according to Chrysostom, is indeed an "apostle and high priest", but not as to his divine essence. At this point Chrysostom is absolutely clear: "'Apostle and high priest' (Heb. 3:1). He is not speaking at all in this place of his essence, nor of his Godhead; but so far concerning human dignities"⁷⁸. So,

⁷² In spite of doubts raised by ancient writers and modern scholars against Paul's authorship of the *Epistle* (see P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary on the Greek text*, p. 3) Chrysostom regards it as genuinely belonging to Paul. In the beginning of his commentary on this *Epistle* he writes: "This is what the blessed Paul hints also in the introduction of his letter to the Hebrews". Cf. also, *ROM*, 1,1, PG 60,395.

⁷³ Cf. *HEBR*, 5,2, PG 63,48.

⁷⁴ Cf. J. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to Hebrews* (1924) 1-10; W. L. Lane, *Word Biblical Commentary, Hebrews 1-8*, vol. 47, pp. 1-11.

⁷⁵ See Chrysostom's interpretation of these texts in *MAT*, 68,1-5, PG 58,639-648 and 69,1-4, PG 647-654. Cf., R. Trench, *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*, pp. 199-218; 361-372; I. Καραβιδουπούλου, *Αί παραβολαί του Ίησού*, pp. 106-115.

⁷⁶ *MAT*, 68,1, PG 58,640.

⁷⁷ *MAT*, 69,1, PG 58,649.

⁷⁸ *HEBR*, 5,2, PG 63,49.

according to his interpretation, when Paul speaks of the mission of the Son by God the Father, he refers to the incarnation and, in general, to economy. This mission of the Son is an operation of the Trinity, but its origin and cause lie in God the Father.

Chrysostom's work on the interpretation of the sacerdotal prayer of the Lord (Jn. 17) offers him the opportunity to go deeper into the sending of the Son by the Father. And he particularly stresses the way in which Christ is revealed to the apostles as the One sent by the Father: "The Son of God is called 'the messenger of great counsel (τῆς μεγάλης βουλής ὁ ἄγγελος)' (Is. 9:6)⁷⁹, because of the other things which he taught, and principally because he announced the Father to men, as also now he said, 'I have manifested your name unto men'... For it is not the same thing to learn that he is creator, and that he has a son. But he 'manifested his name' both by words and actions"⁸⁰. A little later he also notes: "'Whom you gave me out of the world'. As he said above, 'No man comes unto me except it be given him' (6:65), and, 'except my Father draw him' (6:64); so here, too, 'whom you gave to me' (14:6). Now he calls himself 'the way'; whence it is clear that he establishes two things by what is said here, that he is not opposed to the Father, and that it is the Father's will (βούλημα) to entrust them to the Son"⁸¹. I think that the choice of the word "counsel" (βουλή) and "will" (βούλημα) used in the last two texts with reference to God the Father is particularly significant. They express exactly this beginning and first source of the apostolic office, which belong to God the Father.

As regards the sending of the Holy Spirit, some times he is said to be sent by the Father and sometimes by the Son⁸². However, eventually, it seems that the holy father, taking into account all the relevant extracts, accept that God the Father is the one who sends him, yet in the name of the Son: "'These things have I spoken unto you, beginning yet present with you'. Since these sayings were not clear and since some they did not understand, and doubted about the greater number, in

⁷⁹ The text is taken from the translation of the LXX. The word "ἄγγελος" in that text and also here means "apostle". Cf., Π. Τρεμπέλα, *Υπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Ἡσαΐαν*, p. 128.

⁸⁰ *JOHN*, 81,1, PG 59,437.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Jn 14:26, 15:26. Cf., "But why, he said, will I ask the Father? Because had he said 'I will send him', they would not have so much believed, and now the object is that he should be believed. For afterwards he declares that he himself sent him, saying 'Receive the Holy Spirit'" (*JOHN*, 75,1, PG 59,403).

order that they might not be again confused, and say 'What commands?' He released them from all their perplexity, saying 'The Paraclete, whom the Father shall send in my name, he shall teach you'⁸³. As it seems to be the case, God the Father acts as the "first source" for the Apostolic Office.⁸⁴ Even earlier we find the same correlation in Clement of Rome⁸⁵. The observation of Gregory the Theologian, who directly correlates the mission of the apostles to the "good will of God the Father" (εὐδοκία τοῦ Πατρός), is particularly worth mentioning⁸⁶.

Having considered the above testimonies it becomes clear that Chrysostom here follows faithfully the orthodox theological tradition which on the whole considers God the Father the volitional origin of the Apostolic Office. In a synopsis of the plan of divine economy, among the other operations which he attributes to God the Father, he also refers to the mission of the apostles: "Has he not done wonders? Has he not given a law both written and natural? Has he not sent his Son? Has he not commissioned apostles? Has he not worked signs (θαύματα)? Has he not threatened hell? Has he not promised the kingdom?"⁸⁷.

1.3.2.2. *The Son as fulfiller of the Apostolic Office*

Undoubtedly, in both the *New Testament* and the homilies of Chrysostom, most references involving the apostolic office are made to the Person of God-man Jesus Christ. As Ch. Voulgaris observes referring to the contents of the "mission" (Rom. 10:8-17), "the Apostolic Office is correlated here to the Person of Christ in an extremely interesting manner"⁸⁸.

Chrysostom, interpreting the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and talking about the "dispensation of the fullness of times" (Eph. 1:10), says of Paul: "And whereas he points out the origination from the Father and the fulfilment and the execution as

⁸³ JOHN, 75,3, PG 59,407.

⁸⁴ Before Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea had already very vividly depicted the relation of the Apostolic Office to the sending of the Son by God the Father, regarding the Father as the origin and then the Son as the father's arrow and the apostles as the Son's arrows: "The Only-begotten Son was the arrow of his Father; the arrows of the Son were the apostles and his divine and glowing words" (*Commentaria in Psalmos*, 76, PG 23,897).

⁸⁵ See, "Christ was from God and the apostles from Christ. Both happened according to God's will", Clement of Rome, *Epistula i ad Corinthios* (ed., A. Jaubert), 42,1

⁸⁶ See, "Consider the good will of the Father to be apostleship", *In Theophania* (Orat. 38), PG 36,328.

⁸⁷ ICOR, 2,3, PG 61,20.

⁸⁸ Ch. Voulgaris, *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, p. 299.

effected by the agency of the Son"⁸⁹. This theological position of Chrysostom, which generally refers to economy, also obtains in the more specific case of the Apostolic Office, as we shall see below.

If the mission of the Son by the Father refers, according to Chrysostom, to the inhomination of the former, as already mentioned, this in its turn forms the basis for the mission of the apostles and carrying out of the Apostolic Office, as is clearly shown in Jesus' words to the apostles "as my Father has sent me, even so I send you" (Jn. 20:21)⁹⁰. The mission of the incarnate Son is a mystery indeed, since "he willingly obeyed as a son to his father and thus he did not fall into a servile state"⁹¹, but "remaining what he was, he took up what he was not, and although he became flesh he remained God, because he was the Word"⁹².

Here, it should be noted that in the Chrysostomic works there is exalted the threefold ministry of the inhominated Son sent by God, namely, the royal, the priestly and the prophetic. These three offices appear inextricably connected to God-man Lord, as the following extract shows: "The Lord is great and greatly to be praised (Ps. 95 (96),4). If he is great God, he is also great Lord and great king. He is great king over all the earth. The sides of the north are the mountains of Zion, the city of the great king. He is the great prophet, the great priest, the great light, great in everything. And always the Scripture calls him great with exaggeration, as when Paul says: 'Of our great God and saviour Jesus Christ' (Tit 2:13). As David also says: 'The Lord is great and greatly to be praised'. Great king, great prophet; for, when Jesus worked miracles the multitudes said: 'A great prophet has risen up among us', and 'God has visited his people' (Lk. 7:16). He is great not only in divinity, but also in flesh; for just as God is great, he is great also as Lord, great as king and great as prophet. Whence is this? Paul says: 'Seeing then that we have a great priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession (Hebr. 4:14). Therefore, if he is the great priest and the

⁸⁹ *EPH*, 1,4, PG 62,15. On the Christology of Chrysostom and its relation to the Christology of Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers see, M. E. Lawrenz, "The Christology of John Chrysostom", *Studia Patristica*, 22 (1989) 148-153. Cf., E. Michaud, "La Christologie de S. J. Chrysostom", *Revue Internationale de Theologie*, 17 (1909). J. H. Juzek, *Die Christologie des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Dogmatik der Antiochener*, Breslau 1912.

⁹⁰ *JOHN*, 86,3, PG 59,470.

⁹¹ *PHIL*, 7,3, PG 62,232.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 7,2, PG 62,231.

great prophet, indeed God visited his people and raised a great prophet in Israel. If he is the great prophet, the great priest, the great king, he is also the great light"⁹³.

It is worth mentioning that, as is clearly shown in the above extract, of the three offices which Jesus Christ possesses by right, two, namely those of the prophet and priest, refer to his inhomination, while the third, that of the king, has a double reference both to his divine nature and to his inhomination⁹⁴. As regards the first case especially Chrysostom becomes even more clear: "Indeed he had the authority (τὴν ἀρχήν) in his nature, in his essence, neither having taken it afterwards, nor having got it as alien, but begotten thus. On this account, when he was asked, he said, For this cause I was born and for this cause I came into the world (Jn 18:37)... And just as his essence cannot fail to exist, so his kingship"⁹⁵.

As is known from the texts of the Holy Scriptures and from Chrysostom's corresponding interpretations, Christ's disciples became bearers of the Apostolic Office, on the one hand through his calling and mission, and on the other through their association with him⁹⁶. This appropriation of the disciples to Jesus means, according to Chrysostom revelation of his divinity. Very useful and interesting in relation to this truth are the interpretative comments made by Chrysostom on Peter's questions, "Lord, where do you go?" (Jn. 13:36) and Philip's request, "Lord, show us the father, and it suffices us" (Jn. 14:8). In both cases Jesus presents himself as the way which the apostles came to know and which is the only one leading to the Father: "'I am the way' (Jn. 14:6). This is the proof of the fact that 'no man comes to the Father but by me'... Besides, if I am the 'way', you will need none to lead you by the hand... If you had known me, you should have known him, and have seen him... What he says is of this kind: Had you known my essence and my dignity you would have known that of the Father also,... Yet the very essence was not seen; yet it said that he 'was seen', that is, as far it was possi-

⁹³ *Homilia de Ascensione et in Principium Actorum*, 16, PG 52,790.

⁹⁴ See, "Therefore, he [Christ] was a king also before this (creation of the world) but he was unknown. For the world was made by him and the world did know him (Jn 1:10). Now, then, he managed to become also a king because of our appropriation" (*PSALM*, 46,3, PG 55,211).

⁹⁵ *PSALM*, 46,3, PG 55,272. Cf., Π. Τρεμπέλα, *Δογματική*, pp. 143-203; Ν. Ματσούκα, *Δογματική και Συμβολική θεολογία Β'*, pp. 298-308.

⁹⁶ See, "Observe how desirous he is they should be eye-witnesses. It is true indeed that the Spirit would shortly come; and yet great care is shown with regard to this circumstance... He shows that they had dwelt with Christ, not simply been present as disciples. In fact, from the very beginning there were many followed him" (*ACTS*, 3,3, PG 60,37-38). Cf., *ICOR*, 21,1, PG 61,170-171.

ble for them to see. These words are used, that you might learn that the man who has seen him, knows him who begot him"⁹⁷.

According to what Chrysostom says in the cited text, the apostles, being associated with the incarnate Son and Word of God, got to know both him and the Father. However, what is of particular interest is the fact that "they beheld him not in his unveiled essence, but clothed with flesh"⁹⁸. Clearly, here the incarnation of the Son of God is presented as the basis of the contact and revelation of God to the apostles. As a matter of fact the apostles as created men are incapable of knowing the divinity in its essence⁹⁹, so they know it covered by human flesh¹⁰⁰. The same truth is found earlier formulated in a different manner by Origen¹⁰¹.

Consequently, the above Chrysostom's conclusion that, "whatever they [the apostles] have, they have from the Son"¹⁰², sounds reasonable. What they primarily have is authority Jesus gave them.¹⁰³ The Son of God as God-man, according to Chrysostom, is not simply the one who first loved the apostles (1Jn. 4:19); He is also the One who planted them: "'You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you'. That is, I ran upon your friendship. And he stayed not here, but, 'I set you', he said (that is 'I planted you') 'that you should go' (he still uses the metaphor of the vine), that is, 'that you should extend yourselves'"¹⁰⁴. And he himself, is the One who cleansed and prepared the apostles through his sacrifice on the cross and his resurrection so that the Holy Spirit should come and dwell in them: "For when he had cleansed them by the sacrifice, then the Holy Spirit lighted upon them"¹⁰⁵. He also

⁹⁷ JOHN, 73,2, PG 59,398.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* Further down Chrysostom explains that "to behold" (θεωρεῖν) means "to know" (γινώσκειν).

⁹⁹ "Therefore, the fact that the essence of God is incomprehensible to all creation, has already been proved by all the above evidences" (*INCOMPR*, 4,309).

¹⁰⁰ In that homily, we mentioned before (*JOHN*, 73,2), Chrysostom identifies "knowledge" (γνώσις) with "sight" (θεῶν). "He is want elsewhere to put 'sight' for 'knowledge', as when he says, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God' (Mat. 5:8)".

¹⁰¹ "Therefore, the apostles were eyewitnesses of the Word not only because they saw Jesus in his Body, but also they saw the Word of God. For, if seeing Jesus in his body makes someone eyewitness of the Word, then, even Pilate was eyewitness" (Origen, *Fragmenta in Lucam*, ed., M. Rauer, 1,7,14-21).

¹⁰² JOHN, 76,2, PG 59,412.

¹⁰³ See, *MAT*, 41,2, PG 57,447, "But what he says is like this, by whom do the apostles cast them (demons) out? For in fact they were doing so already, because they had received authority from him (Mk 3:14-15)".

¹⁰⁴ JOHN, 77,1, PG 59,415.

¹⁰⁵ JOHN, 75,1, PG 59,404.

refers to the ascension of the God-man as a presupposition for the coming of the Holy Spirit: "Now, because man went up, the Spirit also comes from above"¹⁰⁶.

After Pentecost the apostles as bearers of their office act throughout the world and carry out a superhuman task. Nevertheless, in reality their work is carried out by the inhominated Son who acts through them¹⁰⁷. In another case Chrysostom points out that "some of the laws and the dogmas have been given by Christ through himself and some through the apostles"¹⁰⁸. As can be seen in several of Chrysostom's homilies, during missionary action and preaching of the gospel by the apostles "Christ went before to prepare the way and made the way easy"¹⁰⁹, while they always bore inside them the Lord himself who set their soul in motion and spoke through their mouths¹¹⁰.

The presence of the God-man in the acting apostles is more clearly shown when they perform signs. Here Chrysostom is categorical and absolute: "for all the miracles which they did he wrought in them, and the hand of the Lord was with them" (Acts 11:21)¹¹¹. And according to Jesus' promise "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believes in me, the works that I do, he will do also; and greater works than these he will do" (Jn. 14:12), the apostles "made greater works than he himself had made, using his name, that they might raise those who lay down, and make the preaching about the Resurrection trustworthy"¹¹². More particularly, Chrysostom claims that Tabitha's resurrection by Peter shows the power "of the Lord, who acts in him"¹¹³, while the healing by Peter and John of the crippled man who was sitting at the beautiful gate of the Temple "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth" (Acts 3:1-11), "made manifest the Resurrection, for it was an image of the Resurrection"¹¹⁴. Thus it is readily understood that "the procedure in the present instance is the same as in that which Christ himself did"¹¹⁵. This means that

¹⁰⁶ ACTS, 4,2, PG 60,45.

¹⁰⁷ See, "And many wonders and signs were done through the apostles" (Acts 2:43). Cf., "Therefore, just as in Christ signs were done first and then teaching, so now" (ACT, 7,1, PG 60,64).

¹⁰⁸ *De Virginitate* (ed. H. Musurillo - B. Grillet), 12,16.

¹⁰⁹ *In illud, Messis quidem multa*, 3, PG 63,521.

¹¹⁰ See, "When I say Paul I mean Christ; Because it is he who moved his soul" (GAL, 1,7, PG 61,624): "And what do I say? You ought to obey even Paul, if he speaks of himself, or anything human, but the apostle, that has Christ speaking in him" (2TIM, 2,3, PG 62,610).

¹¹¹ JOHN, 7,4,2, PG 59,402.

¹¹² ACT, 1,2, PG 60,16.

¹¹³ GEN, 55,4, PG 54,484.

¹¹⁴ ACTS, 8,1, PG 60,70.

¹¹⁵ ACTS, 13,1, PG 60,105.

the signs performed by the apostles did not only refer to the Person of God-man directly, but they also were a clear indication that the very work of Christ was continued through the office of apostle. Basil more generally speaks of the works of the apostles and relates them to Christ's divinity¹¹⁶.

Christ's presence in the life and action of the apostles is so real and vigorous that they are not only considered by Chrysostom to be in Jesus' position¹¹⁷, but also that the God-man is all and in all for them. If Paul's words in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, "But Christ is all, and in all (3:11)¹¹⁸, apply to all believers, they certainly apply to the apostles. That is to say, in effect the office of apostle is the extension and continuation of the mission of the inhominated Son of God.

Finally, the relationship between the apostles and the incarnate Word of God is vividly expressed by Chrysostom through his correlating the archetype to the type or seal¹¹⁹. Interpreting Paul's words, "be followers of me, even as I also am of Christ" (1Cor. 11:1) he calls Christ "original model" (ἀρχέτυπον) and Paul "seal" (σφραγιδα): "And, besides, too, he signifies that it is possible even thus to imitate Christ. For he who copies the perfect impression of the seal, copies the original model"¹²⁰.

This Chrysostom's "original model" definitely refers to the inhominated Word of God, since Paul could only follow him because of that similarity. The same applies to the other apostles, too, as Chrysostom elsewhere concludes: "Therefore the apostles were a type preserving an archetypal icon"¹²¹. This archetypal icon preserved by the apostles as bearers of their office, is the inhominated Son himself "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature" (Col. 1:15)¹²². And preserving the archetypal picture they definitely preserve his threefold office, namely that of king, prophet and priest.

¹¹⁶ See, "Everything else was done through the apostles, it was done in order to show the only Begotten", (Basil, *Enarratio in prophetam Isaiam*, ed. P. Trevisan, 8,218)

¹¹⁷ See, "For while Christ was in the flesh, men had war with Him, but when He was translated, the battle came in the next place upon them" (*JOHN*, 77,2, PG 59,416). The same truth is briefly expressed in the *Didache*, "Let every apostle who comes to you be accepted as Lord" (*Διδαχαι τῶν ἀποστόλων*, ed., J. P. Audet, 11,4,1).

¹¹⁸ See, "That is Christ will be all things to you, both, rank, and descent, and himself in you all", *COL*, 8,2, PG 62,353.

¹¹⁹ Of our contemporary authors K. Giles calls Jesus Christ "Jesus the Archetypal Apostle" ("Apostles before and after Paul", *Churchman: Journal of Anglican Theology* (1985) 241, yet with no reference to the use of the image by Chrysostom.

¹²⁰ *ICOR*, 13,3, PG 61,110.

¹²¹ *PHIL*, 12,3, PG 62,273.

¹²² According to Schmithals' argument, "For Paul there exists no connection between the

Thus it becomes clear that, according to Chrysostom, the special nature of the divine energies in relation to the Apostolic Office on the part of the Son of God chiefly refers to his inhomination¹²³. Through the incarnation both he fulfils his Father's will and he becomes the firm basis for the mission of the apostles and, consequently, for the foundation of the Apostolic Office.

1.3.2.3. The Holy Spirit as the fullness of the apostles and treasure of the apostolic gifts

The Holy Spirit, the third consubstantial Person of the Triune God, equal in honour with the other two divine Persons, is responsible, according to Chrysostom, for a special task in connection with the Apostolic Office¹²⁴. This is the task of perfecting its bearers and filling them with the apostolic gifts. Apart from the points referred to below, the perfecting role of the Holy Spirit is also shown in the characteristic phrases Chrysostom uses when he refers to its relationship with the apostles, for example, "clear teacher" (σαφής διδάσκαλος)¹²⁵, "precisely determined knowledge" (ἀπηκριβωμένη γνῶσις)¹²⁶, "accomplished" (ἀπηρτισμένοι)¹²⁷, "they knew everything at once" (ἄθροον πάντα ᾔδεσαν)¹²⁸, "they were

'historical Jesus' and the apostolate (contra Acts 1:21-22). The resurrected one appeared to all the apostles at the time of their call (1Cor 15:7f)" (*The office of apostle*, p. 25). Chrysostom, as shown in the texts cited above, does not make any similar distinction between 'historic Jesus' and 'resurrected Jesus'. The only distinction that may be observed in the Chrysostomic texts is the different manner in which the same Lord is associated to the apostles and their office before and after resurrection. As is also the case with the fathers before him, this distinction made by more recent scholars is unknown to him. Besides, according to the clear testimony in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, and today, and for ever" (13:8). Here Gregory of Nyssa is very illuminating: "For we did not learn by the Apostle to know Christ of two different aspects, one now and another one before as Paul said that, Even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know him thus no longer (2Cor 5:16); for that knowledge pointed out the temporary economy but this eternal existence", (*Contra Eunomium*, ed., W. Jaeger, 3,4,19-20). On this issue see, C. Vulgaris, "Εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστὸν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν": 2Cor 5:16 and the problem of St Paul's opponents in Corinth", *Θεολογία*, 46 (1,1975) 148-164.

¹²³ On the inhomination of the Son in Chrysostom's work see, *MAT*, 2,2, PG 57,25-26; *ibid*, 4,3, PG 57,42-43. Cf. C. Hay, "St. John Chrysostom and the integrity of human nature of Christ", *Franciscan Studies*, 19 (1959) 298-317.

¹²⁴ On the special role of the Holy Spirit generally in the 'economy' see, G. Florovsky, *Ἁγία Γραφή, Ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p.86-88, where he notes his special contribution to the incorporation of man in Christ's body. Also, J. Zizioulas, "Christ, the Spirit and the Church" in, *Being As Communion*, pp. 130-132; Casurella, A., *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers. A study in the history of exegesis*, 1983; J. H. Juzek, "Die Lehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus über den Heiligen Geist", *Der Katholik* 93 (1913) 309-320.

¹²⁵ *JOHN*, 75,3, PG 59,407.

¹²⁶ *JOHN*, 78,3, PG 59,424.

¹²⁷ *JOHN*, 87,1, PG 59,473.

filled" (ἐπλήσθησαν)¹²⁹. The main and central event referring to the relation between the Holy Spirit and the Apostolic Office is that of Pentecost. In addition to the cases where he occasionally refers to this event, Chrysostom concerns himself with it more particularly, interpreting the relevant extract from the Acts (2:1-41), and dedicating other homilies *To the holy Pentecost*¹³⁰. In one of these homilies, he points out that "it was not ten days since Christ ascended and sent to us spiritual charismata as gifts of that reconciliation so that nobody may doubt as to whether Christ did anything by being ascended"¹³¹.

In this text the holy father on the one hand shows that the descent of the Holy Spirit was planned, and on the other hand that the Apostolic Office is necessarily associated with his presence since the apostles received all the charismata. Furthermore, the role of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the bearers of the Apostolic Office is related to the inhomination of the Son, as is shown in the following text: "Even then [in the Gospels] he [The Paraclete] did many works, as just now [in the Acts] Christ does as well as then; only then the Spirit worked through the Temple, now through the apostles; Then he came into the Virgin's womb, and fashioned the Temple; now, into apostolic souls; then in the likeness of a dove; now in the likeness of fire"¹³². This special role refers to the perfection of the apostles. That is, we observe in the bearers of the Apostolic Office a gradual progress in the knowledge of God. This knowledge of God starts from the already existing prophetic teaching, continues with the revelation of God's incarnated Word and is perfected with the visitation of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

As is known Jesus Christ prepared his disciples during his three-year public action. And when he sent them out tentatively he supplied them with his own power (Mat 10:1). Thus, as Chrysostom points out, they performed signs through Christ's authority alone: "For the apostles cast not out devils by the Spirit but by power received from him; As he says himself if I by Beelzebul cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? (Mat 12,27). And this he said, signifying that before the crucifixion not all cast out devils by the Spirit, but that some did so

¹²⁸ JOHN, 38,4, PG 59,217.

¹²⁹ ACTS, 4,1, PG 60,43.

¹³⁰ *De sancta Pentecoste*, 1-2, PG 50,453-470.

¹³¹ *De sancta Pentecoste*, 1, PG 50,453.

¹³² ACTS, 1,5, PG 60,21.

by the power received from him"¹³³. In one of his appearances to the apostles after his resurrection, the Lord "breathed on them, and said, Receive you the Holy Spirit. Whosoever sins you remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever you retain, they are retained (Jn 20: 22-23)'. As a king sending forth governors, gives power to cast into prison and to deliver from it, so in sending these forth, Christ invested them with the same power"¹³⁴.

Using the participle "sending" (ἐκπέμπων) Chrysostom shows that the granting of the Holy Spirit, according to Chrysostom, is directly related to the mission of the apostles. However, an issue comes up here related to when exactly the apostles received the Holy Spirit; the moment Jesus "breathed on them" or on the day of Pentecost? At this point Chrysostom seems to adopt the opinion of some earlier interpreters¹³⁵, who postulated that at the moment of the Lord's "breathing on them" the apostles were only then given the gift of the Spirit to forgive sins, whereas the whole Holy Spirit with all the gifts, they received on the day of Pentecost: "Some say that he gave not the Spirit, but rendered them fit to receive him, by breathing on them... Wherefore he said not, 'You have received the Holy Spirit', but, 'Receive you the Holy Spirit'. Yet one will not be wrong in asserting that they then also receive some spiritual power and grace not so as to raise the dead, or to work miracles, but also to remit sins. For the gifts of the Spirit are of different kinds; Wherefore he added, 'Whosoever sins you remit, they are remitted unto them, showing what kind of power he was giving. But in the other case, after forty days, they received the power of working miracles'"¹³⁶.

As regards the whole granting of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, Chrysostom, once more following his earlier ecclesiastical fathers,¹³⁷ observes:

¹³³ JOHN, 51,1, PG 59,284.

¹³⁴ JOHN, 86,3, PG 59,471.

¹³⁵ Origen had referred to this issue and observed that "the apostles, who hold the life-giving Spirit by the Lord's blowing unto them, bring the original Spirit, who is sent from heaven; not spirit in spirit, another on another, but energy in the same Spirit, just as Paul teaches (1Cor 12:4)" (*Adnotationes in Deuteronomium*, PG 17,24). It is possible Chrysostom refers to Origen's interpretation.

¹³⁶ JOHN, 86,3, PG 59,471.

¹³⁷ On the plentiful and perfective granting of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost other fathers, among whom Irenaeus and Gregory of Nyssa, had already written earlier on. See, "The apostles were perfected by the Holy Spirit after the Ascension of Lord" (Irenaeus, *Elenchus*, 3,12,5, PG 7, 897BC); "But, the power of speaking was all at once added to the apostles by the inspiration of the Spirit, according to this planned grace" (Gregory of Nyssa, *In Basilium fratrem*, ed., J. Stein, 8,17). Here also it is worthy to mention the opinion of Romanides, a contemporary theologian. In, *Δογματική και Συμβολική Θεολογία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. 1, p. 119, he writes: "In our fathers there is not deeper comprehension of the God's mysteries than that

"And they were all filled', he says; not merely received the grace of the Spirit, but 'were filled'"¹³⁸. As he had already explained earlier on, the Spirit which the apostles received on the day of Pentecost remained on them permanently and firmly: "'And he sat upon each of them'. This means that 'he remained and rested upon them'. For the sitting is significant of settledness and continuance".¹³⁹ Thus the presence of the Holy Spirit in the apostles and his relationship to the Apostolic Office in general is proved substantial and permanent. Chrysostom reminds us that "just as Christ said about himself, 'Behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the age' (Mat 28:20)... so did he about the Spirit, that is, 'he is with you for ever' (Jn 14:16); so we can celebrate Pentecost always (ἀεί)"¹⁴⁰. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that Chrysostom considers the event of Pentecost as the baptism of the apostles: "That wind was a font (of water). This betokened copiousness, as the fire did the vehemence"¹⁴¹.

Therefore, the event of Pentecost, by which the perfection of the bearers of the Apostolic Office is concluded, is not momentary, but prolonged. And it is prolonged through the establishment of the very Apostolic Office. That is why we can speak of a continuing Pentecost in the Church, as Yievtic says¹⁴², and, therefore, of a continuous presence and action of the Apostolic Office in it. More particularly, the perfective role of the Holy Spirit is located by Chrysostom chiefly at three points, 1) elucidation (διασάφησις) of the revealed teaching by the inhominated Son of God, 2) transformation (μετασκευή) of the bearers of the Apostolic Office, and 3) fullness (πλήρωμα) as the source of the apostolic dogmas and gifts.

1.3.2.4. The Holy Spirit as elucidator of Christ's teaching

of the theoretical experience of the apostles on the day of Pentecost".

¹³⁸ ACTS, 4,1, PG 60,43.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* See also, "'He remains with you' (Jn 14:17). This shows that even after death he departs not" (JOHN, 75,1, PG 59,404.).

¹⁴⁰ *De sacra Pentecoste*, 1,1, PG 50,454.

¹⁴¹ ACTS, 4,2, PG 60,44. See also, "Now then, if he had not baptised with the Spirit the apostles, and all every day who are willing, you might have doubts concerning those other future things too" (MAT, 11,6, PG 57,198).

¹⁴² A. Yievtic, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου κατὰ τὸν ἱερό Χρυσόστομο*, p. 153.

As is known from Paul and repeated by Chrysostom, the mystery of God's Economy "in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph 3:5).¹⁴³ Elsewhere the holy father observes that this revelation of the Spirit is not in the least different from that of the Son: "But, says one, if they were to hear from the Spirit, why needed they to accompany Christ when they would not retain his words? Because the Spirit taught them not, but called to their mind what Christ had said before; and it contributes not a little to the glory of Christ, that they were referred to the remembrance of the words he had spoken to them"¹⁴⁴.

Here one may pose the question: what is the special significance of the presence and energy of the Holy Spirit in the bearers of the Apostolic Office, since he alone reminded (them) of what Christ taught? Chrysostom's answer is that the apostles were enabled by what the Spirit did to comprehend and experience the same revelation offered to them by Christ to the degree of perfection that God specified for them: "For when they had once received the grace of the Spirit, in a moment they both knew and were able to do all things which they needed to do".¹⁴⁵ Therefore, the difference does not lie in the contents of the revelation of the Son and of the Spirit, but in the receptivity of the bearers of the Apostolic Office. This receptivity was perfected by the operation of the Holy Spirit since "the power of the Spirit is great"¹⁴⁶. The holy father goes even deeper and explains: "'These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you' (Jn 14:25). Since these sayings were not clear, and since some of them were not understood, and doubt was expressed about the greater number of them". Chrysostom points to the work of the Paraclete as providing the solution: "What commands?". He [Christ] released them from all their perplexity saying, 'The Paraclete, whom the Father shall send in my name, he shall teach you' (14:26). Perhaps these things are not clear (ἄσαφῆ) to you now, but 'he' is a clear teacher of them"¹⁴⁷.

Even though Chrysostom characterises as "not clear" (ἄσαφῆ) what Christ revealed to the apostles before the Holy Spirit came, the collocation of this term

¹⁴³ *EPH*, 6,2, PG 62,45.

¹⁴⁴ *JOHN*, 23,3, PG 59,142.

¹⁴⁵ *JOHN*, 38,4, PG 59,217-218.

¹⁴⁶ "Did you see the power of the Spirit? Did you see that the Holy spirit has destroyed every kind of malice?" (*ACTS*, 4,3, PG 60,46).

¹⁴⁷ *JOHN*, 75,3, PG 59,407.

with the words "perhaps" (τάχα), "now" (νῦν) and "to you" (ὕμῖν) shows that this "vagueness" (ἀσάφεια) is not related to the contents of the revelation given by the Son, but to the particular period of time this revelation was offered and to the state of the apostles at that time. All these are better accounted for and in greater detail in another homily of the holy father: "For this also 'he testifies of him, that he shall guide us into all truth' (Jn 16:13). Because he was clothed with the flesh, and because he would not seem to speak concerning himself, and because they did not yet know clearly concerning the Resurrection, and were too imperfect, and also because of the Jews, that they might not think they were punishing him as a transgressor; therefore he spoke no great thing continually, nor plainly drew them away from the Law... So, he says, 'that I told you not what I should have told you, is not because I am ignorant but the hearers are infirm'. On this account having said, 'he shall lead you into all truth', he added, 'he shall not speak of himself (Jn 16:13)'"¹⁴⁸.

Having considered the above testimonies, it becomes clear that, according to Chrysostom, the "precisely determined knowledge", which the Holy Spirit as a "clear teacher" offers to the apostles so that this task is "accomplished", is especially related to his perfective work which he carries out upon the bearers of the Apostolic Office and not to a new or more perfect revelation.

1.3.2.5. The Holy Spirit transformer and inspirer of the apostles

As can be seen in the points presented above, the clarification of the divine revelation by the Holy Spirit presupposes the perfection of Christ's weak disciples. And this perfection, according to Chrysostom, was once more carried out by the Holy Spirit: "They who now trembled and feared after they had received the Spirit sprang into the midst of dangers, and stripped themselves for the contest against steel, and fire, and wild beasts, and seas, and every kind of punishment; and they, the unlettered and ignorant, discoursed so boldly as to astonish their hearers. For the Spirit made them men of iron instead of men of clay, gave them wings, and allowed them to be cast down by nothing human. For such is that grace"¹⁴⁹. As shown in the text, a good change has occurred inside the apostles chiefly related to

¹⁴⁸ JOHN, 78,2, PG 59,423.

¹⁴⁹ JOHN, 75,5, PG 59,409.

their mind (φρόνημα). The Holy Spirit "who is able to exalt them [the apostles]"¹⁵⁰ transforms them through his presence and enables them to manage their lofty office. This is the alteration of the apostles according to Chrysostom: "By the presence of the Spirit they were now transformed, and were become superior to all bodily considerations"¹⁵¹; "For wherever the Holy Spirit is present, he makes men of gold out of clay"¹⁵².

The Holy Spirit whom the apostles received on the day of Pentecost resides in them for ever, so "these hearts of the apostles were of flesh and written on by the Spirit"¹⁵³. Therefore, whatever admirable things the apostles achieved during their apostolic ministry is not an achievement of their own human power "but of the Spirit, who prepared their way and moved their soul"¹⁵⁴. Chrysostom sees the Holy Spirit as initiating the soul of the apostles and activating their Apostolic Office. That is why "till then the apostles were without Spirit, they solved problems by lot (κλήρω)"¹⁵⁵, as exactly happened in the case of Matthias' election in Judas' place (Acts 1:13-26). After Pentecost, however, the apostles are moved and led by the Spirit,¹⁵⁶ by whom they have also been perfected. Thus, there is shown the special administrative role of the Paraclete Spirit in the practising of the apostolic office through keeping its bearers constantly suitable.

1.3.2.6. The Holy Spirit as the source of the apostolic dogmas and charismata

The third point, in which Chrysostom locates the special nature of the economic operations of the Holy Spirit, is the fact that he is the source of the dogmas and gifts within the apostles. Looking deep into the event of Pentecost, he points out two details referring to the relation between the Paraclete Spirit and the Apostolic Office. The first is that the Spirit is granted to all the apostles without being decreased, and the second that within the apostles he is transformed to a source from which other people can receive his grace: "But just as fire kindles as

¹⁵⁰ MAT, 90,2, PG 58,789.

¹⁵¹ In the English translation (B. Eerdmans, *A select Library of the Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, v .XI, p. 29), this part of the quotation is considered to be additional. However, if this is the case, it is a successful characterisation of what is said afterwards.

¹⁵² ACTS, 4,3, PG 60,46.

¹⁵³ 2 COR, 7,1, PG 61,441.

¹⁵⁴ PSALM, 46,3, PG 55,212.

¹⁵⁵ JER, 12,13, PG 64,881.

¹⁵⁶ ACTS, 39,1, PG 60,275. "Moreover he [Paul] was led to Corinth by the Spirit". See, also, 2 COR, 3,3, PG 61,408.

many flames as it will, so here the largeness of the Spirit was shown, in that each one received a fountain of the Spirit; as indeed he himself had foretold, that those who believe in him, should have 'a well of water springing up into everlasting life' (Jn 15:14)¹⁵⁷.

The image of the fire by which the Holy Spirit is shown to be coming to the apostles is very appropriate to express the potential of the Apostolic Office to maintain the source of all divine gifts. According to Chrysostom, "[the apostles] came not down from a mountain, as Moses, bearing monuments of stone in their hands, but carrying about the Spirit in their mind, and pouring forth a kind of treasure and fountain of dogmas and charismata and of all things that are good things, so they went everywhere around the world, and became, through that grace, living books and laws. Thus they won over 'the three thousand' (Acts 2:41), thus 'the five thousand' (Acts 4,4), thus the nations of the world; God, by their tongue, discoursing with all that approached them"¹⁵⁸.

Jesus Christ had prepared his disciples to encounter the difficulties they would be faced with in front of the rulers and wise men of this world: "For it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you" (Mat. 10,20). Chrysostom uses these words of Christ and their fulfilment in order to explain the admirable achievements of the apostles, weak in human terms. "Since men actually had them in the midst, twelve unlearned persons, binding, scourging, dragging them about, and were not able to stop their mouths; but as it is impossible to bind the sunbeam, so also their tongue. And the reason was, 'it was not they' themselves 'that spoke', but the power of the Spirit"¹⁵⁹.

As is shown in the last text as well in the previous ones, the constant and active presence of the Holy Spirit within the apostles gives colour to the apostolic office in its final expression towards the world and, more particularly, in all its details while it is being practised. The Paraclete himself "makes them [the apostles] spiritual" being a witness alongside them: "What, then, the other apostles declared...he also says: 'We are witnesses of the things spoken and the Spirit which he has given to them that obey him (Acts 5:32)'"¹⁶⁰.

¹⁵⁷ ACTS, 4,2, PG 60,45.

¹⁵⁸ MAT, 1,1, PG 57,15.

¹⁵⁹ MAT, 33,4, PG 57,393.

¹⁶⁰ JOIN, 88,2, PG 59,481. Here, Basil's note is especially interesting: "When, then, the apostles

As Chrysostom here declares, there exists a very close co-operation between the apostles and the Holy Spirit in carrying out the Apostolic Office. Thus the apostles offer their personal testimony about the saving work of Christ who suffered and was resurrected, while the Holy Spirit co-testifies through the gifts he grants to the apostles and through the signs which he performs through them. Furthermore, he leads the apostles to this testimony, as is shown by the holy father's words: "Even though Paul comes, however, the Paraclete is present"¹⁶¹. In addition, the condescension adopted by the apostles in tackling pastoral issues is also suggested by the Holy Spirit: "A condescension suggested by the Spirit, who has so ordered it, on a subject which pertains to Christ as man"¹⁶². Since "economy" is an exception to the rule being practised through the free choice of the bearers of the apostolic office, it becomes evident that the Holy Spirit co-operates with the free will of the apostles.

Finally, Chrysostom's observation is worth mentioning, i.e. that the apostles possess, as a kind of grant, all the gifts of the Holy Spirit,¹⁶³ while the other gifted persons of the Church possess only a limited number or only one of them. And this proves, according to the holy father, the validity of the Apostolic Office: "In the Holy Spirit (2Cor 6:6). For in him, he says, we do all these good works... Moreover, he seems to say another thing herein. What then is this? Namely, we have both been filled with abundance of the Spirit and hereby also give a proof of our apostleship in that we have been counted worthy of spiritual gifts"¹⁶⁴. Here John Chrysostom puts forward his own position and interpretation. Nevertheless, the abundant presence of the Paraclete Spirit in the bearers of the Apostolic Office is clearly shown, which, being a source of the apostolic dogmas and gifts, shows the special role of the Holy Spirit in the practice of the Apostolic Office.

say, 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (Acts 15:28), they do not put in order themselves together with Spirit's authority, but subdue themselves to him, because they were bestowed by him then" (*Adversus Eunomium*, 2, PG 29,740).

¹⁶¹ *In illud, Hoc autem scitote*, 6, PG 56,277.

¹⁶² *ACTS*, 1,1, PG 60,15.

¹⁶³ *1COR*, 32,1, PG 61,265, "On this account he put the apostles in the first place because they had in themselves all the gifts".

¹⁶⁴ *2COR*, 12,2, PG 61,483.

1.4. Conclusions

Recapitulating all that has been so far written I cite a list of the main points pertaining to the relation between the Holy Trinity and the Apostolic Office as conceived of and pointed out by Chrysostom. The holy father,

1. considers the Apostolic Office as a grant from above since man being of God's creation and created in his essence cannot hold any office by nature and right;

2. excludes the possibility that the apostles are the sources of the Apostolic Office and locates its origins not only in the historical Jesus, who sent out the apostles in time, but in the common energies of all persons of the Holy Trinity. Additionally, he connects these energies to the common will, the common authority and the common glory of the three divine Persons, associating all these with the identity of their essence;

3. more particularly and on the basis of Scriptural texts, he proves that the apostles belong to all three divine Persons, are granted the revelation and the co-mission again by all of them and act through the real presence of God the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Thus it is shown that the "mission" is the Holy Trinity's responsibility;

4. in parallel to the common energies of the Holy Trinity, Chrysostom points out the special role of each of the three divine Persons in relation to the Apostolic Office. However, at the same time he does not fail to explain that these individual energies and relations of each of the divine Persons do not distinguish them from each other, but are a kind of method and "economy" on God's part in the revelation and implementation of the divine plan of salvation;

5. of these individual energies the position of "the first source" (αἰτία ἡ πρώτη) and "the counsel" (ἡ βουλή) for the constitution of the Apostolic Office, chiefly expressed through the mission of the Son and the sending of the Holy Spirit, is attributed to God the Father. Furthermore, it is again the Father who gives the apostles to the Son. The Son is the One who accomplishes the "counsel" of God the Father through his incarnation, thus becoming the "way" to the knowledge of God for the apostles, the "planter" of the apostles, and the "Archetype" of the Apostolic Office, being the Apostle of the Father. The Holy

Spirit works for the perfection of the bearers of the apostolic office, becoming "the clear teacher" and transformer of the apostles and remaining within them as the source of the apostolic dogmas and charismata.

6. In all the above cited points Chrysostom follows the earlier Church fathers, but develops the relation between the Holy Trinity and the apostolic office further and proves it using ample evidence. Additionally, he innovates when he explains the individual energies of each of the divine Persons as strategy or "economy" of God.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

2.1. General consideration of the chrysostomic teaching about the Church

Before attempting to determine the relation between the Church and the Apostolic Office according to Chrysostom's teaching, we consider it necessary to cite briefly his basic theological position about the Church¹, since this constitutes the framework within which the relation we are interested in is found.

Firstly, Chrysostom considers the Church as a "great mystery"², which is not confined to the narrow limits of human history. He writes of it that "[the Church] has rather taken roots in heaven"³ and that "[it] is heavenly, and is nothing else than heaven",⁴ obviously meaning that its origins lie in God Himself and that it constitutes the way in which the mystery of God is revealed (Eph. 3:9. Col. 2:2)⁵. Analysing this further, he relates it both to the Holy Trinity⁶ and to the incarnate Son of God⁷.

¹ More detailed examination and analysis of Chrysostom's ecclesiology with slight differentiation in their conclusions can be found in specialised studies: E. Michaud, "Ecclesiologie de St. Jean Chrysostome", *Revue Internationale de Theologie* 11 (1903) 491-520; Genadios, Metropolitan of Ilioupolis, "Ἡ περί Ἐκκλησίας διδασκαλία τοῦ ἱ. Χρυσοστόμου", *Ὁρθοδοξία*, 29 (1954) 241-259; J. Karmiris, "Ecclesiology of three Hierarchs", *Greek Orthodox Review*, 6 (1961) 135-185; K. Mouratidis, *Ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου*, 1958; A. Yieftic, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου κατὰ τὸν ἱ. Χρυσόστομο*, 1984.

² *1TIM*, 11,1, PG 62,554-555. Cf., also, *EPH*, 24,4, PG 62,140; *Quales ducendae sint uxores*, 3, PG 51,230; *JOHN*, 11,2, PG 59,80.

³ *In illud, Vidi Dominum*, 4,b, PG 56,121.

⁴ *HEBR*, 14,2, PG 63,112.

⁵ Modern scholars, who, among others, stress the sense of mystery in the Church are the following: Otto Semmelroth, *Die Kirche als Ursacrament*, 1953; M. J. Congar, *Esquisse de mystere de l' Eglise*, 1941; M. J. Guillou, *Church and Christ, a theology of the mystery*, 1966; G. Fittkav, *Der Begriff des Mysteriums bei Johannes Chrysostomus*, 1953.

⁶ "The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit shared the economy which was for us" (*De sancta Pentecoste*, PG 50,456); see also the phrase "Blessed is the kingdom of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit now and ever and to the ages of ages" in the Divine Liturgy (E. E. Brightman, "The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom" in his book, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, (1896) 310; P. Trempelas, *Αἱ τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας* (1982) 22-24.

⁷ "He [Paul] added, 'so also in Christ' (1Cor 12:12). And when he should have said, 'so also in

Based on certain biblical texts which he interprets, Chrysostom accepts that the Church exists in the age-long will of God. Thus, referring to "the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hidden in God" (Eph. 3:9), he notes: "it has been now, he says, brought to pass, but not now decreed, since it had been planned beforehand from above. According to the purpose of the ages, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, that is, according to foreknowledge of the ages, as God foresaw the things to come; he means the ages to come; for he knew what was to be, and thus decreed it"⁸. Even though the apostle's writings are clear, Chrysostom seems to be stressing the pre-existence of the Church somewhat more emphatically. In another homily of his interpretation of the *First Epistle to Timothy*, he becomes even clearer: "He [God] created all this creation and he created us for this purpose, namely, neither that we may be abolished nor that he may send us to hell, but that he may save us and, after delivering us from delusion, he may give us the indulgence of the kingdom. He prepared it for us not now, after the world came into existence, but before the foundation of the world, as he says 'Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world' (Mat. 25:34). Mark the love of the Lord toward man, that he made ready countless goods for him, even before the creation and before bringing him into being"⁹.

In this extract, as also happens in other cases, Chrysostom on the one hand identifies the Church with the Kingdom of God¹⁰, while on the other he directly associates it with man's salvation¹¹. It is also obvious that here he refers both to the

the Church', for this was the natural consequent he does not say it but instead of it places the name of Christ carrying the discourse up on high and appealing more and more to the hearer's reverence. But his meaning is this: 'So also is the body of Christ, which is the Church. For as the body and the head are one man, so he said that the Church and Christ are one. Wherefore also he placed Christ instead of the Church, giving that name to his body' (*ICOR*, 30,1, PG 61,250); Cf. also, G. Dragas, "Orthodox Ecclesiology in Outline", *Ecclesiasticus*, pp. 18-24.

⁸ *EPH*, 7,1, PG 62,50.

⁹ *GEN*, 3,4, PG 53,36.

¹⁰ *MAT*, 69,1, PG 58,647; cf., also, *Catechesis ultima ad baptizandos* (ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus), 1,4, PG 49,227. On the view points of modern theologians, who separate the Church from God's Kingdom see F. M. Braun, *Neues Licht auf die Kirche. Die protestantische Kirchendogmatik in ihrer neuesten Entfaltung*, 1946. On the identification of the Church and the Kingdom in general, see, B. Ioannidis, "Η βασιλεία του Θεού κατά την διδασκαλίαν της Καινής Διαθήκης», *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Θεολογικής Σχολής πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών*, 1954-1955. Cf., also, I. Romanides, *Δογματική και Συμβολική Θεολογία...*, vol. 1, pp. 200-212. More particularly, on the same identification in Chrysostom, see, K. Mouratides, *Η ουσία και τό πολίτευμα της Εκκλησίας...*, pp. 96-104.

¹¹ Cf. the following: "Do not desist from the Church... the Church is your salvation". (*In Eutropium*, 2,6, PG 52,402); "For the Church is a spiritual surgery", (*GEN*, 1,1, PG 53,22); also

beginning of the Church before the foundation of the world, and to its eschatological dimension, since the evangelical text that he cites (Mat. 25:34) speaks of the end time (τὰ ἔσχατα). More particularly, as regards the time at which the Church, was created, Chrysostom's answer in this context, through which the prevailing opinion of the ancient Church¹² is also expressed, traces the origin of the Church back to the period before the creation of the material world, when the spiritual beings were first being created. Thus in his speech *De Sancto Philogonio* Chrysostom declares that St. Philogonius "after leaving this earthly Church, he is in that [Church] of the first born who are registered in heaven, and after leaving these [earthly] feasts he has moved to the festival of the angels. indeed, to be assured that there is a city and a Church above [in heaven], do hear Paul who says 'You have come to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem and the Church of the firstborn who are registered in heaven and in the festival of innumerable angels'¹³. According to all these the Church in its broadest sense is God's communion with the spiritual and rational beings and His Kingdom over them, i.e. it includes the hosts of the angelic and immaterial forces as well as the believers of all ages¹⁴.

According to Chrysostom's teaching, the Church, created before the beginning of the world, is originally revealed in the creation of the world since the latter was carried out for the sake of the Church. As he puts it, "Heaven was created for the Church's sake, and not the Church for heaven's sake"¹⁵. After the creation of the world, however, the Church is considered by Chrysostom as a "body" which includes the believers of all ages. As he says, "Now what is this one body? The faithful throughout the whole world, those who are, have been and shall be. And again, these who before Christ's coming pleased God, are 'one body'. How so?

EPH, 11,3, PG 62,84. Clement of Alexandria's relative expression is quite interesting. "The will of Him [God] is the salvation of men, and this is called Church" (*Paedagogus*, 1,6, PG 8,281). Cf. also, M. J. Guillou, "The thought of the Fathers is completely dominated by the movement of revelation and the economy of salvation, which begins in God and passes through Christ to the Church" (*Christ and Church...*, *op. cit.*, p. 68).

¹² As far as the opinion of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Ambrose and Epiphanius is concerned see, C. Beumer, "Die altchristliche Idee einer praexistierenden Kirche und ihre theologische Anwendung", *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 9 (1942) 16ff. Cf. also, Hermas, *Visiones pastoris*, 2.4.1 (in J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 297) and Athanasius, *De Incarnatione et contra Arianos*, PG 26,1004- 1005.

¹³ *PHILOG*, 1, PG 48,749.

¹⁴ Cf. K. Mouratidis, *Ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, pp. 70-71.

¹⁵ *Antequam iret in exsilium*, 2, PG 52,429. Cf. G. Dragas, "Creation and the Kingdom of God", *Church and society documents*, (August 1988) 43-48.

Because they too knew Christ"¹⁶. Mouratides comments here that, "this fact leads necessarily to a search for the origin of the Church in its narrow sense in the creation of man in Paradise, where Adam 'had the benefit of contact with God and had the pleasure to be free to approach him. Although angels trembled and Cherubim and Seraphim did not dare to look up, he had conversation with God as a friend with a friend"¹⁷. During this first period even though the angelic and the human, the earthly and the heavenly forces constituted one unit, one Church, one Kingdom of one King, the Triune God, nevertheless, the Church, consisting of God's communion with his people and the people's participation in God's heavenly Kingdom, had not yet acquired its final form"¹⁸.

It is also notable here that Chrysostom sees in Eve's creation from Adam's ribs the anticipation of the new creation of the Church from Christ's ribs, pierced on the cross. "For as Eve, he says, came to be from the side of Adam, so we [came to be] from the side of Christ... Whence could anyone prove that even the Church was built from the side of Christ? Scripture proves even this. For, when Christ was lifted up to the cross and was nailed and died, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear and immediately blood and water came out (Jn. 19:34). You mark how we are from his flesh and from his bones, born and fed from the water, and, as the woman was made while Adam was sleeping, in the same way the Church was formed from the side of Christ"¹⁹.

After man's fall the scene changed, because "a middle wall of partition" (Eph. 1:14) was erected between God and Man and man falling out of paradise fell out of the Church, since "Heavenly things had been severed from earthly. They had no longer one Head"²⁰. Thus, the Son of God through his inhumanity "after coming to its shelter and finding it filthy, dried, naked, mixed up with blood, he washed its body, anointed it with oil, dressed it in an outer garment, he himself being a cloth, and after having taken it, he leads it up"²¹.

The reconstitution of the Church through the incarnation of the Son of God is clearly suggested by Chrysostom when he states one of his homilies that the Lord

¹⁶ *EPH*, 10,1, PG 62,75.

¹⁷ *Cum imperator reliquias veneratus esset*, 1, PG 63,473-474.

¹⁸ K. Mouratidis, *Ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 72.

¹⁹ *Quales dicendae sint uxores...*, 3,3, PG 51,229; See also, *JOHN*, 85,3, PG 59,465.

²⁰ *EPH*, 1,4, PG 62,15.

²¹ *PSALM*, 5,2. PG 55,63.

in his incarnation "took the flesh of the Church"²². Thus with the incarnation of the Son of God, the humanity "naked and mixed with blood", was not merely cleansed by him, but was also perfected and made his body, i.e. was churched.. That is precisely why the shortest and most complete definition Chrysostom gives for the Church is the body of Christ: "The Church of Christ, according to blessed Paul, is the Body of Christ"²³. This shows the direct relation between the "mystery of God the Father", the "mystery of Christ" and the "mystery of the Church"²⁴. As Chrysostom puts it, "as the body and the head are one man, so, he [Paul] said, the Church and Christ are one"²⁵, and "the fullness of Christ is the Church. And rightly so, for the complement of the head is the body, and the complement of the body is the head"²⁶. Therefore, according to Chrysostom, one cannot refer to the Church irrespective of Christology, just as, Christology cannot be comprehended irrespective of Ecclesiology²⁷.

Finally, Chrysostom sees the Church eschatologically, both through the images of the building²⁸, the body²⁹ and the bride³⁰ and in Her being characterized as Kingdom of God or Kingdom of heaven³¹. He usually connects the end time (τὰ ἔσχατα) with history, as he preaches the Kingdom of God as present in history³². Thus, according to Chrysostom, the Church is "the place of angels, the place of archangels, the Kingdom of God, Heaven itself"³³; but the Kingdom of God "is not only of the present things but also of the coming ones; for, [it is] endless and

²² *Antequam iret in exsilium*, 2, PG 52,429.

²³ *SACERD*, 4,2, PG 48,665. Cf., D. L. Greeley, *The Church as Body of Christ according to the teaching of St. John Chrysostom*, 1971.

²⁴ "'The knowledge of God's mystery, and of Christ' (Col 2:2). So, this is the mystery of God, the fact of being brought through Christ" (*COL*, 5,2, PG 62,333).

²⁵ *ICOR*, 30,1, PG 61,250.

²⁶ *EPH*, 3,2, PG 62,26; See, also, *ROM*, 24,2, PG 60,624.

²⁷ "There is no interval to separate between the head and the body; for were there a separation, then were it no longer a body, then were no longer a head" (*EPH*, 3,2, PG 62,26). Cf., "Wherever Jesus Christ is, there the Catholic Church is" (Ignatius, *Smyrnaeos*, 8., *Epistulae vii genuinae*, ed., P. T. Camelot).

²⁸ See *EPH*, 6,1, PG 62,44.

²⁹ See *ICOR*, 8,4, PG 61,72; 24,2, PG 61,200.

³⁰ See *PSALM*, 5,2, PG 55,63; *EPH*, 20,4, PG 62,140; *Quales ducendae sint uxores* 2. PG 51,227.

³¹ "He also calls that end the kingdom" (*PSALM*, 5,1, PG 55,62).

³² "Let us also learn the time, when we are going to enjoy these things. It is not the present time, but the future one; rather both, the present and the future. 'Seek, then, first the Kingdom of God and all these things will be added to you; then [we shall enjoy] the whole" (*PSALM*, 5,1, PG 55,62).

³³ "The Church is not a barber or perfume shop, or any other workshop in the market, but place of angels and archangels, kingdom of God, the heavens themselves" (*ICOR*, 36,5, PG 61,313).

infinite and it alone has eternity... it extends to the whole world, all ages, all times"³⁴.

Especially notable here is the fact that Chrysostom discerns the eschatological reality of the Church in the worshipping congregation through the accomplishment of the divine Eucharist 'in time'. Thus, if the martyrs of the Church "being in body during the communion of the mysteries, were in that choir with the Cherubim, and chanted the thrice holy hymn, as you, who are initiated, know, [they are] much more now"³⁵. Elsewhere he stresses that "this mystery [of the Eucharist] turns the earth into Heaven for your sake"³⁶.

Therefore, according to the viewpoint and teaching of Chrysostom, the one and indivisible Church of God, which is closely related with Triadology and Christology³⁷, is revealed in three ways: 1) as hidden (secret) mystery in God's will which is revealed in the creation of the visible world; 2) as a historical reality covering four periods, namely, the period before the Fall, the prophetic period, the period of the incarnation of the Son of God and the apostolic period; and 3) as a triumphant eschatological reality.

2.2. The Apostolic Office in the periods of the Church preceding the incarnation

Since the Church, according to Chrysostom, is revealed in different periods, it would be useful to examine the relations between the Apostolic Office and each one of them, as well as its place in them.

Firstly, there is the question of relation of the Apostolic Office to the Church as a mystery in the eternal will of God. Certainly, the apostles were called to play their role in building up the Church when the latter was revealed in its historical reality, especially during its last period. It is very difficult, however, to find clear references in Chrysostom's work to the apostles and their office in the early periods of the Church. There is only the point that its eternal existence was

³⁴ *PSALM*, 144,4, PG 55,469.

³⁵ *In omnes sanctos martyres*, 2, PG 50,709.

³⁶ *ICOR*, 24,5, PG 61,205. Modern scholars particularly stress the relation between the Eucharist and the revelation of the Church as eschatological reality. Cf., M. P. Guillou, *Christ and Church...*, p. 100-103. J. Romanides, "The ecclesiology of St Ignatius", *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 7 (1961-2) 62-64. J. Zizioulas, "The ecclesiology of the Orthodox Tradition", *Search* 7 (1984) 44-46.

³⁷ "The triadological and christological dimensions cannot be divorced in Orthodox Ecclesiology, because the Church is the Church of the Holy Trinity insofar as She is the Church of Christ and vice versa" (G. Dragas, "Creation and the Kingdom of God", *op. cit.*, p. 24).

revealed to the bearers of the Apostolic Office (Mat. 25:34)³⁸. It is also possible that Paul, writing about "a holy calling" (2Tim 1:9), apart from the general calling for men's salvation, had in mind the special calling of apostleship³⁹. Yet, the general teaching of Chrysostom about the Church, and the fact that God, who "prepared it before the beginning of the world" and who "before the creation and before bringing man into being he made ready countless goods for him"⁴⁰, implies that God must have also included the apostles and the Apostolic Office in his perfect divine plan. From Chrysostom's general teaching we know that to God the Father particularly belongs "the origination" (ἡ ἀρχή), "the purpose" (ἡ πρόθεσις), "the will" (ἡ βουλή) and "the first intention" (ἡ πρώτη ὀρμή), while to the Son belongs "the fulfilment through the works" (ἡ διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐκπλήρωσις)⁴¹. Therefore what the Son accomplished through the calling and mission of the apostles, already existed in the will of God the Father when he created "the Church of the first-born" (Heb. 12:23). And as is shown in the revelation in Christ that followed, the Apostolic Office was designed to perform a particular role in the Church when the latter was about to be revealed as a historic reality. All this means, then, that the Apostolic Office and the Church were created simultaneously. What happened with the Apostolic Office can be compared to what happens with the human body, where all functional systems are present from the beginning, even though some of them are utilised only later on. The Apostolic Office had always been present in the body of the Church but its function became clear in a particular phase of the evolution of the Church. Thus the chrysostomic image of the Church as a body may be said to include the Apostolic Office as its nervous system, as it were or as equipment of this body which had a special mission only at

³⁸ See *GEN*, 3,4, PG 53,36 and Origen, "Apostolorum maximus, qui sciret multas esse non solum in terris, sed et in coelis ecclesias, ex quibus et septem quasdam Johannes enumerat, ipse tamen Paulus ostendere volens quandam praeterea etiam primitivorum ecclesiam dicit ad Hebraeos scribens: 'Non enim accessitis ad ardentem et tractibilem ignem, sed accessitis ad montem Sion, et civitatem Dei viventis Jerusalem coelestem, et multitudinem angelorum collaudantium, et Ecclesiam primitivorum ascriptam in coelis'" (*In Numeri*, 3,3, PG 12,596): cf. *In Canticum Canticorum*, 2, PG 13,134.

³⁹ "Share the suffering for the gospel in the power of God who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not in virtue of our deeds but in virtue of his own purpose and the grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus ages ago" (2Tim 1:8-9). This means that all these were before the ages prefigured in Christ to happen. It is not without importance [God] willing [these] from the beginning" (*2TIM*, 2,1, PG 62,608).

⁴⁰ *GEN*, 3,4, PG 53,36.

⁴¹ *EPH*, 1,4, PG 62,15. Cf. also, "For the Father 'fore-ordained', but Christ in His own blood wrought the whole aright" (*ROM*, 7,2, PG 60,444).

the commencement of its last period⁴². This is clear in the second period, which extends from the fall of man to the inhomination of the Son of God, i.e. in the prophetic period in which Chrysostom points out on the basis of relevant texts from the Old Testament, the Apostolic Office and its emergence were prophesied. In a number of such texts the Apostolic Office is related to the Old Testament prophecies and predictions of the Church.

Dealing with the story of Rahab, Chrysostome discovers in the face of that Moabite woman the Church as it appears after the fall: "Rahab is an image of the Church who was muddled at that time with the prostitution of demons, and who accepts now the spies of Christ, not those of Joshua son of Nun, but the apostles, who were sent by Jesus the true Saviour"⁴³. Particularly important here is the point that the apostles are not only prefigured in the persons of the spies of Joshua of Nun but are directly connected with Jesus Christ, the Son of God as the real Saviour. This point particularly stresses the redeeming work which the apostles were to exercise by means of their office. In this way not only is the relationship between the Apostolic Office and the Church indicated, but also its specific relation to Jesus Christ and His redeeming work through the Church is stressed.

Another such text is the well known statement of the book of Proverbs, "Wisdom has built her house, she has hewn out her seven pillars" (9:1). Chrysostom notes: "He calls the Church house and the apostles pillars... The Church is the house of wisdom; pillars those who are thought to be pillars"⁴⁴. Here Church and apostles are brought together in the powerful imagery of house and pillars in a way which reminiscent of St. Paul's words about the leading apostles (Gal. 2:9) and about the Church as a building (1Cor. 3:9-17; Eph. 2:20-21).

Another such text is that of Zechariah's prophecy of Christ's entry into Jerusalem (Zach. 9:9) which again brings together Church and apostles: "For here the Church is signified by the colt, and the new people, which was unclean, but which, after Jesus sat on them, became clean. And see the image preserved throughout. I

⁴² F. X. Durrwell, (*The mystery of Christ and the apostolate*, 1974) dedicates a special chapter to this topic under the title, "Creation and the apostolate", but he chiefly refers to the relationship between the Apostolic Office and Jesus Christ as Creator.

⁴³ *In Solomonis Proverbia*, 9, PG 64,680.

⁴⁴ The interpretation of the "pillars" as prefiguration of the apostles can also be found in Eusebius of Caesarea: "But for their waste, I, he says, have founded her pillars (Ps. 74[75]:3). Who would you recall here but the sacred apostles and all the disciples and evangelists of the Saviour?" (*Commentaria in Psalmos*, 9, PG 23,869).

mean that the disciples loose the asses. For, by the apostles, both they and we were called; by the apostles were we brought near"⁴⁵. Chrysostom stresses here the sovereignty and kingdom of Christ through the Church, which is completely different from the secular one since it is based on Christ's sacrifice whereby he first cleanses and then guides his people. In this process sees the apostles as playing the role of 'those who offer access' (τῶν προσαγόντων) to the Lord king and to his Church (Rom. 5:2; Eph. 3:12).

When again Chrysostom interprets the apostolic words from the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, "for I betrothed you to a man as a pure virgin" (11:2), he stresses the relation of Paul -and, in general, of each apostle- to the Church in terms of bride-escort (νυμφαγωγός) and the bride herself: "But let us see what he [Paul] brought and espoused us with, what kind of nuptial gifts. Not gold, not silver, but the kingdom of heaven. Therefore he also said, 'We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ' (2Cor. 5:20), and beseeches them, when he was about to receive the bride"⁴⁶. Then he refers to the prefiguration of this event, which he discovers in the mission of Abraham's servant who was appointed as bride-escort of the patriarch's son, Isaac (Gen. 24): "What happened in Abraham's case was a type of this. For he sent his faithful servant to seek a Gentile maiden in marriage; and in this case God sent his own servants to seek the Church in marriage for his Son"⁴⁷. In this prefiguration Chrysostom on the one hand relates the Apostolic Office to the classic image of the Church as a bride, while on the other hand he stresses its divine origin as well as the loyalty of its bearers. It should be noted here that the prefiguration referring to the wedding underlines the relation between the Apostolic Office and the eschatological reality of the Church. In this relationship the apostles function as bride-escorts employed by God to bring the bride Church to the Bridegroom Christ. Thus, their office is prefigured as ministry of this bride-escorting.

In general, it can be said that according to Chrysostom, the Apostolic Office is born together with the Church and grows with it as a necessary ministry of it until the parousia of the Son of God and the descent of the Holy Spirit, in which case it starts to accomplish its special mission. It should be stressed here that, as every

⁴⁵ MAT. 66,2, PG 58,628.

⁴⁶ 2COR, 23,1, PG 61,554.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

great and particularly important event of the divine economy is prepared, according to Chrysostom, by God through a long preparatory period⁴⁸, so also must be the case with the Apostolic Office. God prepares the ground for a long period, so that the role of this office is accepted after his inhomination and, more particularly, after Pentecost.

2.3. The Apostolic Office in the historic period of the Church following the incarnation

The relation between the Apostolic Office and the Church is fully expounded by Chrysostom in the context of the period following the incarnation. In that period the presence of the apostles is richly presented in the Scriptures, from which Chrysostom chiefly derives his relevant teaching. For a more effective consolidation of this teaching, Chrysostom mainly uses in addition to a multitude of other images⁴⁹, the images of a building and a human body, both of which will be examined below because they elucidate the topic of our research.

2.3.1 The Church as a building and the Apostolic Office

House (οἰκία), building (οἰκοδομή) and builders (οἰκοδόμοι) are favourite images for Chrysostom; he borrows them from Paul, who calls himself "a wise master-builder" (ἀρχιτέκτονα) (1Cor. 3:10), in order to expound his teaching about the Church and the position and function of the Apostolic Office in it.

For Chrysostom "the Church is nothing else than a house (οἰκία) built of our souls. But this house is not of equal honour throughout, but of the stones which constitute it, some are bright and shining, whilst others are smaller and more dull than they, and yet superior again to others. Thus we may see many who stand out as gold, the gold which adorns the ceiling. Again we may see others, who offer the charm and gracefulness produced by statues; or we may see many standing like pillars. For he is accustomed to calling men pillars too (Gal. 2:9), not only on

⁴⁸ "For, when God is about to do openly some great things, He announces them of a long time before, to practise men's hearing for the reception of them when they come" (*ROM*, 1.2, PG 60,397).

⁴⁹ "See, therefore, that the Church, as I said, now is a bride, now a daughter, now a virgin, now a servant, now a queen, now a sterile woman, now a mountain, now a paradise, now a woman having many children, now a lily, now a source; She is everything" (*In Eutropium*, PG 52.403). Cf., G. G. Christofis,, *The Church's identity established through images according to St. John Chrysostom*, 1990.

account of their strength, but also on account of their gracefulness, adding as they do, much charm, and having their heads overlaid with gold. Likewise we may see a multitude, forming by and large the space and the vast circumference of the enclosures; for the large multitude occupies the place of those stones which make up the outer walls"⁵⁰.

It is important to note that, for Chrysostom, the Church as house consists both of Jesus Christ⁵¹, as foundation and of believers, as a multifarious crowd, who are placed in it according to their commission and merit⁵². It is certain that the apostles are the pillars of the house (Gal. 2,9) and Chrysostom exalts not only their position and contribution to the edifice of the Church "on account of their strength" but also their merit "on account of their gracefulness through which they add much charm". Chrysostom's description here is reminiscent of his interpretation of the book of Proverbs⁵³.

When we turn to Chrysostom's interpretation of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, we find that he is more specifically concerned with the relation of the Church as a building to the Apostolic Office. He writes: "Having built, says he, upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets (Eph. 2:20); that is, the apostles and the prophets are foundation stones (θεμέλιοι)... Then he adds, 'Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone' (λίθος ἀκρογωνιαίος); Thereby making clear that Christ is the one who binds the whole together. For the chief cornerstone binds together both the walls and the foundation stones. 'In whom the whole building (οἰκοδομή [consists])'. See, how he knits it all together, and how sometimes he represents at one time, as upholding and welding together the whole body from above as head and at other times, as supporting the edifice from below, as a root. And as regards his statement, 'He built in himself [of the two] one new man' (Eph. 2:15), he showed by this that it was by himself that Christ conjoined both walls and again, that it was in him that they were built. 'He is the first-born', he says, 'of all creation' (Col. 1:15), that is, He himself supports all things. 'In whom the whole

⁵⁰ *EPH*, 10,2, PG 62,78.

⁵¹ "Thus, he elsewhere calls Him a foundation. 'For other foundation', says he, 'can no man lay than that which is Jesus Christ' (1Cor 3:11). 'In Whom each several building', he says, 'fitly framed together'. Here he displays the perfection of it, and indicates that one otherwise have placed in it" (*EPH*, 6,1, PG 62,44).

⁵² "For as in a house, each one is set apart for divers works; thus also in the Church, there be divers distributions of ministrations" (*ROM*, 1,1, PG 60,396).

⁵³ See above, footnote 43.

edifice is fitly framed together'; whether you speak of the roof, or of the walls, or of any other part whatsoever, it is that supports the whole. Indeed elsewhere he calls him a foundation. 'For no other foundation', he says, 'can any man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ (1Cor. 3:11)⁵⁴.

Here, I think that, above all, Chrysostom clarifies the theme of the apostles as "the foundation stones" of the Church which constitute along with the prophets the foundation stones of the Church in its historical dimension. Yet the apostles, apart from being the 'foundation stones, are also considered to be 'walls' (τοιχοι) and 'pillars' (στύλοι), i.e. two of the most essential parts of the edifice of the Church. In addition, they are considered as "builders" as is elsewhere shown (1Cor. 3:10-15). This, of course, does not mean that they are founders or principal and substantial supporters of the Church as Christ is. This privilege belongs to the inhominate Son of God, who "holds together the walls and the foundations" (καὶ τοὺς τοίχους συνέχει καὶ τοὺς θεμελίους) and is "the foundation of all foundations" (ὁ θεμέλιος πάντων τῶν θεμελιῶν)⁵⁵. Nevertheless the position and function of the apostles in the Church is most important next to that in Christ. Chrysostom points out elsewhere: "For not only the apostolic hands have founded it [the Church]"⁵⁶. It is clear, then, that although the apostles as human beings constitute building material of the Church, just like all other members, at the same time, as bearers of the Apostolic Office, they have been placed in extremely vital positions for constructing and maintaining the building of the Church; they are "foundation stones", "walls" and "pillars" upholding both the structure and function of the Church. Chrysostom explains all this further in a very important text which deserves to be fully cited and carefully analysed:

"Since the building is so much unshakeable and the wall so much unbroken, let us see how the apostles put the foundations, how much they dug in depth so that the building becomes unshakeable. They did not dig in depth, they did not overwork. Why? Because they found an old and ancient foundation, that of the prophets. For, the man who is going to build a big house (οἰκίαν μεγίστην), if he

⁵⁴ *EPH*, 6,1, PG 62,43-44.

⁵⁵ *In Isaiam* (ed., Dumortier, J.), 28,16. Cf. *MAT*, 54,2, PG 58,534; 52,3, PG 58,741; *GAL*, 4,1, PG 61,611. Cf. also A. Yieftic's opinion: "The Church, being founded upon the unique foundation, Jesus Christ, is characteristic of Paul's ecclesiology. This gives Chrysostom and most Fathers of the Church the secret code so that they comprehend and interpret correctly the Lord's words in Mat 16:16-18" (*Ἡ ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου...*, p. 88).

⁵⁶ *PRINC*, 2,1, PG 51,77.

finds an old and safe and unbroken foundation, he does not stir up the foundation, nor does he move the stones, but, leaving it immovable, he then puts the new and more recent building (οἰκοδομή) on it; So the apostles did, when they were going to build this great edifice (οἰκοδόμημα), that is the Church, which is established all over the world. They did not dig in depth, but, since they found an old foundation, that of the prophets, they did not disturb it, did not move the building and the teaching, but leaving it immovable, added their teaching onto it, this new faith of the Church. Indeed, in order to know that they did not move the old foundation, but they built on it, hear the wise master-builder, Paul himself, telling us about the exact nature of the building; for he is the wise master builder. 'As a wise master builder I have laid the foundation' (1Cor. 3:10). But let us see how he put that foundation. Above another old foundation, he says, that of the prophets. Whence is this evident? 'You are no longer strangers', he says, 'but fellow citizens with the saints built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets' (Eph. 2:19-20). You saw the one foundation and the other, the one of the prophets and the other of the apostles which is laid above; and what is marvellous, the apostles did not come immediately after the prophets, but much time elapsed since then. Why is this so? Because the best builders do so; once they have placed the foundation they do not immediately put the building on it, so that the work of the foundation, which is softer and more recent, may not be weakened by the weight of the walls. For this purpose, after leaving the stones for many years in order to become fast, when they see them firm, then they add the weight of the walls on them. So did Christ; after leaving the foundation of the prophets become fast in the souls of the hearers, and the teaching become firm, when he saw that the building was unshakeable and that the holy precepts were fixed, so that they may bear the new teaching, then he sent the apostles in order to raise up the walls of the Church on the foundation of the prophets. For this purpose he did not say, 'having been built (οἰκοδομηθέντες) the foundation of the prophets', but 'built upon' (ἐποικοδομηθέντες), which means, built on top [of other foundations]"⁵⁷.

The first thing to be observed here on the basis of this text is that Chrysostom considers the bearers of the Apostolic Office not only as foundation stones in the building of the Church, but also as builders who lay the real foundation for the

⁵⁷ *PRINC.* 2.2, PG 51,79-80.

Church's construction. According to St. Paul's testimony (1Cor. 3:11) the real foundation is only Jesus Christ himself. It is important to note that the real foundation, Jesus Christ, is expressed through the apostolic teaching as the "new faith of the Church". This means that the Apostolic Office as ministry of evangelic preaching is necessary for people to know the one foundation of the Church, Jesus Christ.

The second point to be stressed is that the apostles do not commence the building of the Church in its historical revelation from nothing, but use the foundation of the prophets. As a matter of fact, the teaching of the prophets, which has much in common with the teaching of the apostles, serves in a different way the same purpose of the Revelation in Christ. As already mentioned, the centre of the apostolic preaching as well as of the prophetic is, according to Chrysostom, the person and the work of Jesus Christ related inextricably to each other⁵⁸. Thus, upon the inhominate Son of God, the real foundation and corner stone, the prophets build the Church confined to old Israel, while the apostles, based upon the same foundation, erect the Church which is "all over the world"⁵⁹.

Now it can be clearly seen that the bearers of the Apostolic Office are not the only builders of the building of the Church since they continue the building work of the prophets. Of course, it goes without saying that the apostles are not all alone the founders of the Church, since its founder and landlord is God himself. Chrysostom lays special emphasis on this truth when he interprets Paul's words "you are God's building" (1Cor. 3:9): "Now if you are God's husbandry, it is right that you should be called not from those who cultivate you, but from God. For the field is not called the husbandman's field, but the householder's, 'You are God's building'. Again the building does not belong to the workman, but to the master"⁶⁰.

On the basis of the general image of the building and especially from the emphasis the Church father lays on its basic parts (foundations, walls, pillars), we can conclude that Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office, on the one hand, as the structural framework of the building of the Church based on the firm foundation of the God-man Lord Jesus Christ, and on the other hand, he sees it as a ministry which contributes to the formation of the building. This truth is especially stressed

⁵⁸ See, "I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1Cor 2:2). Cf. *ICOR*, 6,1, PG 61,48.

⁵⁹ *PRINC*, 2,2, PG 51,79-80.

⁶⁰ *ICOR*, 8,3, PG 61,72.

with the bearers of the Apostolic Office being compared to farmers, builders, architects and technicians.

These conclusions are reinforced through Chrysostom's interpretation of Paul's self-characterization "as a wise master-builder" (1Cor. 3:10). Chrysostom stresses the fact that the bearer of the Apostolic Office as the architect of the building of the Church is chiefly responsible "for laying the one foundation", namely Jesus Christ⁶¹. Apart from that and next, the apostle contributes to the building of all believers upon the one foundation. In other words, the bearers of the Apostolic Office minister the congregation of the believers as well as themselves within the building of the Church. "For both the artificer and the learner contribute to building, therefore he says 'Let every man take care how he builds' (1Cor. 3:10)"⁶².

Finally, if we perceive the Church building as a temple⁶³ within which the Holy Trinity⁶⁴ resides and Jesus Christ is the "initiator" (ὁ μυσταγωγῶν)⁶⁵, we can consider the Apostolic Office, according to Chrysostom, even as ministry to Christ's mystagogy, which is nothing else than offering access to God the Father⁶⁶.

It can be observed that in the whole presentation and interpretation of the image of the building by Chrysostom the double nature of the bearers of the Apostolic Office is particularly stressed; on the one hand it is the human factor, since the apostles themselves need to be built up, and on the other hand the divine factor, since they minister the building up to the other members being authorised to do so by the Landlord God. This conception and interpretation of the position of the bearers of the Apostolic Office within the body of the Church is a paradoxical one, because logically one cannot be the foundation stone or pillar of a building and at the same time its builder. It should be noted that here there is a

⁶¹ 1COR, 8,3, PG 61,72. Cf. also Oecumenius, "This is the trait of a wise builder to lay this foundation, that is Christ" (*Commentarium in epistulam ad i Corinthios*, 3,10, PG 118,673).

⁶² 1COR, 9,2, PG 61,18.

⁶³ "It grows, he says, into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also, he adds, are built together. He is speaking continuously 'into a holy temple for a habitation of God in the Spirit'. What then is the object of that building? It is that God may dwell in this temple. For each of you severally is a temple, and all of you as in the body of Christ, and as in a spiritual temple" (*EPH*, 6,1, PG 62,44).

⁶⁴ See, 1Cor 3:16--17; 6:19; 2Cor 6:16; *Ad Theodorum lapsus*, 1,1, PG 47,277-278; *MAT*, 73,3, PG 58,676. Cf. Ignatius: "You are stones of the Father's temple, prepared for the building of God the Father and lifted up to the heights by the machine of Jesus Christ, which is the Cross, using as rope the Holy Spirit" (*Ad Ephesios*, 9,1).

⁶⁵ *PAENIT*, 8,1, PG 49,336 ("The snake is not here plotting, but Christ initiating"). Cf., also, *De prodicione Judae*, 1,6, PG 49,380; 1COR, 8,1, PG 61,69; *JOHN*, 82,4, PG 59,472.

⁶⁶ Eph. 2,18; *EPH*, 6,1, PG 62,44 ("He did not say 'approach', but 'access', for we did not come on our own, but we were offered access by Him").

similarity between the bearers of the Apostolic Office and Jesus Christ, the foundation and builder of his Church⁶⁷. I think that with the paradox mentioned above the transcendental dimension of the Church, as well as of the Apostolic Office, is clearly stressed.

2.3.2 *The growth of the Church's body and the Apostolic Office*

The Church as a building, or as "the house of God the Father"⁶⁸, as Chrysostom calls it, is not just a stone building, but a living organism chiefly characterized by "growth"⁶⁹. This truth is made clearer by Chrysostom by means of the image of the human body since "the force of this metaphor is great"⁷⁰. In it, growth is a sign of its vitality and strength. It is known from the physiology of the human body that there is a series of organic functions, which contribute to this process of growth. This is also the case with the members of the body of the Church. That is why each member in it has his/her own certain position according to his/her mission (1Cor. 12:18-24). Chrysostom stresses this truth both in relation to the image of the body and with the image of the building, with which we have already dealt. "For the body must not be put together anyhow, but with exceeding art and nicety, since if it gets out of place, it is no longer. So that each must not only be united to the body, but also occupy his proper place, since if you shall go beyond this, you are not united to it, neither do you receive the Spirit"⁷¹ and "just as in a house each one is assigned to a work, so in the Church the assignment of services varies"⁷². The One who places each member in "his own place" and authorises him with a certain mission and arranges his particular ministry is Jesus Christ, the head of the Body⁷³.

⁶⁷ See, Mat 16:18; 1Cor 3:11. Cf. *MAT*, 54,2, PG 58,534; *ICOR*, 8,3-4, PG 61,71-73.

⁶⁸ *ROM*, 10,5, PG 60,481. Cf. *EPH*, 10,2, PG 62,77.

⁶⁹ Eph 3:19; 4:13; Col 2:19. Cf., "The building of Christ's body has a dynamic character, which means that the growth of this living organism does not stop, but goes on and lasts "till we all come ... unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of the times" (A. Yefic, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου...*, p. 196).

⁷⁰ *ROM*, 21,1, PG 60,601. Cf., "But among all these different images the one of the Body is the most inclusive and impressive, the most lively expression of the basic vision. Of course, no analogy should be excessively stressed. The image of an organism, when used for the Church, has its limits" (G. Florovsky, *Ἁγία Γραφή, Ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p.92).

⁷¹ *EPH*, 11,4, PG 62,84.

⁷² *ROM*, 1,1, PG 60,396. Cf. also, "As in a building, all stones do not hold the same position, but one is fit for a corner but not for the foundations, another is fit for the foundations and not for a corner; so it happens in the body of the Church; one can see the same in our body as well" (*GAL*, 6,1, PG 61,674-675).

⁷³ Eph 1:22; 5:23; Col 1:18.

It is He that distributes the gifts to the members of the Church through the Holy Spirit, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Eph. 4:12). Initially the apostles and after them the pastors ordained by them receive the "sacred authority which the grace of the Holy Spirit put into their hands"⁷⁴ and "without which is impossible for us to gain the salvation or promised goods"⁷⁵. As Yieftic notes, "the apostles-bishops-presbyters-deacons, just because they have a special mission as 'servants of God', perform a more difficult task within the body, and that is why God 'exhibited them as last of all' and they are everybody's 'servants' through Jesus and serve 'with unfeigned love' the 'ministry of reconciliation' and the 'word of reconciliation'. Therefore they are indispensable as preachers of the Gospel of salvation and 'ministers of the New Testament' and 'ambassadors for Christ' appointed by Christ to build his body with diligence and self-sacrifice. That is why as long as the building up lasts they are indispensable. That is why God entrusted them with greater authority, as Chrysostom says, 'the Saviour gives to the apostles the authority he has'⁷⁶, in other words, He made them his own colleagues as 'God's servants' doing everything by himself and using them as his instruments"⁷⁷.

The hierarchy as regards the members of the body of the Church is considered to be a necessary presupposition for its regular function, preservation and growth⁷⁸. That is why God gave the Church "some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4:11)⁷⁹. But under no circumstances are any members with authority and special mission for the function of the Body superior and substantially different from the other members, since the authority they exercise is neither theirs nor parallel to the authority of the Head⁸⁰. Chrysostom emphatically stresses the point that "it is not men that govern

⁷⁴ *PHILOG*, 2, PG 48,751.

⁷⁵ *SACERD*, 3,5-6, PG 48,643-644.

⁷⁶ *In Ascensionem Domini nostri...*, 4, PG 52,777.

⁷⁷ A. Yieftic, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου...*, p. 116.

⁷⁸ "In the same way as the spirit which descends from the brain, communicates sensitivity through nerves not simply to all members, but proportionally to each one of them, more to that which is capable of receiving more, or less to that which is capable of receiving less (for the spirit is the root), so Christ; since the souls of human beings are depended upon Him as members, His provident care and supply of spiritual gifts effects the increase of each member proportionally and with measure" (*EPH*, 11,3, PG 62,84).

⁷⁹ Cf. *EPH*, 11,2, PG 62,82.

⁸⁰ Cf. J. Zizioulas, "The existing ministries are copies and secret radiation of Christ's authority, who is the only pre-eminent minister" (*Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας...*, p. 49).

his Churches, but He himself shepherds those who believe in him all over the world"⁸¹.

Referring to the image of the body, when he interprets the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, Chrysostom observes "For as there are in the body such recipient organs, as we have seen, so is it also with the Spirit, the whole root or source being from above. For example, the heart is the recipient of breath, the liver of the blood, the spleen of the bile and the other organs, some of the one thing, others of another, but all these have their source from the brain. So also has God done, highly honouring man and being unwilling to be far from him, he has made himself indeed the source of his dependence and has constituted them fellow-workers with himself; and He has appointed some to one office and some to another. For example, the apostle is the most vital vessel of the whole body, receiving everything from Him; so that he made eternal life to run through them to all, as through veins and arteries, I mean through their discourse"⁸².

The analogy drawn in the above text between the position of the apostles in the body of the Church and the position of the "most vital vessels" in the human body helps us considerably to understand how Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office in relation to the Church. In his viewpoint, just as the various organs are parts of the body, so the apostles are members of the body of the Church; the same applies to all believers⁸³. Again, just as the organs of the body have a special position according to their function, so the apostles are the most vital parts⁸⁴. It means that the

⁸¹ *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, 4, PG 50,592. Cf., also, *2TIM*, 2,4, PG 62,612 and especially "For having asked 'Who is Paul, and who is Apollos,' he said 'Nothing else but ministers through whom you believed' (1Cor 3:5). Now this is in itself a great thing that deserves of great rewards, although in regard of the archetype and the root of all good it is nothing. For the benefactor is not the one who ministers good things, but the one who provides and offers them" (*ICOR*, 8,2, PG 61,70-71).

⁸² *EPH*, 11,4, PG 62,85.

⁸³ E. Michaud (*op. cit.*, p. 495) interprets the relations between the parts of the body, to which Chrysostom refers, as relations of local Churches. The bishop of Helioupolis Gennadius gives a well argued response to this position (*op. cit.*, p. 244).

⁸⁴ "The body is composed of members both honorable and dishonorable. Only the greater is not to rise up even against the meanest, nor this latter to envy the other. They do not all indeed contribute the same share, but severally according to the proportion of need. And for as much as all are formed for necessary and for different purposes, all are of equal honor. Some indeed there are, which are more especially principal members, others less so" (*EPH*, 10,1, PG 62,75). Cf. Eusebius of Caesarea "If the Church is the body of the Christ himself, according to the Apostle, who taught saying, 'You are the body of Christ and members of a part of it' (1Cor 12:27), you would say that the most necessary members of the body, namely the senses, are the men who are necessary for people; for example, the rulers are the head, the teachers the mouth, the prudent audience the ears, those who are keen at Scriptures the eyes, the more practical the hands and the rest of a body's members are something else accordingly" (*Commentaria in Psalmos*, 68, 4-5, PG

Apostolic Office has an important position and mission for the function of the body of the Church. Furthermore, it can be observed that the apostles themselves as members of the body of the Church are served by the function of their office, just as all the other members are. The image of the body shows exactly the same as the image of the building where the bearers of the Apostolic Office are building and at the same time are being built.

It should be noted here that the contemporary consideration of the Apostolic Office, either as being above the Church⁸⁵ or submitted to it⁸⁶, is not to be found in Chrysostom's teaching. One can only reach such a conclusion if one approaches the Church, as well as the Apostolic Office, using as models the secular organisations and their hierarchy. Here there is a mechanical, a legal relationship between the hierarchy and the other members, which leans towards the predominance and prevalence of one of the two sides. Compatibility between equality and hierarchical differentiation is rather unlikely. In contrast with this perspective, Chrysostom with the image of the body and its nervous and circulatory systems places the relations between the Church and the Apostolic Office on an organic basis. When we have a living body we cannot speak of its functional systems as being either outside or above of it⁸⁷. We can only conceive them as placed in it organically and

23,732).

⁸⁵ Cf. W. Patrick, "The Christian Church rests on the Apostles, for the Church is their creation. But they, in turn, were the creation of Jesus" ("Apostles", *Dictionary of the Christ and the Gospels*, ed. J. Hastings, 1,110; M. L. Held, "The Apostles do not receive their commission from Church (Gal. 1:1), and therefore they are above Church and not subject to its tribunal (1Cor 4:3)" ("Apostle", *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, 1,680-681).

⁸⁶ E. Michaud, (*op. cit.*, p. 501) argues that, according to Chrysostom, "the Church is above the apostles. *Propter Ecclesiam prophetae, propter Ecclesiam apostoli* (PENT, 1)". Yet, clearly the conjunction designates the purpose of the work and not the position of the prophets and apostles in relation to the body of the Church. W. Schmithals, (*The office of Apostle...*, p. 22), attempting to stress the apostles' equality to the other members of the body of the Church, abolishes in effect any kind of discrimination between the members of one and the same body. He writes "The office of the apostle does not bestow the bearer any kind of spiritual quality, which elevates him above the congregation; he is and remains a member of this congregation... The special commission and the special authority, which the apostles receive are functions on the congregation; for God set ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ first apostles, second prophets, third teachers (1Cor. 12:28)". Undoubtedly, for the writer of the text the adjectives *first*, *second* etc do not have any special significance, as they do for Chrysostom (see, *ICOR*, 32,1, PG 61,264-265. Also, "Do learn that all the supplies of the other gifts are stored up in the Apostleship, just as they are in the head" (*PRINC*, 3,4, PG 51,93).

⁸⁷ "There is no ministry in the Church which can be conceived outside or above the community. If the Church is basically a community, all ministry exists in order to serve the community and, what is more important, it exists in order to make up this community to compose the structure. It is this that makes the ministry indispensable for the community since it is its very structure, and at the same time part of the community and not something outside or above it" (J. Zizioulas, "The ecclesiology of the orthodox tradition", *Search* 7 (1984) 46).

as its complement⁸⁸. On the other hand, we cannot, in the name of equality, level down all members of the Church's body, since, if we do so, it will not be a body anymore but a simulacrum of a body made from mince!

In conclusion it may be said that on the basis of the image of the body, the Apostolic Office is, according to St. Chrysostom, the nervous system of the Church's body. In this way there are stressed both its dependence upon God-man and, through him, upon the whole Holy Trinity, and its necessary and redeeming work in the body of the Church. Thus, the mysterious connection between the divine and the human factor is clearly shown.

2.4. The Apostolic Office as is shown in the worshipping congregation

Very early in our study and investigation we found out that Chrysostom uses in his speeches the bearers of the Apostolic Office alongside other rational creatures of God in a series of interesting patterns. In them there are included the angels and other prominent human members of the Church of all the ages. It is worth mentioning that these patterns are usually referred to in connection to the worshipping and Eucharistic gathering of the Church⁸⁹. Thus Chrysostom points out that "how much is the profit of the gathering when prophets cry from every side, when apostles evangelise, when Christ stands in the middle, when the Father accepts the facts, when the Holy Spirit gives his own jubilation"⁹⁰. He also stresses the point that "no less than prophets and apostles and patriarchs and all righteous men do we set over you as teachers in every assembly"⁹¹. Elsewhere he reproaches the ones who, before coming to the Church's gathering have been to the theatre. "How, therefore, do you dare to come back to the assembly of apostles, after having

⁸⁸ "All are needed so that a body is complete. A head is implemented and a body becomes perfect, when we all are joined together and united" (*EPH*, 3,2, PG 62,26). Cf., "Body and fullness are two terms closely related to one another in the thought of St. Paul, and in fact the one explains the other" (Florovsky, G., *Άγία Γραφή, Έκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p. 87).

⁸⁹ Chrysostom's special interest in the teaching about divine Eucharist is well-known, being spread over his homilies, so that he is justifiably called "Doctor eucharistiae" (A. Nagele, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus des Doctor Eucharistiae*, 1900). See also, E. MICHAUD, as above, p. 492 "In many texts Chrysostom considers the word Έκκλησία synonymous to the place of gathering for praying, liturgy and preaching (*In Illud, Vidi Dominum*, 1,1)".

⁹⁰ *In illud, Paulus vocatus...* 4,1, PG 51,145.

⁹¹ *MAT*, 11,7, PG 57,200. Here, Eerdman's translation is not accurate, because Chrysostom using the term "Έκκλησία" (assembly) means the eucharistic gathering.

danced with demons?"⁹², In an other case he insists: "In this assembly we are not alone; there are prophets and apostles... and so many fathers ... among us"⁹³.

Investigating the Chrysostomic texts carefully , we found a series of patterns used by Chrysostom in his speeches; the apostles are included in all of them. They are as follows:

1. Prophets, Apostles⁹⁴.
2. Prophets, Apostles, Jesus Christ, Father, Holy Spirit⁹⁵.
3. Prophets, Apostles, Patriarchs, Righteous Men⁹⁶.
4. Prophets, Apostles, Righteous Men, Angels, the Only Begotten Son⁹⁷.
5. Prophets, Apostles, the Fathers, the Despot (ὁ Δεσπότης)⁹⁸.
6. Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, All Saints⁹⁹.
7. Angels, Archangels, Prophets, Martyrs, Apostles, Righteous Men, the King Lord¹⁰⁰.

Summing up all the above Chrysostomic patterns we are led to a general one as follows:

The Father, the Only Begotten Son (or Despot -Master-, or King Lord, or Jesus Christ), the Holy Spirit, Archangels, Angels, Patriarchs, Righteous, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Fathers, All saints.

This pattern, a similar one to which is used in the Holy Liturgy of Chrysostom in the sanctification of the Holy Gifts¹⁰¹, is, I think, one of the clearest images of the Church as the body of Christ, while at the same time it shows us the position of

⁹² *Adversus Judaeos*, 2,3, PG 48,861.

⁹³ *GEN*, 6,1, PG 54,605.

⁹⁴ *De verbis Apostoli*, *Habentes eudem spiritum*, 3,2, PG 51,285, 291; *EPH*, 6,1-2, PG 62,43-45.

⁹⁵ *In illud, Paulus vocatus*..., 4,1, PG 51,145.

⁹⁶ "For no less than prophets and apostles and patriarchs and all righteous men are by us set over you as teachers in every assembly" (*MAT*, 11,6, PG 57,200).

⁹⁷ "Consider, why prophets, why righteous men, why angels, were sent, why the only begotten son of God came; Not to save people? Not to bring back those who are misled?" (*Adversus Judaeos*, 8,9, PG 48,941).

⁹⁸ "For as I see the gatherings decreasing, the prophets being insulted, the apostles being overlooked, the fathers being despised, the insult going over to the Lord through servants, I want to charge...." (*De Anna*, 4,1, PG 54,660).

⁹⁹ "For the kingdom of Heaven and the eternal tabernacles and the choirs of the patriarchs prophets and apostles and the party of all the saints will welcome him [Abel] that he may reign the king Jesus Christ the Only Begotten Son of God for endless ages" (*GEN*, 19,6, PG 53,165).

¹⁰⁰ *PHILOG*, 1, PG 48,749-750.

¹⁰¹ See Chrysostom's *Liturgy*, "Again we offer unto Thee this reasonable worship for all those who have fallen asleep in the faith, for fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, ascetics, and every righteous spirit made perfect in faith" (E. E. Brightman, *op. cit.*, p.386; P. Trempelas, *op. cit.*, p.109). Cf., also, *1COR*, 41,5, PG 61,361.

Apostolic Office in the Revelation in Christ, always in connection to the Church. The fact that the angels are also included in the patterns mentioned above is one more indication that the Church was created before the world, as rightly observed by bishop Dionysius¹⁰². The permanent and firm position of Jesus Christ shows that he constitutes the only Head of the body of the Church. The prophets are the first foundation of the ecclesiastical building and God's first collaborators in its construction. The apostles, who alongside the prophets are never left out of these Chrysostomic patterns, perform a very important role in the course followed by the revealed Church in the world, as "walls" or as "the most vital vessels" of her body, but also as her technicians led by the Lord himself, so that the Church remains known as "apostolic"¹⁰³. Finally the Fathers and all the Saints are the ripe fruit of the working of the Holy Spirit within the area of the Church, where they serve as God's friends¹⁰⁴.

The fact that Chrysostom connects the above patterns referring to the structure of the Church with the worshipping and Eucharistic gathering shows that he sees the nature of the Church revealed in the sacrament of Eucharist¹⁰⁵. And as he characteristically notes, "He [Jesus Christ] has made us his own body, He has imparted to us his own Body"¹⁰⁶. And elsewhere, "for as that body is united to Christ, so also are we united to him by this bread... For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do they become who partake of it? The Body of Christ: not many bodies, but one body"¹⁰⁷.

The "one body of Christ", according to Chrysostom's definition cited above, is the Church¹⁰⁸. Chrysostom places within this body as participants in the sacrament of the Eucharist not only the present living ones, but also all the pre-existing believers and saints. Of them, he often refers to the prophets, the apostles and the

¹⁰² Dionysius, Metropolitan of Kozani, *Οικοδομή και Παράκλησις* (1969-1970) 380.

¹⁰³ See the sub- chapter, "The Church is apostolic in its structure".

¹⁰⁴ See *GEN*, 24,4, PG 53,211-212; *ITIM*, 14,6, PG 62,578.

¹⁰⁵ "It is deeply rooted in the consciousness of the orthodox that the Church is the place where the Liturgy is celebrated. We could draw a similar conclusion from a careful study of Paul's first Corinthian letter, chapter eleven, where the terms *ecclesia* and 'gathering together for the celebration of the Eucharist' are used synonymously" (J. Zizioulas, "The ecclesiology of the Orthodox Tradition", *Search* 7 (1984) 44).

¹⁰⁶ *EPH*, 3,3, PG 62,27.

¹⁰⁷ *ICOR*, 24,2, PG 61,200.

¹⁰⁸ Origen expresses the same opinion. "The Body of the Christ is not something different from the Church which is his Body" (*Commentarium in evangelium Mathaei*, ed. E. Klostermann, 14,17).

fathers of the Church. Very illuminating for our study is the way in which the Church father commences one of his homilies which refers to the ones who abandoned the gatherings of the Church only to go to the theatre: "I do not know which words I have to use today. For as I see the gathering decreasing the prophets being insulted, the apostles being overlooked, the fathers being disposed of, the insult transferring to the Lord through the servants, I want to charge [those who are responsible], but I do not see those who ought to hear the accusation, being here; instead [I see] you who do not need this exhortation and admonition "¹⁰⁹. What becomes crystal clear in the above text is that Chrysostom not only accepts without a doubt the living presence of the apostles alongside the prophets and fathers in the worshipping gathering, but also regards their being as directly connected both to the Master Christ¹¹⁰ and to each other¹¹¹.

More particularly and as regards the patterns mentioned above, they can be said to express the structure of the Church, which is especially characterized by the presence of the bearers of the Apostolic Office. These, alongside the prophets, constitute the ministers closer to the inhominated Son of God; and they are alone the first witnesses of Christ's appearance after his resurrection (Acts 1:8), but also and at the same time founders of the Church as she is revealed in its last historic period, after Pentecost¹¹². Therefore, the Apostolic Office is not simply a ministry in the Church, but a basic ministry of the Church's body, with which God, who created it, continues the work of the growth of the Church and of the salvation of mankind.

It should be noted here that the same patterns are also used when Chrysostom refers to the eschatological reality of the Church. Thus, when he talks about righteous Abel, he says that "the Kingdom of Heaven and the eternal tabernacles and the choirs of patriarchs, prophets and apostles and the party of all the saints will welcome him [Abel] that he may reign with the King Jesus Christ, the only

¹⁰⁹ *De Anna*, 4,1, PG 54,660.

¹¹⁰ "What is this, 'We have been made partakers of Christ?' We partake of Him (he means); we were made One, we and He- since He is the Head and we the body; 'fellow-heirs and of the same body; we are one body, of His flesh and of His bones' (Eph 3:6 Rom 12:5)" (*HEBR*, 6.2, PG 63,56).

¹¹¹ "Not in vain does he that stands by the altar cry out when the tremendous mysteries are celebrated, 'For all that have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who perform commemorations in their behalf. For if there were no commemorations for them, these things would not have been spoken: since our service is not a mere stage show, god forbid, yea, it is by the ordinance of the Spirit that these things are done'" (*ICOR*, 41,5, PG 61,361).

¹¹² Cf. G. Florovsky, *Ἁγία Γραφή, ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, pp.78-96.

begotten Son of God for endless ages"¹¹³. When Chrysostom praises blessed Philogonius, he refers to the Liturgy in heaven, where the saint will participate from now on. There, he says, in "the Church of the first-born who are registered in heaven... countless angels and thousands of archangels and a company of prophets and choirs of martyrs and brigades of apostles and gathering of righteous and different multitudes of all those who satisfied [God]" praise God incessantly¹¹⁴.

Abel's case is remarkably characteristic, because, when he was murdered, neither the righteous men of the Old Testament, nor the apostles, nor the saints existed historically. Yet, the heavenly Church, which accepted him, was already complete. Clearly here we deal with her eschatological dimension. By the second extract we are readily led to the conclusion that the worshipping and Eucharistic gathering is the prelude of the eternal Liturgy in its eschatological ecclesiastical reality, that is the Kingdom of God¹¹⁵. Since the apostles minister the sacrament of the Eucharist¹¹⁶, this means that their office is ministry of the eschatological ecclesiastical body.

The fact that Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office and its bearers in this eschatological dimension can also be seen in the way he uses the term "the apostles" (οἱ ἀπόστολοι), or "the apostle" (ὁ ἀπόστολος). That is, while he refers to historic events of the Church related to the apostles, he usually refers to them as a whole, sometimes as "the chorus of the apostles" (ὁ χορὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων), or "the apostolic chorus" (ὁ ἀποστολικὸς χορὸς)¹¹⁷, sometimes as "the association of the apostles" (ὁ σύλλογος τῶν ἀποστόλων)¹¹⁸, and most of the times to all of them as "the apostles" (οἱ ἀπόστολοι)¹¹⁹.

Furthermore, referring to certain apostles, such as Paul, Peter, John, Philip, he usually calls them only by their title "the apostle" (ὁ ἀπόστολος)¹²⁰. This means

¹¹³ GEN, 19,6, PG 53,165.

¹¹⁴ PHILOG, 1, PG 48,749-750.

¹¹⁵ J. Zizioulas, "The ecclesiology of the orthodox tradition", *Search* 7 (1984) 45, "The Eucharist is the eschatological event par excellence. In the Eucharist we do not celebrate so much a past event, the Last Supper for example, but the Kingdom to come".

¹¹⁶ 1Cor 11,23.

¹¹⁷ ACTS, 9,1, PG 60,76.

¹¹⁸ *Catechesis ultima ad baptizandos* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus), 175, 6-7.

¹¹⁹ *Adversus Judaeos*, 3,1, PG 48,86; *PRINC.* 2,2, PG 51,79; *MAT.* 24,4, PG 57,325; *ACTS.* 11,1, PG 60,94; *EPH.* 6,1, PG 62,43.

¹²⁰ For Paul: *MAT.* 64,1, PG 58,609; *ICOR.* 7,3, PG 61,58. For Peter *PRINC.* 3,5, PG 51,94; *GEN.* 55,4, PG 54,484; *MAT.* 65,4, PG 58,622. For John: *PSALM.* 46,3, PG 55,212; *JOHN.* 1,1, PG 59,26. For Philip: *GEN.* 35,2, PG 53,323.

that Chrysostom sees the apostles not only as isolated historic persons, but also as a whole, as an apostolic body¹²¹ connected to the Church not only historically, but also eschatologically.

On the grounds of Christ's promise to the apostles, "behold, I am with you always, to the close of age" (Mat. 28:28), Chrysostom explains: "For plainly the apostles were not to remain here unto 'the end of the world', but he speaks to the believers as to one body"¹²². This is while the apostles as historic persons were to leave this world, yet their "apostolic sayings" (ἀποστολικά ρήματα)¹²³, "apostolic laws" (ἀποστολικοί νόμοι)¹²⁴, "apostolic commandments (ἀποστολικά παραγγέλματα)"¹²⁵, "apostolic teaching" (ἀποστολική διδαχή)¹²⁶, "apostolic way of life" (ἀποστολικὸς βίος)¹²⁷, "apostolic character (ἀποστολικὸς χαρακτήρ)"¹²⁸, "apostolic conviction (ἀποστολικὸ φρόνημα)"¹²⁹, etc. were to remain. We should particularly stress the "apostolic succession" (ἀποστολική διαδοχή)¹³⁰ by means of which the Apostolic Office remains in the Church permanently and reveals her unalterable structure. All these are partial features of the apostolic Church, not only in the sense of the first historic period of the Church, but of the Church as the Body of Christ, of the Church in her eschatological dimension as revealed in the Eucharistic gathering. There, as can be seen in the prayers of Chrysostom's Liturgy, the apostles participate, and so do the prophets and saints¹³¹. And they are mysteriously present wherever the Eucharist is carried out, just like Christ and his Body.

2.5. The Apostolic Office as contributor to the Church's unity

We should note one more particular function of the Apostolic Office in the Church stressed both through the images of the building and body and with the

¹²¹ "I in them and you in Me (Jn 17:23). How gave He the glory? By being in them, and having the Father with Him, so as to weld [the apostles] together" (JOHN, 82,2, PG 59,444).

¹²² MAT, 90,2, PG 58,789.

¹²³ *Contra Anomeos*, 1, PG 49,797; *ROM*, Argumentum, PG 60,392; *ROM*, 5,4, PG 60,429.

¹²⁴ *De Cruce et latrone*, 1,6, PG 49,403; *ibid.*, 2,1, PG 49,412; *GEN*, 33,2, PG 53,308; *MAT*, 55,6, PG 58,547.

¹²⁵ *In illud, Vidua eligatur*, 2, PG 51,323; *ACTS*, 1,3, PG 60,17.

¹²⁶ *ROM*, 32,1, PG 60,675.

¹²⁷ *PRINC*, 2,3, PG 51,82; *Laus Diodori episcopi*,... PG 52,764.

¹²⁸ *GEN*, 54,5, PG 54,477.

¹²⁹ *Epistula Monachis Gothis*, PG 52,727; *PSALM*, 41,6, PG 55,165; *GAL* 1,7, PG 61,625; *ibid.* 1,8, PG 61, 628; *PIHL*, 9,3, PG 62,250.

¹³⁰ *De non anathematizandis*, 3, PG 48,948.

¹³¹ Cf. above, the sub-chapter, "The Apostolic Office as is shown in the worshipping congregation".

others used by Chrysostom¹³². This particularly concerns its contribution to the maintenance of the unity of the Church¹³³ that is one of her essential attributes¹³⁴.

First of all the equality, which applies to all members of the body, also applies to the apostles, as Chrysostom observes referring to St. Paul: "For not even I the apostle, have any more than you in the respect, says he. For you are the body even as I, and I even as you, and we have all the same Head and have passed through the same birth pains. Wherefore we are also the same body"¹³⁵.

Nevertheless, while on the one hand the apostles' equality to the other members of the ecclesiastical body is stressed, on the other their specific character referring to the special ministry assigned to them for the maintenance and growth of the Body is exalted. Just as the heart and the nerves in a human body consist of the same material, of which all parts of the body are also made, and are organically placed in it being at the same time vital for the survival and growth of the human body, so the apostles function in the same way within the ecclesiastical body. More particularly, it is worth our consideration their connection both to the head of the body, where the brains of the body are and from where they receive commands, and to all the other parts of the body to which they carry commands or anything else, as is clearly shown in the parallel drawn between the apostles and the nerves of the human body. "The apostleship is not only an authority (ἀρχή), but also a foundation and a root... For the nerves, which administer the body, born from that [the Head] and grown from the brain itself, they accept the provision of the Holy Spirit and so they dispense to the whole live body"¹³⁶. As G. Florovsky points out, "the organic unity of the Body is not only represented or displayed, but also, and to a larger extent, based without prejudice on the equality of the believers just as the equality of the cells of an organism is not cancelled by their different structure"¹³⁷. Thus, it becomes clear that in Chrysostom's work there is a

¹³² Cf., J. R. Nelson, "Many images of the One Church", *Ecumenical Review*, 9 (1957) 105-113; N. Koulomzine, "Images of the Church in St. Paul's Epistles", *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 14 (1-2, 1970) 5-27; G. G. Christofis, *The Church's identity established through images according to St. John Chrysostom*, 1990.

¹³³ Cf., Ch. Voulgaris, *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (1974) 297-327; B. Ioannides, "The unity of the Church according to St. Paul", *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 9 (1, 1963) 47-66.

¹³⁴ "For the very name 'Church' does not mean separation, but unity and concordance" (*ICOR*, 1,1, PG 61,13)

¹³⁵ *ICOR*, 30,2, PG 61,251.

¹³⁶ *PRINC*, 3,4, PG 51,93.

¹³⁷ Florovsky, G., *Ἀγία Γραφή, Ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p. , 90.

harmonisation between the equality and the distinguishing position of the members of the ecclesiastical body, quite difficult to perceive¹³⁸. Yet, this harmonisation forms the basis of the unity of the Church¹³⁹.

Chrysostom considers this unity as the goal, but also as the result of the ministry of the Apostolic Office. "To the unity, he says, of the faith (Eph 4:13). That is, till we all be proved to have one faith. For this is unity of faith, when we all are one, when we all know well the relationship (σύνδεσμον) alike, till then you should work, if you have received a gift for this purpose, that is you may build the others... for even the apostle was for this purpose, and the prophet for this purpose was prophesying and convincing"¹⁴⁰. The phrase "for even the apostle was for this" shows the main goal for the achievement of which the bearers of the Apostolic Office received the gift. That is why they have¹⁴¹ to work until this work is completed.

One of the sectors of this unity concerns the incorporation of Israel and the other nations assigned to the apostles and more particularly to Paul. Among other things, Chrysostom writes: "'That the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body and fellow-partakers'. What is this, 'fellow-heirs and fellow-partakers of the promise and fellow-members of the body? This last is the great thing, that they should be one body; this exceeding closeness of relation to Him". This is the unity ministered by Paul, he himself confesses: "Of this gospel I was made a minister according to the gift of God's grace which was given me by the working of his power"¹⁴². In this context Ch. Voulgaris notes that in this apostolic ministry "the deeper ecclesiological character of the Apostolic Office is formulated. The mystery of the participation of the Gentiles in the promises to Israel 'in Christ and Church' comes as a result of the Gospel, which is revealed unto his holy

¹³⁸ E. Michaud, (*op. cit.*, p. 493), uses the Chrysostomic text cited above in order to support his one-sided position that "if all Christians are the same body we conclude that they are all equal within this body, and the pastor, the apostle himself, is not superior to any other Christian. Chrysostom's expression is clear". Nevertheless, the author overlooks the importance of other Chrysostomic texts, where the apostle is considered as a basic element of the structure of the ecclesiastical building and as the most vital vessel of the ecclesiastical body.

¹³⁹ "Did you see his exact consideration? He is pointing out the same thing to be both one and many. Wherefore also adds, pressing the point more rigorously, 'and all the members of the body, being many, are one body.' He said not 'being many, are one body' but 'the one body itself is many' and those many members are this one thing" (*ICOR*, 30,1, PG 61,249).

¹⁴⁰ *PAENIT*, 7,5, PG 49,330.

¹⁴¹ "For necessity is laid upon me; yes, woe is me if I do not preach the gospel" (1Cor 9:16)

¹⁴² *EPH*, 6,4, PG 62,45-46.

apostles and prophets by the Spirit (Eph. 3:4-5). The reality of the one Church of the Jews and Gentiles is to be attributed to the apostles, who spread the Gospel to both, thus creating the one Church"¹⁴³.

In another case, when Chrysostom interprets the Lord's sacerdotal prayer, he points out: "Because nothing so offends all men as divisions, He promised that they should be one. 'What, then, says someone, did He effect this?' Certainly He effected it. For all who believe through the apostles are one, though some from among them were torn away. Nor did this escape his knowledge, He even foretold it, and showed that it proceeded from men's slack-mindedness"¹⁴⁴. In this text the unity of the Church is presented as Christ's achievement. Yet, it is particularly characteristic that it has been achieved through the apostles. This unity is to be located in the one faith of all members of the ecclesiastical body¹⁴⁵, which has the God-man as its origin and source, but reaches the believers through the bearers of the Apostolic Office. As Chrysostom points out, "first of all, therefore, the grace, coming upon the apostles, and after seizing them just as a citadel, and through them rushing like a wave to the believers, fulfils everybody and does not shorten the streams of grace"¹⁴⁶. Conversely, if one is to be incorporated in Christ's body, one needs to receive the revelation in Christ from the apostles and participate in the life the latter's preaching¹⁴⁷. The apostles being the "most vital vessels" of the one Church's body contribute to maintenance of the parts-members of this body since they join them to the one Head in an organic unity. This unity is expressed with the sacrament of Baptism¹⁴⁸ and chiefly with that of Eucharist¹⁴⁹ ministered by the apostles. Thus heresies and schisms cannot split Christ's Church since, after the one Head of the Church's body and as criterion of unity, the one Apostolic Office is connected to it. Simply, the ones who deny or distort the apostolic faith,

¹⁴³ Ch. Voulgaris, *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 301.

¹⁴⁴ *JOHN*, 82,2, PG 59,444.

¹⁴⁵ "Now when we shall all believe alike, then shall there be unity" (*EPH*, 11,3, PG 62,83).

¹⁴⁶ *PENT*, 1,5, PG 64,421.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. *SACERD*, 3,6, PG 48,643, where Chrysostom refers to the clergy as successors of the apostles. "We put on Christ with these things and we are joined together with the Son of God, we became members of that blessed Head".

¹⁴⁸ "And not only is that which has baptised us one, but also that unto which He baptised us, i.e., for which He baptised us, is one. For we were baptised not that so many several bodies might be formed, but that we might preserve one with another the perfect nature of one body" (*ICOR*, 30,1, PG 61,251).

¹⁴⁹ "Therefore, our participation in Eucharist connects us to Christ and to each other simultaneously in one body, 'for that great and terrific sacrifice takes us up there' (*ICOR*, 24,3, PG 61,203)" (A. Yiēftic, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου...*, p. 138).

the apostolic preaching and the apostolic structure of the Church confessed at Baptism, are cut off from the ecclesiastical body without the latter being damaged or altered. St. Chrysostom sees the bearers of the Apostolic Office as ministers of the unity of the Church always in reference to their relationship to Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. This unity is in fact offered by the incarnated Lord and activated by the Paraclete. The inhominated Son of God is the ultimate measure and criterion for the unity of the Church's body, while the Paraclete enables the apostles to minister the work of unity. "Do you perceive the dignity of the office? Each one edifies, each one perfects, each one ministers. 'Till we all attain' he proceeds, 'unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:12-13)"¹⁵⁰. Clearly the bearers of the Apostolic Office minister the unity of the Church's body of Christ being supplied with the special gift of the Holy Spirit, which Chrysostom calls the "office" (τὸ ἀξίωμα). To them and to their successors the sacred authority, which the grace of the Spirit handed over, was granted.

Thus, the apostles utilising this authority contribute to making up of a perfect body by all members of the Church, that is the body of Christ. "For to this end was the Spirit given, that He might unite those who are separated by race and different manners"¹⁵¹. Therefore, the Apostolic Office does not simply aim at unity, but is also proved the chief contributor to the unity of the Church¹⁵².

2.6. The Church is apostolic in its structure

Having considered the above, we can, I think, understand more clearly how Chrysostom received and how he perceives the Church as apostolic.

Even though in the works of Chrysostom the term 'apostolic' characterising the Church and already prevailing towards the end of the fourth century¹⁵³ is not found, it is nevertheless easy to see that the way in which the predicate "ἀποστολικός, ἡ, όν" is used in the Chrysostomic texts helps us considerably to realise that the Church is considered by him as substantially apostolic. Analysing those cases in which we come across the above mentioned predicate in the texts we

¹⁵⁰ EPH, 11,3, PG 62,83.

¹⁵¹ EPH, 9,3, PG 62,72; see, also, Gregory the theologian, (*oration* 2,3), "[The members of the Church] are put together and joined up by the harmony of the Spirit".

¹⁵² Ch. Voulgaris, *op. cit.*, 372-466.

¹⁵³ See, T. H. Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, (1899), p. 64.

examine, we can see that these cases can be divided into three categories. The first refers to faith, the second to life and the third to the structure of the Church.

In the first category fall those cases in which Chrysostom talks, among other things, about "the apostolic faith" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν πίστιν)¹⁵⁴, "the apostolic teaching" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν διδαχὴν)¹⁵⁵, "the apostolic admonition" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν παραίνεσιν)¹⁵⁶, "the apostolic words" (τὰ ἀποστολικά ρήματα)¹⁵⁷, "the apostolic dogmas" (τὰ ἀποστολικά δόγματα)¹⁵⁸, "the apostolic laws" (τοὺς ἀποστολικούς νόμους)¹⁵⁹, etc. granted to the body of the Church by God-man Lord through the apostles, which the members of this body must keep unadulterated and integral. Thus it becomes clear that the faith of the revelation in Christ safeguarded by the Church, definitely comes through the apostles. They are those human persons and distinguished members of the Church, who have been granted special grace and authority¹⁶⁰, so that they receive from the inhominated Son of God the revealed faith and distribute it to the other members of the Body. Therefore, they are firm points of reference in the ecclesiastical body so that the correctness of the faith possessed by the members is tested.

In the second category fall those cases in which Chrysostom puts forward "the apostolic life" (τὸν ἀποστολικὸν βίον)¹⁶¹, "the apostolic outspokenness" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν παρρησίαν)¹⁶², "the apostolic virtue" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἀρετὴν)¹⁶³, "the apostolic wisdom" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν σύνεσιν)¹⁶⁴, "the

¹⁵⁴ "God allows his (Eustathius') true and apostolic faith to be attacked, while He permits heresies and Hellenism free" (*In sanctum Eustathium Antiochenum*, 3, PG 50,603).

¹⁵⁵ "And so there would be no offence, there would be no division, unless some opinion were thought of contrary to the doctrine of the apostles. And this he here points out saying, 'contrary to the doctrine'" (*ROM*, 32,1, PG 60,675).

¹⁵⁶ "But let us hold self-sufficiency, according to the apostolic exhortation that says, 'And having food and clothing, with these shall be content (1Tim 6,8)" (*GEN*, 37,4, PG 53,348).

¹⁵⁷ "that this thing may not be done, let us open our eyes towards to the shining apostolic sayings" (*ROM*, praefatio, PG 60,392).

¹⁵⁸ "....prophetic voices, apostolic dogmas, laws of the Lord, the whole menu of virtue.." (*PAENIT*, 6,1, PG 49,315).

¹⁵⁹ "...the customs, the laws, the institutions, the apostolic rules, all the other things" (*ICOR*, 14,1, PG 61,115).

¹⁶⁰ Mark 3:5; Luk 9:1; Act 20;17,28; 1Cor 12:28; Phil 1:1; 1Thess 5:12. Cf., G. Florovsky, *Ἁγία Γραφή, Ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p.81.

¹⁶¹ See, Origen, *In Genesim*, 1,5-6 (GGS, 6,7), "they [the apostles] are the true Church, according to this saying of the Apostle, that God had willed to present himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing".

¹⁶² "Therefore it is obvious that even now there are many who show off their apostolic life, just as the three thousand and the five thousand" (*MAT*, 21,4, PG 57,298).

¹⁶³ "...monks who live in the city of Antioch as showing off apostolic boldness" (*Ad Populum Antiochenum*, 17,2, PG 49,175).

apostolic piety" (τὴν ἀποστολικὴν εὐλάβειαν)¹⁶⁵, "the apostolic zeal" (τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ζῆλον)¹⁶⁶, "the apostolic conviction" (τὸ ἀποστολικὸν φρόνημα)¹⁶⁷, which believers must imitate and preserve¹⁶⁸. Once more we observe that ecclesiastical life, the life the members of the Church lead, is transmitted to them by the Head of the Church through the bearers of the Apostolic Office. In this case, too, the apostles are firm points of reference of the Church's body, so that the communion of the members with God-man is achieved and the purity of their life is tested.

It should be noted here that Chrysostom often associates faith with life, or dogma with ethos and includes both in the "completed piety" (ἀπηρτισμένην εὐσέβειαν)¹⁶⁹ or, better, in the Church itself. Thus, he declares that the "Church is faith and life"¹⁷⁰. Since we know that faith and life are considered by Chrysostom as apostolic, it is really understood that the Church, too, is considered by him as apostolic.

Finally, in the third category fall those cases in which Chrysostom uses the predicate "apostolic" in order to refer to the structure of the Church. Thus, he talks about "apostolic authority" (ἀποστολικὴ ἀρχή)¹⁷¹ within the ecclesiastic building and considers "the apostolic mouths" (ἀποστολικά στόματα) as "royal treasuries" (ταμεῖα βασιλικά)¹⁷². Furthermore, he stresses the point that the first Church of Jerusalem "was founded by apostolic hands" (ὕπὸ ἀποστολικῶν ἐθεμελιώθη χειρῶν)¹⁷³, while "the letters (the Scriptures)" are "apostolic walls" (ἀποστολικά τείχη)¹⁷⁴. He also speaks of the "apostolic succession"

¹⁶⁴ "So, it is not necessary us to send you letters in order to prove the apostolic virtue, because the events are crying..." (Ibid.).

¹⁶⁵ "What, then, should be admired is apostolic prudence (σύνεσις)" (ROM, 5,5, PG 60,428).

¹⁶⁶ "And do mark the apostolic piety (εὐλάβειαν)" (Ibit, 6,5, PG 60,439).

¹⁶⁷ "You prepare (ἀλείφεις) those who are here, fulfilling them with apostolic zeal" (Epistula 53, Nicolao presbytero, PG 52,537).

¹⁶⁸ "But rejoice and be glad holding the apostolic mind (φρόνημα), which is expressed in the saying, 'I, now, rejoice in my suffering for you (Col 1:24)'" (Epistula 207, Monachis Gothis, PG 52,637).

¹⁶⁹ ACTS, 49,1, PG 60,338. cf., also, "'Train yourself in godliness' (1Tim 4:7), that is, in pure faith and right life: for this is piety" (ITIM, 12,2, PG 62,560).

¹⁷⁰ In Eutropium, 2,1, PG 52,397.

¹⁷¹ "But the apostolic authority is superior than all these [Spiritual gifts]" (PRINC, 3,3, PG 51,92).

¹⁷² "...for their mouths were royal treasuries...." (De sancta Pentecoste, 1,2, PG 50,456).

¹⁷³ PRINC, 2,1, PG 51,77.

¹⁷⁴ "For, therefore, the Scriptures are apostolic walls of the Churches..." (In illud, Hoc autem scitote.... 3, PG 56,274).

(ἀποστολικὴ διαδοχὴ)¹⁷⁵, through which the structure of the ecclesiastical body is kept unaltered¹⁷⁶. Apart from these references, the position of the Apostolic Office in the structure of the Church can be clearly seen in the image of the building where the apostles are presented as foundations, walls or pillars, as well as in the image of the body, where they are compared with the "most vital vessels" (καιριώτερα ἄγγεῖα)¹⁷⁷ all these show that the Apostolic Office occupies such an important place in the structure of the ecclesiastical body, that it characterises the Church.

Thus I think that, for Chrysostom, the position of the Apostolic Office in the structure of the Church's body is the very factor which proves it (i.e. the Apostolic Office) essential both to ecclesiastical faith and to ecclesiastical life. Now, if we see the Church's body in its eschatological dimension, where "one is the body of Christ", and "one is the body of the believers... and this body neither time nor place could divide"¹⁷⁸, we understand better the position of the Apostolic Office as an essential element in the structure of the Church, not only in her historical, but also in her eschatological dimension. Thus, its bearers are the pillars which "sustain the roof" and "eyes of the body of the Christ"¹⁷⁹. With this apostolic structure of the body of the Church, both the preservation of the one faith and life in Christ and the growth of the Church's body without its being substantially altered, are achieved. It follows that the Church, having the bearers of the Apostolic Office as an element essential to their structure, is in effect, "apostolic". This term, already used by fathers before Chrysostom¹⁸⁰, is neither invented, nor confined to

¹⁷⁵ "Βούλεσθε μαθεῖν οἷά τις ἐφθέγγετο ἅγιός τις πρὸ ἡμῶν, τῆς διαδοχῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος, ὃς καὶ μαρτυρίου ἤξιωτο;" (*De non anathematizandis*, 3, PG 48,948).

¹⁷⁶ See *MAT*, 90,2, PG 58,789.

¹⁷⁷ See above, sub-chapter, "The growth of the Church's body and the Apostolic Office".

¹⁷⁸ *In illud, Hoc autem scitote...*, 6, PG 56,277,

¹⁷⁹ *In illud, In faciem ei restiti...*, 2, PG 51,373.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Eusebius, "And after these things, just as you might like to express, let a basilica, worthy of the catholic and apostolic Church, be built on the same place" (*Vita Constantini* (ed., Winkelmann, F.), 3,53,2). Also, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. G. Bardy), 7, 32, where he (Eusebius) considers Jerusalem as an "apostolic throne" (ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον) since it is connected to its first bishop, James. See, also, "It seemed good [to the Synod]... that Alexander has the authority to ordain those who were not found in any schism, but have spotlessly been in the catholic and apostolic Church with the grace of God and your blessings" (*Copy of Epistle of the Nicene Synod against Arius and his companions*, Athanasius, *De Decretis Nicaeni Synodi*, 36). Also, Basil, "The Catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes these persons". (*Epistulae* (ed. Y. Courtonne), 125,1,31; *ibid.*, 125,1,31; *ibid.*, 140,2,27).

the historic period when the apostles lived¹⁸¹. On the contrary, it is substantial and characterises the Church not only historically, but also universally and eschatologically¹⁸². I think that even if he does not use the predicate "apostolic" to refer to the Church, yet, Chrysostom substantially recognises and preaches it as such.

2.7. Conclusions

The way Chrysostom tackles the relationship between the Church and the Apostolic Office leads us to the following conclusions:

1. Chrysostom, without concerning himself with this issue in particular, deals with it occasionally within the framework of his broader teaching about the Church, which he sees both in its historical and eschatological dimension, while accepting the Eucharistic gathering as its best expression. On the basis of the event of Inhomination, he sees the presence of the Apostolic Office both in the phases of the Church that preceded it and in the ones that followed.

2. Even though there is no relevant direct reference to the Apostolic Office in the phases of the Church both before Creation and before the Fall, yet from the broader teaching of Chrysostom we conclude that it originally existed in God's will and later on as equipment of the Church's body, prepared to play its main role after the inhomination of the Son of God and the descent of the Holy Spirit. During the prophetic period of the Church Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office and its bearers prefigured with clarity so that the ground was prepared for its acceptance when its main mission was undertaken.

3. In the post-inhomination historic period of the Church Chrysostom refers to the Apostolic Office in relation to the Church by means of different images, but chiefly, by images of the building and body.

a. With the image of the building Chrysostom teaches that the Apostolic Office constitutes on the one hand the structural framework of the Church's building

¹⁸¹ K. Berger - J. Danielou, "Apostolic Church", *Encyclopaedia of Theology* (ed. by Karl Rahner, 1991), "But since the concept of 'apostle' varies widely in the N.T. (in John it is only used by Jesus), the notion of 'apostolic' is also somewhat artificial". "Apostolic Church means the Church of apostolic times and thus covers the period up to about A.D. 70".

¹⁸² J.N.D. KELLY in his article "Catholic and Apostolic", *One in Christ*, 6 (3, 1970) 281-287, examining the fathers of the three first centuries, identifies the same points mentioned above as expressing the 'apostolicity' of the Church. Yet, he does not stress the apostolic structure of the Church as the basis of the rest, nor does he connect it to the eschatological dimension of the Church.

based of the one foundation cornerstone, God-man Lord, while on the other it constitutes that building ministry which, dependent upon the Lord, serves the shape-taking and growth of the Church's building.

b. With the image of the body Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office as the functional system of the "most vital vessels" organically placed in Christ's body. Furthermore he associates it directly to the Head of the Body and points out that its special nature and authority is essential to the preservation and growth of the Body. In this way he indirectly rejects any viewpoint which sees the Apostolic Office either outside and above the Church or dependent upon it.

4. Chrysostom illustrates the relationship between the Church and the Apostolic Office with a series of patterns which he uses with reference to the Eucharistic gathering and which include the Persons of the Holy Trinity, the angels, distinguished human members of the Church, and always the apostles. With these patterns as well as the collective use of the term "the apostle" or "the apostles" he perceives the Apostolic Office as connected not only to the historic but also to the eschatological reality of the Church.

5. A very substantial and important offer of the Apostolic Office is its contribution to Church's unity. Chrysostom considers this unity both as the goal and as the result of the ministry of the Apostolic Office. Its special offer is to be found in the special role that it plays both in the transmission of the preaching from the Head and in the incorporation of the people in Christ's body through the sacraments.

6. Although Chrysostom never uses the predicate "apostolic" to refer to the Church, yet he virtually considers the Church as such, identifying her apostolicity chiefly in its apostolic structure through which the faith and life in Christ as well as the preservation of the Church's body are safeguarded.

7. Finally, even though Chrysostom's basic positions on the relationship between the Church and the Apostolic Office are identical with those of the previous great Church fathers, and especially of Origen and the Cappadocians, he is distinguished from them on the following counts: a. he uses metaphors abundantly and stresses the Apostolic Office's place in the structure of the Church, b. he associates the Apostolic Office with the historical as well as with the eschatologi-

cal dimension of the Church, and this clearly appears in his favorite Eucharistic teaching.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

3.1. Basic elements of Chrysostom's eschatology

St. John Chrysostom refers to eschatological issues in numerous occasions in his homilies¹. However, in my opinion, the key to a good understanding of his eschatology can be found in his interpretative approach to the New Testament term "betrothal" (ὁ ἄρραβών)².

As is well-known, "ἄρραβών", which is said by Lightfoot to be of Semitic origin³, is a term relating to commercial and other transactions⁴. On all three occasions where it is found in the New Testament, it is used metaphorically. For Chrysostom, "the ἄρραβών is a part (μέρος) of the whole"⁵, while "the whole" (τὸ ὅλον) is the redemption, that is, "the plain redemption" (ἡ καθαρά ἀπολύτρωσις)⁶. This "the whole" is connected both to the inhominated Son of God and to the role undertaken by the Holy Spirit in the plan of Divine Economy. Thus, God "has purchased what we are most concerned in, our salvation; and has given us an earnest in the meanwhile... Nay, more, he has given yet another pledge, his own blood, and has promised another still. In the same way as in the case of war between nation and nation they give hostages just so has God also given his Son as a pledge of peace and solemn treaties, and further, the Holy Spirit

¹ See the studies by: S. Schiwietz, "Die Eschatologie des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus und ihr Verhältnis zu der origenistischen", *Katholik* 93 (1913) 445-455 and 94 (1914) 45-63· 271-281· 436-448; F. Leduc, "L' eschatologie une preoccupation centrale de St. J. Chrysostome", *Proche Orient Chretien*, 19 (1969) 109-134; F. X. Murphy, "Conflagration: The eschatological perspective from Origen to John Chrysostom", *Studia Patristica* 17:1 (1985) 179-185; P. Yazigi, *Ἐσχατολογία καὶ Ἠθικὴ, ἡ ἐσχατολογικὴ θεμελίωσι τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον Ἰωάννη τὸν Χρυσόστομο*, 1992.

² 2Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14.

³ J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from unpublished commentaries* (1904) 323; Liddell and Scott, *A Greek- English Lexicon*, new edition revised by H. S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie (OUP, 1925-1940), sv ἄρραβών.

⁴ See, A. J. Kerr, "Ἀρραβών", *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988) 92.

⁵ *EPH*, 2,2, PG 62,18.

⁶ *Ibid*, PG 62,19. Cf. *MAT*, 11,6, PG 57,199; *EPH*, 23,3, PG 62,167.



also which is from him. For they that are indeed partakers of the Spirit, know that he is the earnest of our inheritance". And to the obvious question, "Why then did he not give the whole at once?", he answers: "Because neither have we, on our part, done the whole of our work. We have believed. This is a beginning; and he too on his part has given an earnest. When we show our faith by our works, then he will add everything"⁷.

In the above texts we note that Chrysostom refers to history (inhomination of the Son and its aftermath) as well as to the eschata ("the whole", "everything", "the inheritance"), which God promised we will enjoy. It is particularly important to say that the eschatological gifts are characterized by Chrysostom as "the whole" and "everything" (τὸ πᾶν)⁸. That is, emphasis is laid on the quality (wholeness and perfection of the gifts) and not only on the time (future gifts). This wholeness is better shown in Chrysostom's perceiving Christ as the last Adam. He notes: "So also is written the first man Adam became a living soul (Gen 2:7); the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit (1Cor 15:45)... And these things he said that you may learn that the signs and pledges both of the present life and of that which is to come have already come upon us; to wit, of the present life, Adam, and of the life to come, Christ. For since he sets down the better things as matters of hope, he signifies that their beginning has already come to pass, and their root and their fountain been brought to light. But if the root and the fountain is evident to all, there is no need to doubt of the fruits"⁹.

Christ as the last Adam, according to St. Chrysostom, does not only constitute the specific reality¹⁰ of the eschata; at the same time he connects the eschata on the one hand to mankind, since as God-man he bears human nature, and on the other to history, since the part of everything and the beginning of the whole is given by him to man within history. In other words, in Chrysostom we find a mysterious

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ See, "Seek the Kingdom of God and all these things will be added to you (Luke 12:31). But the whole [will be given] then" (*PSALM*, 5,1, PG 55,61). J. B. Lightfoot's comment is also worth mentioning: "In other words, the thing given is related to the thing assured- the present to the hereafter- as a part of the whole. It is the same in kind... The patristic commentators on the passages in St. Paul insist strongly on this force of ἀπαβών and St. Jerome more especially on this passage complains that it is obliterated in the rendering of the Latin version" (*op. cit.*, pp. 323-324).

⁹ *ICOR*, 41.4, PG 61,360.

¹⁰ P. Yazigi notes: "Chrysostom uses names with a purpose. He knows and teaches that what there is in the opinion of the majority is only 'name', while what there is in truth is 'thing' " (*op. cit.*, p. 197).

joining of time to eternity and of history to eschatology, in sharp contrast with the modern school of eschatology, which, following S. Kierkegaard's philosophic positions, completely separates the two realities¹¹. This joining, as seen by Chrysostom, is achieved in the Person of the inhominated Son with the co-operation of the Holy Spirit and is expressed through the image of betrothal.

It seems that in Chrysostom's interpretation there is a deeper correlation between the present and future life. For one thing he points out that "the gospel belongs to things of the future, and not to things of the present"¹², and that "the principal sum is stored up for the life to come"¹³, while for another he stresses the fact that "Jesus had the custom of speaking of the future as being present"¹⁴. Thus, the eschata do not constitute an exclusive future reality, but an eternal reality, tangible even within the framework of history. As G. Florovsky observes, "The future has a different meaning after Christ (*post Christum*). The tension between present and future has within Christ's Church a meaning and character different from those in the Old Economy. This is the case because Christ is not only related to the future, but also to the past as well as to the present"¹⁵. Chrysostom is positive at this point: "And 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty' (2Cor 3:17). For surely you will not assert, that he says, 'And where the Lord of the Lord is'. 'Liberty', he said, with reference to the former bondage. Then, that you may not think that he is speaking of a time to come, he says 'But we all, with unveiled face, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord' (1Cor 3:18), not that which is brought to an end but that which remains"¹⁶.

The Lord's "remaining" glory, which can not be confined within the narrow limits of time, being eternal and identical to the kingdom of God, as J. Romanides proves using a number of patristic texts¹⁷, is reflected in the faces of the believers, who live within historic reality. In other words, man, living in history, partakes of God's eternal glory. This partaking will carry on after the end of history, but in a

¹¹ On criticism of the school of Eschatology see Ch. Voulgaris, "Ἡ ὑπὸ τὸ πρῖσμα τῆς ἐσχατολογίας θεώρησις τῆς ἐνότητος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας", *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, pp. 41-60.

¹² *ITIM*, 2,2, PG 62,512.

¹³ *ITIM*, 11,2, PG 62,555.

¹⁴ *JOHN*, 82,5, PG 59,443.

¹⁵ *Ἁγία Γραφή, Ἐκκλησία, Παράδοσις*, p. 36.

¹⁶ *2COR*, 7,4, PG 61,448.

¹⁷ J. Romanides, *Δογματική καὶ Συμβολική Θεολογία τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. 1, p. 201-208.

different way. The difference between the two cases is not to be attributed to the nature of the Lord's glory, which is always the same, but to man's potency which seems to change, as Paul has vividly said, "For now we see in a mirror but then face to face" (1Cor 13:12). On these words Chrysostom comments: "Not as though God has a face, but to express the notion of greater clearness and perspicuity. Do you see how we learn all things by gradual addition?"¹⁸, "and that you may understand that not concerning the economies did he speak the words: 'Now I know in part', hear what follows. He adds then, 'but then shall I know perfectly, even as also I have been known perfectly'. He was surely known not by the dispensations, but by God"¹⁹.

On the one hand, we have God's presence in the "dispensations" (οἰκονομίαι)²⁰ as well as outside them in the eschata, as presence of the immutable God; on the other, we have God's knowledge (ἐπιγνωσις) revealed to man, which follows a course gradual addition (κατ' ἐπίδοσιν) from "in part" (ἐκ μέρους) of "now" (ἄρτι) to "perfectly" (τέλειον) of "then" (τότε). Therefore, according to St. Chrysostom, one of the main features of eschatology is man's gradually becoming worthy of the "knowledge" given by God and able to enjoy his perfect presence, which he has already experienced and enjoyed within history as betrothal "through a glass, darkly" (1Cor 13:12).

It should be mentioned here that the certainty of the eschata is, according to St. Chrysostom, as strong as that of the present, which the believers experience within history. This is the case, firstly, because the present gifts are an inseparable part of the whole and, secondly, because God who offered believers the present gifts, himself promises the eschata. Chrysostom expresses this position as follows: "For, if he [God] gave the principles and the foundations, and the root and the fountain (to wit, the true knowledge of him, the partaking of the Spirit) how shall he not give the things that come of these? For if for the sake of these those are given, much more will he supply those. And if to such as were enemies he gave these, much more when now made friends will he 'freely give' those to them. Wherefore he said not simply 'the Spirit' but spoke of 'betrothal', that from this your mightiest

¹⁸ ICOR, 34.2, PG 61,287.

¹⁹ Ibid, PG 61,288.

²⁰ For the use of the term 'dispensations' (οἰκονομίαι), which are identified with the divine energies in Chrysostom, see Th. Zissis, *"Ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ Κόσμου*, p. 59-62.

have a good hope of the whole as well. For, if he did not purpose to give the whole, he would never have chosen to give 'the betrothal' and to waste it without object or result"²¹. Before this text, there is another one, which is also very important: "For in him [God], not in man, the promises have their being and fulfilment. Fear not, therefore, for it is not man so that you should mistrust; but it is God who both said and fulfilled. 'Unto the glory of God through us' (2Cor 1:20). What is 'unto his glory through us?' He fulfilled them by us, that is, and by his benefits towards us unto his glory; for this is 'for glory of God'. But if they are the glory of God, they will certainly come to pass. For his own glory he will not think little of, even did he think little of our salvation. But as it is, he thinks not little of our salvation either, both because he loves mankind exceedingly, and because our salvation is bound up with his glory from these things accruing"²².

As regards the first point, one should point out Chrysostom's observation that whatever was given to the people by God within history, was given as a guarantee for the entire eschatological gift ("the One who gave these ones, will provide those as well"). Furthermore, all terms used for the present gifts, immediately make us see the relation of the part to the whole ["beginning" (ἀρχή), "foundations" (ὑποθέσεις) "roots" (ρίζαι), "fountain", (πηγή)] - "the things that come from these" (τὰ ἐκ τούτων) [(the whole (τὸ ὅλον), outcome (ἐκβάσεις), tree (δένδρον), river (ποταμὸς)]. It is precisely with these images that he interprets the "ἄρραβών" as a necessary relation between the part and the whole ("for he called it betrothal, so that you take courage from this for everything"); in the last analysis, he directly connects the "ἄρραβών" to the presence of the Holy Spirit²³.

As regards the second point, particularly worth mentioning is the connection made by Chrysostom between God's promises about the eschata and his own glory. According to what he writes, not only are the eschata characterized by the dominance of God's undiminished glory, but, because of their connection to it, they constitute an indisputable reality of the present as well, since God's glory is also revealed partially within history. A typical example of such a revelation of

²¹ 2COR, 3,4, PG 61,411.

²² *Ibid*, PG 61,410.

²³ See, "Then as showing the credibility of this and furnishing the proof of it, he added "who also gave the earnest of the Spirit" (2 Cor 5:5). For even then He fashioned us for this; and now He has worked unto this by baptism and has furnished us with no light security thereof, the Holy Spirit" (2COR, 10,2, PG 61,468).

God's eternal glory is for Chrysostom, as well as for other earlier fathers²⁴, the event of Transfiguration²⁵. Additionally the connection between the eschata and God's eternal glory becomes the best possible and indisputable guarantee for them, because God can not deny himself. This must be the meaning of the phrase "he will not disdain his glory".

Furthermore, special attention should be paid to Chrysostom's observation that God's immense love of mankind (ἡ φιλανθρωπία) is a safe guarantee for the eschatological gifts. Chrysostom expresses this conviction on many occasions²⁶ and especially in his homily on *Psalm 144*: "He made all these for us dispensing his multifold and incomprehensible providence every day through miracles and laws, the capital of all gifts, i.e., that he did not spare even his Only-begotten Son of God for us, the things supplied through baptism, through mysteries, the things that are to be given, those hidden gifts, the kingdom, the resurrection, the end which is full of every happiness"²⁷. Particularly characteristic in this text is the connection of the eschatology to God's providence²⁸, which expresses his love of mankind in the best possible way. In addition, a combination of history and eschatology can be observed, since a large number of the gifts we are already enjoying in part are eschatological.

Finally, another point which should also be referred to, is the Last Judgement, which is the main feature of the eschata. According to St. Chrysostom that Judgement, even though an event of the eschata, it is related to history. This is clearly shown in the correlating interpretation of the two seemingly contrasting extracts, i.e., Jn 12:47-48 and Jn 3:18²⁹. Chrysostom explains: "He either means this, that

²⁴ See J. A. McGuckin, "The patristic exegesis of the Transfiguration", *Studia Patristica* 17 (1, 1985) 335-341.

²⁵ See, "Thus, having ascended the mountain he transfigured himself before his disciples opening up the glory of things to come for them and in a riddle and dimly showing off what our body would be" (*De futurae vitae deliciis*, 6, PG 51,352); cf. also, "And this, because the rest would have desired exceedingly to have followed, being to see a pattern of that glory; and would have been pained, as overlooked. For though it was somewhat in a corporeal way that He made the disclosure, yet nevertheless the thing had much in it to be desired" (*MAT*, 56,1, PG 58,550)

²⁶ See P. Yazigi, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-31.

²⁷ *PSALM*, 144,1, PG 55,465.

²⁸ G. Florovsky, "Ο ἅγιος Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος ὁ προφήτης τῆς ἀγάπης". *Ἀκτίνες*, 18 (1955) 5ff; also, G. Dragas, "St. John Chrysostom's doctrine of God's Providence", *Ἐκκλησιαστικός Φάρος*, 57 (1975) 375-406.

²⁹ "For I did not come to judge the world but to save the world. He who rejects Me, and does not receive my words, has that which judges him-the word that I have spoken will judge him in the last day" (Jn 12:47-48); "He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son

the very fact of disbelieving without repentance is a punishment, (for to be without the light, contains in itself a very severe punishment) or he announces what shall be. For, as the murderer, though he is not as yet condemned by the decision of the judge, is still condemned by the nature of the thing, so is it with the unbeliever. Since Adam also died on the day that he ate of the tree; for so ran the decree, "In the day that you eat of the tree you will die (Gen 2:17); yet he lived. How then "died" he? By the decree; by the very nature of the thing; for he who has rendered himself liable to punishment is under its penalty, and if for a while he is not actually so, yet he is by the sentence"³⁰.

The distinction made between the Judgement as "nature of the thing" and its ratification by the Judge proves to be very useful in the connection between eschatology and history. According to this distinction, the Last Judgement is simply the ratification of the Judgement, which is an event also taking place in history. The presence of God-man in it forms a criterion for everyone who faces him and listens to his words. Nevertheless, this Judgement, which occurs within history and is substantial, becomes apparent only within the eschata with the Judge's final confirmation.

To sum up, it can be said that Chrysostom, approaching Church's eschatology with the New Testament term, "ἄρραβών", connects the eschata to history (to the past and present) and presents God-man Lord as the central axis of this connection, while at the same time he stresses the important role of the Holy Spirit in it³¹. Furthermore, he sees the Last Judgement as ratification of the already complete Judgement by the very "thing", that is, by the incarnation. Finally, he connects the eschata to love of mankind, providence and glory of God, which render their final outcome. Nowhere in the Chrysostomic texts is there an allusion to the distinction between "the eschatology to be" of Jesus and "the fulfilled eschatology" of Paul³²

of God" (Jn 3:18).

³⁰ JOHN, 28,1, PG 59,162-163.

³¹ See, "I have received the Spirit from Heaven, the Spirit of God; I have my pledge secured. What pledge? His body ascended, His Spirit descended to us" (*De Ascensione*, 28,1, PG 52,789). Cf. also "Therefore, his guaranty is above, that is the body, which he took up from us, and the Holy Spirit is down with us. See the remarkable thing; the Spirit is with us as well as above and the body of Christ is above as well as with us" (*ibid.*); "for I start from the Spirit and I rush to everything" (*Ad populum Antiochenum*, 5,2, PG 49,79).

³² As regards the differentiations put forward by modern scholars between the eschatology of Jesus and Paul, see A. Schweitzer, *The Question for the Historical Jesus*, (tran. into English), p. 365 and *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 89 ff. On the well-known "issue" of the relations between Jesus and Paul, see W. Sanday, *The life of Christ in recent research*, pp. 221ff.

or to the distinction between the kingdom of God and the glory of God³³, issues which have already been and are still being discussed³⁴. It would be more appropriate to characterise chrysostomic eschatology as "inaugurated eschatology", a terminology used in the current debate and preferred by G. Florovsky³⁵. In other words, Chrysostom sees the eschata as a uniform and complete reality, which in its gradual revelation is connected to the plan of divine economy and more particularly to both persons of the inhominated Son of God and of the Holy Spirit³⁶ as well as to his Church. I believe that the use of the term "ὁ ἀρραβών" by Chrysostom additionally refers us to the well-known image of the Lord as the bridegroom and of the Church as the bride;³⁷ at the same time it appropriately expresses the synthesis of history and eschatology³⁸.

All the above enable us to look for a relationships between eschatology and the Apostolic Office, since the bearers of the latter are related to the plan of divine economy and, more particularly, to the Person of God-man as the bridegroom of the Church, to the Person of the Holy Spirit and to the very Church.

Chrysostom, interpreting Biblical texts, offers us a number of eschatological points in relation to the apostles and their office, which can be listed in a particular order as follows.

3.2. Jesus Christ's words to the apostles on the eschata

³³ J.Romanides, *Op. cit.*, pp. 209-212.

³⁴ Ch. Voulgaris, *op. cit.*

³⁵ "On the other hand it is early yet to talk about 'fulfilled eschatology' simply because eschaton has not been fulfilled yet. The holy history has not been closed yet. Perhaps the phrase 'inaugurated eschatology' would be better since it renders the biblical diagnosis accurately. The critical point of revelation belongs to the past. The 'eschaton' or 'new' has already entered history, even though the last stage has not been achieved yet" (*op. cit.*, p. 37).

³⁶ See, "And not only they but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves" (Rom 8:23)... For if the first-fruits be so great that we are thereby freed even from our sins, and attain to righteousness and sanctification, and that those of that time both drove out devils, and raised the dead by their shadow (Acts 5:15), or garments (*ibid.* 19:12), consider how great the whole must be" (*ROM*, 14,6, PG 60).

³⁷ The correlation between betrothal and marriage must have been in current use at Chrysostom's time. There seems to be a relevant allusion in the following words of Chrysostom on virginity: "Ἡδη τοῖς τῶν μελλόντων ἡ παρθένος ἐντροφᾶς ἀρραβῶσιν, ἤδη τῷ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀγιασμῷ ἐνοικεῖς" (*Laudio S. Protomartyris et apostolae Theclae*, PG 50,747).

³⁸ See J. Zizioulas: "The *arrabon* of the Kingdom which is the presence of the Spirit in history, signifies precisely the synthesis of the historical with the eschatological. This *arrabon* does not imply- as it is often presented by New Testament theologians- the absence of the eschatological from historical, i. e. a hope and an expectation on the basis of a word of promise. On the contrary, it signifies a real presence of the eschatological on the basis of the fact that God is present in the historical and risen Christ" (*Being as Communion*, pp. 186-187).

As is known from the Biblical texts, Jesus Christ himself talked to the apostles many times during their apprenticeship about the eschata, and he revealed a number of truths related to them³⁹. However, here we will concern ourselves mainly with those occasions when Jesus' words are specially related to the apostles and their office.

Commenting on the apostles' question, "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" and Jesus' answer, "It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father has fixed by his own authority" (Acts 1:6), Chrysostom refers to a number of Christ's revelations to the apostles concerning the eschata. He points out: "[The apostles learned] that when he [Christ] ascended, he sat on the right hand of God (Lk 22:69), and what is still more stupendous, that flesh is seated in heaven, and adored by angels, and that he will come again (Mk 16:19); they learned what is to take place in the Judgement (Mat 16:27); learned that they shall then sit and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Lk 21:27); learned that the Jews would be cast out, and in their stead the Gentiles should come in (Mat 19:28). For tell me which is greater?... To learn that a person will reign or to learn the time when? (Lk 21:24)"⁴⁰. This text clearly shows that during their discipleship with Jesus the apostles were becoming familiar with the eschatological reality, gradually receiving revelations about it.

When Jesus was challenged by Peter's question, "Lord, where are you going?", Chrysostom notes that He answered "not to his words, but to his thoughts"⁴¹ saying, "Where I am going you cannot follow me now; but you shall follow afterward" (Jn 13:36). Peter's "mind", according to Chrysostom's account, refers to the fact that "Peter said what he said, not in order to learn, but that he might follow"⁴². This observation leads us to the conclusion that the revelation of the eschatological realm is not an idea or an intellectual conception, but a reality in which they want to participate. Shortly afterwards and addressing the apostles, Christ reveals: "In my Father's house there are many dwelling places; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you" (Jn 14:2). Chrysostom interprets these texts and comments: "That is, 'The same place which receives Peter shall receive

³⁹ Cf. Mat 10:23, 16:27, 19:28, 24:1-51, 25:1-46; Mark 4:26-32, 10:30, 12:18-27, 13:1-37; Lk 11:31-32, 13:24-30, 16:19-31, 18:18-27, 21:25-33; Jn 8:21, 14:3, 21:22.

⁴⁰ *ACTS*, 2,1, PG 60,26.

⁴¹ *JOHN*, 73,1, PG 59,395.

⁴² *JOHN*, 73, 2, PG 59,497.

you'. For a great abundance of dwellings is there, and it may not be said that they need preparation. When he said, 'You cannot follow me now', that they might not deem that they were finally cut off, he added, 'That where I am there you may be also: (Jn 13:3). So earnest have I been concerning this matter, that I should already have been given up to it, had not preparation been made long ago for you', showing them that they ought to be very bold and confident"⁴³.

It is clear that Christ, wishing to encourage his disciples who soon after his ascension and while carrying out their mission would face many adversities, reveals to them the future glory which they will enjoy through him eternally. He depicts this eschatological wealth and bliss through the "abundance of dwellings", which already exist and are not going to change. Of course, speaking of place and dwellings does not mean that he uses the categories of place as commonly perceived in the present material world. On the contrary, he implies a state which can only be approached and described by means of images with which we are already familiar⁴⁴. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the "great abundance of dwellings" implies a distinction of glory for the ones who live in them, as is shown in other words of Paul "for one star differs from another star in glory" (1Cor 15:41).

Apparently, a main characteristic of the relation of the apostles to the eschatological reality, according to St. Chrysostom, is the presence of the incarnated Son of God and their permanent presence where the Son is as well as their constant communion with him. This is also concluded from other words of Christ, "and again a little while and you will see me" (Jn 16:16), which mean that "he [Jesus] will both come to them again, and that their separation would be but for a little while and his presence with them continually"⁴⁵.

Chrysostom's interpretation of the following words of Christ about his apostles, "I desire that they may be with me, where I am, that they may behold my glory which you have given me" (Jn 17:24) is also interesting: "But why said he not, 'That they may share my glory', instead of, 'That they may behold my glory?' Here

⁴³ JOHN, 73.1, PG 59,496-497.

⁴⁴ See, B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John*, (1894) 200; P. Trempelas, *Υπόμνημα εις τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον*, pp. 506-508; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, (1978) 546. Cf., B. W. Bacon, "In my Father's House are many mansions", *Expository Times*, 43 (1932-1932) 477-478; R. H. Gundry, "In my Father's House are many monai", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 58 (1967) 68-72.

⁴⁵ JOHN, 74.1, PG 59,427.

he implies, that all that rest (ἀνάπαυσις) is looking on the Son of God. It is this certainly which causes them to be glorified; as Paul says, 'With open face mirroring the glory of the Lord' (2Cor 3:18). For as they look on the sunbeams, enjoy a very clear atmosphere, and draw their enjoyment from their sight, so then also, and in much greater degree, this will cause us pleasure"⁴⁶.

We notice that, according to Christ's words and their interpretation by Chrysostom, the bearers of the Apostolic Office will live in a constant communion with the eschatologically glorified Lord. As long as the apostles live within time and history, they are unable to follow Jesus in the perfect eschatological state. They will go there when time is abolished. Yet, Christ offers his disciples the exceptional possibility to live to a certain degree the eschatological reality within history. This is achieved with the mission of the Holy Spirit, as Chrysostom points out: "At first then he told them, 'You shall come whither I go' (Jn 13:36 and 14:3); and 'In my Father's house there are many mansions' (Jn 14:2); but here, since that time was long, he gives them the Spirit; and when, not knowing what it could be of which he spoke, they were not sufficiently comforted, 'I will not leave you orphans' (Jn 14:18), He says; for this they chiefly required. But since the, 'I will come to you', was the saying of one declaring a "presence", observe how in order that they might not again seek for the same kind of presence as before, he did not clearly tell them this thing, but hinted at it; for having said, 'Yet a little while, and the world sees me not'; He added, 'But you see me' (Jn 14:19). As though he had said, 'I come indeed to you, but not in the same way as before, ever being with you day by day'. And lest they should say, 'How then said you to the Jews, henceforth you will not see me?' (Mat 23:39), He solves the contradiction by saying, 'to you alone; for such also is the nature of the Spirit. Because I live, you will live also' (Jn 14:19). For the cross does not finally separate us, but only hides for a little moment, and by 'life' he seems to me to mean not the present only, but the future also"⁴⁷.

From what Chrysostom says it becomes clear that Christ's passion, expressed chiefly with the cross as its culmination, does not separate Christ from the apostles permanently, neither does it substantially alter their relationship. Simply the former is concealed for a short time due to the Lord's death and resurrection. After

⁴⁶ *JOHN*, 82.2-3, PG 59,445.

⁴⁷ *JOHN*, 75.b, PG 59,405.

that Jesus is connected to his apostles within the framework of the eschatological reality⁴⁸. During the post-resurrection historical era the presence of the Holy Spirit plays a very important role, creating the possibility of experiencing the eschatological reality already in the present⁴⁹. This is, while Jesus ascends to heaven physically, yet he continues to live close to and within the apostles in a different, eschatological way through the working of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that the use of the verb to live ('ζῆν') in the present tense for Jesus (ζῶ) and in the future tense for the apostles (ζήσεσθε) implies that while Jesus is the fixed point of the eschata, the apostles move towards them. The safe way leading there is Jesus Christ himself⁵⁰, "the witness who wants them to hold that glory"⁵¹.

Shortly before his ascension, Jesus Christ commanded his apostles to go and make disciples of all nations: "Unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8)⁵², promising that, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Mat 28:20). Referring to this promise, Chrysostom notes: "He reminds them also of the consummation that he may draw them on more, and that they may look not at the present dangers only, but also at the good things to come that are without end. 'For the irksome things', says he, 'that you will undergo are finished together with the present life, since at last even this world itself will come to an end, but the good things which you will enjoy remain immortal, as I have often told you before'. Thus, having invigorated and roused their minds by the remembrance of that day, he sent them forth"⁵³.

⁴⁸ W. Pannenberg points out: "The appearance of the risen Christ (1Cor. 15:6) implied not only the confirmation of his own mission, but also its revival for the disciples. Thus, the early Christian apostolate had its starting point in the experience of that eschatological reality of the Resurrection from the dead which appeared in Jesus" ("The significance of Eschatology...", *One in Christ* 6 (1970) 415).

⁴⁹ J. Zizioulas argues: "In the eschatological approach, however, things are again different. Here the Holy Spirit is the one who brings the eschata into history (Acts 2:17). He confronts the process of history with its consummation, with its transformation and transfiguration" (*op. cit.*, p. 180); cf. N. Q. Hamilton, "The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul", *Scottish Journal of Theol.*, 6 (1957) *Occasional Papers*).

⁵⁰ See, "For if I am the Lord, he says, you will reach the Father, being brought to him" (*JOHN*, 73,2, PG 59,398).

⁵¹ *JOHN*, 82,3, PG 59,445.

⁵² J. Zizioulas connects this mission of Christ's disciples to the eschata as follows: "Mission requires sending to the ends of the earth, whereas the eschata imply the convocation of the dispersed people of God from the ends of the earth to one place" (*op. cit.*, p. 174).

⁵³ *MAT*, 90,2, PG 58,790.

The reference to the end of the ages as well to the future gifts is once more made by the Lord so that the apostles are encouraged, something that has already happened before on a number of occasions. This clearly concerns the apostles, since He addresses the ones whom he "sent out". Since the holy father refers to the mission of Christ's disciples he apparently correlates the eschata to the Apostolic Office. In other words, he stresses the eschatological perspective of the office in the sense that its bearers draw on the reality of the eschata⁵⁴ for the strength they need to practise it and for the comfort they need for the imminent hardships. Therefore, the eschata are revealed by Christ to the apostles as a present historic reality, since they are fully exploited historically by the apostles.

In the last text the use of the verb "ἀναμνήσκειν" (to recall to mind), referring to the end of the ages, is worth mentioning. Normally, this verb should refer to a past event and not to a future reality, since recalling to mind presupposes reference to the past. The way it is actually used is, in my opinion, indicative of the way Chrysostom perceives the end of the age and the eschata, interpreting Christ's words accordingly. Thus, according to Chrysostom, when Jesus talks about the eschata he refers not to an exclusively future reality, but to a reality already existing.

Finally, important conclusions are also drawn from Jesus' words to the apostles, when he sent them out tentatively so that they were trained and prepared: "For there is nothing covered that will not be revealed, and hidden that will not be known" (Mat 10:26). On the basis of this extract Chrysostom notes: "Now what He says is like this. It is indeed sufficient for your encouragement, that I also shared with you in the same reproach; I who am your Master and Lord. But if it still grieve you to hear these words, consider these other things too, that even from this suspicion you will soon be released. For why do you grieve? At their calling you sorcerers and deceivers? But wait a little, and all men will address you as saviours, and benefactors of the world. Yes, for time discovers all things that are concealed, it will both refute their false accusation and make manifest your virtue. For when the event shows you saviours, and benefactors, and examples of all virtue, men will not give heed to their words, but to the real state of the case;... Let, not, there-

⁵⁴ On Chrysostom's correlating the sorrows to the eschata see P. Yazigi, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-243.

fore, what is now said humble you but let the hope of the good things to come raise you up. For it cannot be, that what relates to you should be hidden"⁵⁵.

At first sight, this text does not seem to be related to the eschata, since it refers to a revelation which is to be fulfilled in time. However, using the Chrysostomic connection between the eschata and history as a criterion, we understand that clearly the text has also an eschatological meaning. Chrysostom views the fulfilment of Christ's words to the apostles eschatologically, since he connects it to the eschatological gifts. Yet, this very fulfilment is also related to history, since the recognition of the apostles is also a reality within history. Therefore, according to what Chrysostom mentions above, Christ himself, on the one hand relates the Apostolic Office to eschatology, treating the latter as chief source of courage for the apostles, and on the other hand eschatology to history, since the fulfilment of his promises to the apostles starts from history and is concluded with the complete revelation of the eschata.

One of the points particularly worth our attention in the last cited extract is that the Apostolic Office is connected to the "truth". At the same time Chrysostom attributes an eschatological character to the "truth" placing it within the eschatological framework of the text. Thus, according to this viewpoint, truth or true is not whatever seems to be so in the eyes of people in the present of history but that which will prove to be so eschatologically with God's complete revelation. In the last analysis the truth is identical to the very Lord of Glory, who is the essence of the eschata⁵⁶. From this perspective, the eschata are a powerful and firm criterion in the hands of the bearers of the Apostolic Office so that they judge people and their actions.

3.3. The mindedness and preaching of the apostles about the eschata

According to St. Chrysostom, the eschatological reality forms a central point not only in Christ's words to the apostles but also in the apostolic preaching and in the very apostolic mindedness. The bearers of the Apostolic Office experience the eschatological reality living in the world while at the same time they testify to it to the people whom they address⁵⁷. Paul's words from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*

⁵⁵ *MAT*, 34.1, PG 57,399.

⁵⁶ See, "I am the way and the Truth and the Life" (Jn 14:6) and "the Truth and the Life [is the proof] of this, that these things will surely be" (*JOHN*, 73,2, PG 59, 398).

⁵⁷ See, "Did you see the apostle's concern? Did you see how they are one body? Did you also

(11:1) are typical in this occasion, because he connects the eschata with faith. Chrysostom, in his interpretation of the verse, includes it in his general eschatological perspective of the correlation between "the whole" and "the part"⁵⁸.

As we know from the apostolic *Acts* and *Epistles*, the nucleus or the main Person of reference in the apostolic preaching is Jesus Christ⁵⁹. Nevertheless, when the apostles preach Jesus Christ, they preach him not only as the inhominated Son of God⁶⁰ or as the one who rose from the dead⁶¹, but also as "the one who is coming"⁶² and "the one who shall judge the quick and the dead"⁶³. It is this kind of preaching that Chrysostom talks about when he interprets the *Second Epistle to Timothy*. "I charge you therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick and the dead' (2Tim 4:1)... that is, who will call them to account 'at his appearing and his kingdom'. When will he judge? at his appearing with glory, and in his kingdom either he says this to show that he will not come in the way that he now come, or, 'I call to witness his coming, and his kingdom'. He calls him to witness, showing that he had reminded him of that appearing"⁶⁴.

According to Chrysostom's interpretation, Paul here, as well as the other bearers of the Apostolic Office in general, not only preaches about the eschata, but at the same time he uses the eschatological truth as the basis upon which he places his missionary work. That is precisely why Paul calls Jesus Christ as the glorious Judge of the universe to testify to what he says to Timothy. Using Christ thus as the Judge directly leads us to the eschata because this feature of Christ is connected to his second and not to his first coming⁶⁵. Yet, the fact that he is called

see how much Peter was concerned with the present as well as the future things? So Paul did; therefore he was saying 'Understand this, that in the last days will come times of stress' (2Tim 3:1)" (*In illud, Hoc autem scitote*, 5, PG 56,276); cf. Badger, A.B., *The role of the New Testament apostolate in the eschatological plan of God*, Dallas Theol. Seminar, 1987.

⁵ object of hope seem to be unsubstantial, faith gives them substantiality, or rather, does not give it, but is itself their substance. For instance, the Resurrection has not come, nor does it exist substantially, but hope makes it substantial in our soul. This is [the meaning of] 'the substance of things'... You have labored [he says], you have struggled: I too allow this, nevertheless, wait; for this is faith: do not seek the whole here" (*HEBR*, 21,2, PG 63,151).

⁵⁹ See, among others, Acts 8:35; 18:5,25; 19:13; 28:23; 1Cor 12:3; 2Cor 4:10; 11:4; Eph 4:21; 1Tim 4:14; Hebr 4:14.

⁶⁰ See, Rom 1:3-4; Gal 4:4.

⁶¹ See, Acts 2:24; 13:33; 17:31; 1Tim 4:14.

⁶² See, Acts 1:11; 1Cor 4:5; Hebr 10:37; 2John 7; Rev 1:4,8.

⁶³ 2Tim 4:1; 1Pe 4:5.

⁶⁴ *2TIM*, 9,1, PG 62,650-651.

⁶⁵ "For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved" (Jn 3:17). "Because He has appointed a day on which He will judge the world in righteousness by Man whom He has ordained. He has given assurance of this to all in

as witness means that he automatically becomes Judge at the moment the apostle is speaking. Therefore the feature of "judging" in Christ does not belong to the future only, but also to the present. Particularly characteristic in this context is the use of the verb "ἀνέμνησεν" (recalled to mind), which refers to "his appearing and his kingdom ", while we know that the latter is a future event. This again shows that the eschatological reality, which is connected to Jesus Christ, is present in history. We become aware of this truth in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, as bishop John Zizioulas has pointed out: "When the eschata visit us, the Church's anamnesis acquires the eucharistic paradox which no historical consciousness can ever comprehend, i.e. the memory of the future, as we find it in the anaphora of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. 'Remembering, Thine own of thine own we offer Thee'"⁶⁶.

If we correlate the way the verb "ἀναμνήσκειν" is referred to in Paul's words with the way it is referred to in Christ's words⁶⁷, we see that Chrysostom does not simply see no difference between Christ's eschatological revelation and Paul's eschatological apostolic preaching, as modern scholars argue⁶⁸. In contrast he presents Paul as perceiving the eschata in exactly the way Christ taught, or as having received the same eschatological reality as it was revealed by Christ.

Further below in the same homily Chrysostom interpreting Paul's words (2Tim 4:8) notes: "But he did not say, 'and to you', but 'to all', meaning, if to all, much more to him. But how, it may be asked, is one to 'love the appearing' of Christ? By rejoicing at his coming; and he who rejoices at his coming, will perform works worthy of his joy; he will throw away his substance if need be, and even his life, so that he may obtain future blessings, that he may be thought worthy to behold that second coming in a fitting state, in confidence, in brightness and glory. This is to 'love his appearing'. He who loves his appearing will do everything to ensure before His general coming, a particular coming to himself. And how, you will say, is this possible? Hear from Christ, who says, 'If a man loves me, he will keep my words, and my father and I will come unto him and make our abode with him' (Jn

that He has raised Him from the dead. (Acts 17:31).

⁶⁶ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, p. 180.

⁶⁷ See, footnote 32 of the present chapter.

⁶⁸ See, footnote 53 of the present chapter.

14:23). And think how great a privilege it is that he who will appear to all generally, should promise to come to us in particular"⁶⁹.

This interpretation of the apostolic words helps us considerably to comprehend two important points of the relations between eschatology and the Apostolic Office. The first is to do with how the very bearers of the Apostolic Office perceive the eschatological reality, while the second is to do with how they experience it. As regards the first, Chrysostom argues that the apostles (and especially Paul here) talk about two eschatological advents and, therefore, two Judgements of Christ: A partial, which refers to each human being individually being apparently related to his / her physical death⁷⁰, and a general, which refers to all human beings being the glorious second coming of the Lord.

As regards the second point, Chrysostom particularly stresses the apostles' love for Christ's appearing. He considers the joy of the apostles as an expression of their love for Christ's presence. Thus, he also gives this apostolic joy an eschatological content, since in effect it springs out from the relationship of the apostles both with the resurrected and with the final Judge, Lord Jesus Christ⁷¹. I think that in this way the eschatological purpose of the bearers of the Apostolic Office is firstly expressed and then moulds their "βίωμα" (= a deep-rooted subconscious system of experiences and beliefs through which the individual perceives the world inside and around him).

Elsewhere, interpreting Paul's words to the Philippians, "I press toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus " (Phil 3:14), Chrysostom once more gives us both the content of the eschatological "prize"

⁶⁹ 2TIM 9,3, PG 62,653.

⁷⁰ See, "'That you keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1Tim 6:14). That is, till your departure hence, though he does not express it, but that he may the more arouse him, says, 'till His appearing' (1TIM 18,1, PG 62,597). Gregory of Nyssa considers physical death as the beginning of the way to the eschatological perfection. "Death would be a good thing, the beginning and the road leading to the better things" (*Oratio funeri de Pulcheria*, PG 46,877).

⁷¹ "How then does Paul say, 'Rejoice away?' He does not say simply, 'Rejoice', but he adds, 'in the Lord' (Phil 4:4). This is the greatest joy, such as the apostles rejoice withal (*ACTS*, 16,3, PG 60,132). Cf., also, "We consider the joy in God and for God and that which is caused by doing good works to be the most complete and truly perfect, because of the fixed and unshakable hope" (Cyril of Alexandria, *Com. in Johannem*, 10,2 [4,886]). W. Schmithals referring especially to Paul, points out: "The apostle is in a special way an eschatological figure. This 'in a special way' suggests that with the apostolate an eschatological conception is bound up, which includes more than the obvious fact that the apostle is entrusted with the eschatological message. The proclamation of the end of the world which has broken in with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ" (*The office apostle...*, p. 44). However, Schmithals does not go beyond 'the proclamation' and he does not mark any apostolic experience of the eschata.

(βραβεῖον) and the mindedness of the apostle for the eschata. "And what is the prize? No palm branch; but what? the kingdom of heaven, everlasting rest, glory together with Christ, the inheritance, brotherhood, the thousand good things, which is impossible to name; it is impossible to describe the beauty of that prize; he who is holding it alone knows it, and he who is about to receive it... If you have this and take your departure to heaven, you will be able to walk there with great honour; the angels will reverence you, when you bear this prize with much confidence will you approach them all"⁷².

It should be noted here that once more a connection of the eschata to the present is attempted. Thus, he who knows (οἶδεν) the eschatological prize, is "he who is holding it" (ὁ κρατῶν αὐτὸ) and "he who is about to receive it" (ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸ λαμβάνειν). Although, "he who is about to receive it" is still within the framework of history, he, also, takes part in the eschata since "he is holding it" already. This Chrysostomic phrase is particularly characteristic in this context showing that the believer and, to a much larger extent, the apostle already participate partially in the eschatological reality and are going to participate in it fully.

The above cited chrysostomic description of the eschatological reality which is offered to the believers as a prize and, definitely, to the apostles, is given both affirmatively and negatively. This double mode of the theology of the eschata is simply the way in which the apostles used to preach about them⁷³.

The eschatological reality as seen by the apostles does not only include the "hidden gifts"⁷⁴ which "eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for those who love him" (1Cor 2:9) but, also, "punishment" (κολάσεις) and "wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Mat 8:12). That is why Paul preaches "continuously thinking of the hell of fire"⁷⁵. Thus, it is true that Paul as well as the other apostles tend to refer often not only to the positive but also to the negative aspect of eschatology. This is stressed by Chrysostom in his homily on Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*: "For since he said, 'Do you think this, you who judge those who do such things, and do the same, that you

⁷² PHIL 12,2, PG 62,272.

⁷³ Cf. Acts 17:31; 26:18; 1Cor 3:13-15; 2Cor 5:1; 1Thess 4:17; 2Thess 1:8; 2Pet 3:12-13.

⁷⁴ MAT, 34,3, PG 57,402.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* Also "Do you see that both the good things and the evil things are there to be dispensed?" (*ibid.*).

will escape the judgement of God?' (Rom 2:3); that you may not expect such a sentence as you pass yourself, but you may know, that that of God is far more exact than thine own, he brings in 'the secrets of men', and adds 'through Jesus Christ according to my gospel' (Rom 2:16)... Do you see with what wisdom he has bound them both to the gospel and to Christ, and demonstrated that our affairs come not here to stand still but travel further. And this he made good before also, when he said, 'You treasure up to yourself wrath against the day of wrath' (Rom 2:5); here again, 'God shall judge the secrets of men' (Rom 2:16). Now let each man enter his own conscience, and reckoning up his transgressions, let him call himself to a strict account that we be not then condemned with the world (1Cor 11:32). For fearful is that court, awful the tribunal, full of trembling the accounts, a river of fire rolls alone, (Dan 7:10)"⁷⁶.

One of the most characteristic phrases of the text above with which Chrysostom summarises both the apostolic mindedness and the apostolic preaching is the following: "Do you see with what wisdom he [Paul] has... demonstrated that our affairs come not here to stand still but travel further". In other words "our things" (τὰ ἡμέτερα), that is, the truths and life which the believers experience and the ministers, are not confined to the narrow limits of the present historical reality but extend beyond it to the eschata, since all of them are connected to the Gospel and Christ. It is that ultimate reality that every single human being is connected to, his salvation being served by the Apostolic Office. Therefore, even from the perspective of the preparation of people so that they are saved and fully enjoy the eternal gifts, the Apostolic Office is directly related to eschatology. It seems that according to Chrysostom, the Apostolic Office functions as an instigator arousing the believers so that they enter eternal rest, as Chrysostom points out: "So that on this account Paul exhorts those who had already been counted worthy of the mysteries saying, "Let us labour to enter into that rest" (Heb 4:11). "Let us labour [he says], faith not sufficing, the life also ought to be added there to, and our earnestness to be great; for truly there is need of much earnestness too, in order to go up into heaven"⁷⁷.

⁷⁶ ROM 5,5-6, PG 60,429-430. Some scholars have pointed out the fact that Chrysostom accepts eternity of hell, differentiates him from other Alexandrian and Antiochene fathers, who had rejected it (see P. Christou, *op. cit.* vol. 4, p. 303).

⁷⁷ HEBR 7,1, PG 63,60.

The bearers of the Apostolic Office, following the example of their teacher, use in their missionary work chiefly the word and miracle (preaching and signs) as their means. The signs of the apostles, just like Jesus', declare the presence of the kingdom of God and therefore, of the eschatological reality in history.

Referring to Christ's reply to the Jews, by whom he was accused of casting out "demons by Beelzebul", and to his reply which refers to the signs of the apostles (Mat 12:24-30), Chrysostom connects the kingdom of God to Christ's presence in time. "For, if I say he, by Beelzebul cast out devils, by whom do you sinners cast them out? (Mat 12:24)... But what he says is like this, By whom do the apostles cast them out? For in fact they were doing so already, because they had received authority from him, and these men brought no charge against them;... 'But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you' (Mat 12:28). What means 'the Kingdom'? My coming... Then to conciliate them, he said not simply, 'The kingdom is come', but, 'unto you', as though he had said, 'To you the good things are come'"⁷⁸.

This correlating of the "gifts" to the kingdom, also, shows that, according to Chrysostom, the kingdom of God is identical to the eschatological reality. Thus, the apostles, who do signs by virtue of their office, testify to the presence of the kingdom of God in history⁷⁹. Interpreting the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, Chrysostom characteristically notes: "Again among us has fruit been brought, fruit from heaven, not the cluster of grapes borne upon the staff (Num 13:23), but the "betrothal of the Spirit" (2Cor 1:22), "the citizenship which is in heaven" (Phil 3:20) which Paul and the whole company of the apostles, those marvellous husbandmen, have taught us"⁸⁰. What the apostles received, possessed and managed was "part of the whole" and, according to Chrysostom, is to be found chiefly in the sacraments, for the carrying out of which the bearers of the Apostolic Office had been authorised⁸¹.

⁷⁸ MAT, 41.1-2, PG 57,446-447.

⁷⁹ A relevant observation by G. Patronos, is worth our attention: "The apostle as the nucleus of Christ's Church shows us from the present moment the new eschatological reality of the kingdom of God, where ' by the power of the Spirit ' all these 'signs' and 'wonders' are performed as well as the casting out of demons (Rom 15, 19)" (*Η βιβλική θεμελίωσις...*, p. 41).

⁸⁰ EPH 23,3. PG 62,167.

⁸¹ Chrysostom talks extensively on the eschatological reality and associates it with the apostles and their office, especially in his homily to Eutropius: "You all know that ἀρραβών is a small part of the whole; ...He therefore gave the ἀρραβών. What ἀρραβών? The Holy Spirit, the provision of the Spirit... He gave the ἀρραβών of the ring, and giving the ἀρραβών, he says: 'I give you some, and I promise you some'... He granted to its [the Church's] remission of sins,

3.4. The exploitation of the "καιρός" by the bearers of the Apostolic Office

The fact that the apostles connect the eschatological reality to history both in their preaching and in their experience must have become clear from what has been said so far. Yet, Chrysostom proceeds even further and refers to the apostles using the "καιρός" (fit time) for this connection. On the grounds of Paul's teaching about the "acceptable time" (εὐπρόσδεκτος καιρός) (2Cor 6:2; Rom 13:11) he comments: "For not only from the greatness of the blessing and his love for mankind, but also from the shortness of the time he urges them [Corinthian Christians] continually. Wherefore he says also elsewhere, 'For now is our salvation nearer' (Rom 13:11). And again; 'The Lord is at hand' (Phil 4:5). But here he does something yet more. For not from the fact that the remainder of the time is short and little, but also from its being the only season available for salvation, he incited them. For, 'Behold', he says, 'now is the acceptable time; Behold, now is the day of salvation' (2 Cor 6:2)"⁸².

This extract shows that Chrysostom connects the Apostolic Office with the eschata through the "καιρός". This "καιρός"⁸³ is the historical time during which the eschata are revealed through the inhomination of the Son of God and within which the apostles practise their office. Additionally, it is connected directly to the eschata because it is "the only season available for salvation"⁸⁴.

Chrysostom underlines the same truth but much more vividly, when he interprets Paul's words, "Besides this you know what the hour is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed" (Rom 13:11). He says: "For the time of judgement, he means, is at the doors. So too he wrote to the Corinthians also, 'The remaining time is short' (1Cor 7:29). And to the Hebrews again, 'For yet a little while, and he that shall

deliverance from punishment, righteousness, sanctification, redemption, Dominical body, divine and spiritual table, resurrection of the dead. For the apostles possessed all these" (*In Eutropium*, 12, PG 52,407).

⁸² COR, 7,1, PG 61,481.

⁸³ Cf. Dellling, "καιρός", *TDNT*, v.3, p.455-461.

⁸⁴ It should be noted that the suitability (ἐπιτηδειότητα) of the "fit time" for salvation is related to the two Comings of the Son of God; the first during which He "sent the apostles to comfort [people]", and the Second in which He himself is expected to "come with glory that He may judge the living and dead" (See T. H. Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, (1989) 64).

come will come, and will not tarry' (Heb 10:37) ... and what is that which he says, 'Now it is high time to awake out of sleep?' (Rom 13:11). It is that near is the Resurrection, near the awful Judgement, and the day that burns as a furnace, near... 'for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed' (*ibid.*). You see how he puts their resurrection now close by them. For as the time advances, he means, the time of our present life is wasting away, and that of the life to come waxes nearer. If then you are prepared, and have done all whatsoever he has commanded, the day is salvation to you; but in the contrary, not so... If then this is ending, and the latter is drawing near, let us henceforth do what belongs to the latter, not to the former. For this is what is done in the things of this life. And when we see the night pressing outwards the morning, and hear the swallow twittering, we each of us awake our neighbour, although it is night still. But as soon as it is actually departing, we hasten one another, and say, It is day now! and we all set about the works of the day, dressing, and leaving our dreams and shaking our sleep thoroughly off, that the day may find us ready, and we may not have to begin getting up, and stretching ourselves, when the sunlight is up. What, then, we do in that case that let us do here also. Let us put aside imaginings, let us get clear of the dreams of this life present, let us lay aside its deep slumber, and be clad in virtue for garments"⁸⁵.

The chrysostomic image of dawn which ushers in the day vividly reflects the connection between history and eschatology simultaneously designating the "καιρός" which is exploited by the bearers of the Apostolic Office. The "καιρός", which in this image is identified with the dawn, belongs to history ("although it is night still"), but at the same time it also brings the eschata ("and say, It is day now! and we all set about the works of the day").

It seems that the image presented above by Chrysostom helps us to designate interpretatively other apostolic expressions, such as "ἔσχατοι χρόνοι"⁸⁶, "ἔσχαται ἡμέραι"⁸⁷, "ἔσχάτη ὥρα"⁸⁸, "σήμερον"⁸⁹ and "νῦν"⁹⁰. Chrysostom tackles all these expressions connected within the same eschatological framework⁹¹

⁸⁵ ROM, 24,1, PG 60, 621-623.

⁸⁶ 1Pe 1:5; 1:20; Jud 18.

⁸⁷ Acts 2:17; 2Tim 3:1; Hebr 1:2; Jam 5:3; 2 Pe 3:3.

⁸⁸ 1Jn 2:18.

⁸⁹ Hebr 3:7, 4:7, 13:8. Cf. "For 'today' means 'for ever', until the world exists" (*HEBR*, 6,1, PG 63,55). "For as long as we live in this world, 'today' still applies" (*Ibid.*, 6,3, PG 63,57).

⁹⁰ Rom 8:18, 13:11; 2Cor 5:16, 6:2; Gal 2:20; Eph 2:13.

⁹¹ "Well also said he, 'at the end of the days'. (Heb 1:2), for by this he both stirs them up and encourages them not responding any more. For as he says also in another place, 'The Lord is at

. Clearly, all the above cited phrases present history being intersected by the eschata, while each one of them stresses a particular aspect of this intersection. The use of these phrases on the part of the bearers of the Apostolic Office confirms the fact that the latter are fully aware of the presence of the eschata within history and exploit it in their preaching. Thus, the Apostolic Office through exploiting the "καιρός" becomes in effect a ministry to the body of the Church.

3.5. The Apostolic Office as ministry to the "bridal procession"

The relations between the Apostolic Office and eschatology can also be traced in Chrysostom's interpretation of the parable of the marriage feast (Mat 22:1-14) and that of the image of Christ as the bridegroom (Mat 9:15; Mk 2:19; Lk 5:34), where another aspect of these relations can be seen. Commenting on the relevant parable from the *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, Chrysostom notes: "Wherefore is it called a marriage? One may say. That you might learn God's tender care, his yearning towards us, the cheerfulness of the state of things, that there is nothing sorrowful there, nor sad, but all things are full of spiritual joy. Therefore also John calls him a bridegroom (Jn 3:20), therefore Paul again says, "For I have espoused you to one husband" (2Cor 11:2); and, 'This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church' (Eph 5:32)"⁹².

From the above it becomes clear that Chrysostom interprets both the parable and the image of the bridegroom Christ eschatologically, since he refers both to the reality of the perfection and, what is more, in connection to God⁹³. A little further down he connects this eschatological reality to the apostles and their office, identifying them with the last group of servants of God sent and, thus, places them within the complete divine plan. He notes: "For since in what went before he had spoken of the death, he shows that even after the death, then is the marriage, then the bridegroom. But even so these do not become better men, nor more gentle, and

hand, be careful for nothing' (Phil 4:5-6), and again, 'For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed' (Rom 13:11) so also here. What then is it that he says? That whoever is spent in the conflict, when he hears of the end thereof, recovers his breath a little, knowing that it is the end indeed of his labours, but the beginning of his rest" (*HEBR*, 1,1, PG 63,14-15).

⁹² *MAT*, 69,1, PG 58,648.

⁹³ The following Chrysostomic words seem to point out this direction: "As at the marriage the maiden goes not to the bridegroom, but he hastens to her, though he is a King's Son, and though he is about to espouse some poor and abject person, or even a servant, so it was here. Man's nature did not go up, but contemptible and poor as it was, He came to it, and when the marriage had taken place, He suffered it no longer to tarry here, but having taken it to himself, transported it to the home of his Father" (*JOHN*, 18,2, PG 59,115).

what can be worse than that? For this again is a third accusation. The first that they killed the prophets; then the son; afterwards that even when they had slain him, and were bidden unto the marriage of him, that was slain, by the very one that was slain, they come not, but feign excuses... And when were they bidden? By all the prophets; by John again;... by the Son himself again... But not by words only, but also by actions did he bid them, after his ascension by Peter, and those with him. 'For he that worked effectually in Peter', it is said, 'to the apostleship of the circumcision, was mightily also in me towards the Gentiles' (Gal 2:8). For, since on seeing the Son, they were wroth and slew him, he bids them again by his servants. And unto what does he bid them? Unto labours, and toils, and sweat? Nay but unto pleasure"⁹⁴.

In the last group of servants of the parable Chrysostom recognises Christ's apostles, including Paul in them. And he seems to accept that their mission is directly connected to the eschatological reality, chiefly for two reasons. Firstly, because the bearers of the Apostolic Office are connected to the "Bridegroom", who forms the central Person of the "marriage", that is of the eschatological reality, and who sends them out to invite the people. Secondly, because the apostles invite "to pleasure" (ἐπι τρυφήν), which is a characteristic feature of the world to come⁹⁵.

The fact that the "marriage" and the "bridegroom" as well as the ministry of the apostles, are all placed "after death" with Christ's resurrection as the starting point, shows that the eschata to which the apostles invite (the people) constitute a tangible reality, also within history. Christ as bridegroom, whom the apostles serve by means of their office, forms the intersection between the eschata and history. From this perspective the Apostolic Office refers to eschatology through the Lord as bridegroom. If now this position is correlated with Chrysostom's interpretation of the "ἄρραβών", it can be argued that while the apostles can be seen as people in charge of the bridal procession (νυμφαγωγοί)⁹⁶, their office can be said to be

⁹⁴ MAT, 69,1, PG 58,648-649.

⁹⁵ Although Chrysostom usually uses "τρυφή" with a negative meaning (for example, MAT, 13,1, PG 57,210,2; ACTS, 27,3, PG 60,208,30; ICOR, 39,9, PG 61,348,6), some times assigns a positive eschatological meaning to this term (PSALM, 41,6, PG 55,165,35; MAT, 61,5, PG 58,595,2; ROM, 4,4, PG 60,422,23; 2COR, 9,3, PG 61,463,33.).

⁹⁶ See, "When, therefore, I hear of Paul I think of a man who is in affliction, in difficulties...[I mean] Christ's leader of the bride" (*In illud, Paulus vocatus...*, 4,3, PG 51,149). Also, "He [the Son] too was killed when He had come, and yet not even then did He quench his love, but kindled it even more, and kept on beseeching us, after even his own Son was killed, and entreating us, and

ministry to the process of the betrothal, that is of the connection of the people to Bridegroom Lord with the ultimate goal to take part in his marriage⁹⁷. It is exactly this relation that Chrysostom talks about, referring to John the Baptist and Paul's words, and calling it "bridal procession" (νυμφαγωγία).⁹⁸ "But what means, 'He who stands and hears him rejoices greatly, because of the Bridegroom's voice? He transfers the expression from the parable to the subject in hand; for after mentioning the bridegroom and the bride, he shows how the bride is brought home that is, by a voice and teaching. For thus the Church is wedded to God; and therefore Paul says. "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God" (Rom 10:17).⁹⁹

Having considered the above, we can argue that, according to Chrysostom, the Apostolic Office is clearly eschatologically orientated, not only in the sense that it is directed to the eschatological reality to be and preaches it, but also in the sense that it experiences and ministers this reality, which is already present in history¹⁰⁰.

3.6. The place of the Apostolic Office in the Last Judgement and beyond

While the presence of the Apostolic Office and of its bearers after the central eschatological event of the Christ's second coming is referred to in very few cases in the Holy Scriptures¹⁰¹, there can be found no clear reference of the sort in relation to the very event of the Second Coming itself. Nevertheless, describing the event of the Second Coming, Chrysostom, also, mentions the apostles amongst the ones who will be following Christ "coming in glory" (Mat 25:31): "For the Lord of us all will come and will not delay. He will come bringing with him multitudes, orders of angels, divisions of archangels, leagues of martyrs, choirs of righteous,

doing all things to turn us unto himself. And Paul cries aloud, saying, 'Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: be you reconciled to God' (2 Cor 5:20)" (ROM, 5,6, PG 60,431).

⁹⁷ "For the present time is time of betrothal; the time of marriage is another, when they say that 'the bridegroom is risen' " (2COR, 23,1, PG 61,553).

⁹⁸ One of the hymns from the Orthodox hymnology dedicated to the apostle Ananias expresses this very truth: "Glorious Ananias leads to blameless Bridegroom the spotless bride, who is the present Church of Christ; let us praise with her our God" (Troparion of the Canon in Matins on 1st of October in, *Μηνναῖον*, v. 9).

⁹⁹ JOHN, 29,3, PG 59,170.

¹⁰⁰ J. Zizioulas argues: "In stressing the difference between the 'missionary' and the 'eschatological' images of apostolate, I do not wish to deny the eschatological character of the apostolic mission as it appears especially in Paul (see on this works mentioned in previous note, esp. Pannenberg and Congar). But I maintain the view that there is a difference between eschatology conceived as orientation, and eschatology conceived as a state of existence which reveals itself here and now" (*Being as Communion*, p. 174).

¹⁰¹ See, among others, Mat 19:28; Rev 21:14.

bands of prophets and apostles, and in the middle of those immaterial multitudes the King will appear in ineffable and inexpressible glory"¹⁰².

The angels, whom Chrysostom mentions as the coming Lord's attendants, are referred to explicitly and repeatedly in the New Testament texts¹⁰³. Yet, neither the apostles nor the prophets refer to these texts. Here the question arises: What does the holy father base his argument on? His only possible source may be 1Cor 15:23 where there is reference to Christ's resurrection as the starting point, as well as to the final resurrection of the people, which coincides with the Last Judgement. Chrysostom interprets this extract in this context as follows: "Christ the first-fruits, then they that belong to Christ' (1Cor 15:23); that is, the faithful and the approved. 'Then comes the end'. For when these shall have an end, not as now when after Christ's resurrection things abide yet in suspense. Wherefore he added, 'at his coming', that you may learn that he is speaking of that time"¹⁰⁴. It sounds plausible that in the phrase "Christ's, that is the faithful and the approved" there are included all saints and, primarily, all prophets and apostles who will appear escorting the Lord coming with glory.

This presence of the apostles in the triumphant Second Coming is also connected with Christ's other words to the Twelve, "You who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Mat 19:28). Listening to these words we tend to assume that during the Last Judgement the apostles will have a substantial legal authority and that they, instead of Christ, will judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Yet, Chrysostom's interpretation of these words of the Lord is somewhat different. Let us follow it: "Now to the disciples he promised things to come, saying, 'You will sit on twelve thrones' (Mat 19:28), for they were now of a higher stamp, and sought after none of the things of the present world, but to the rest he promises also what are here... But what is, 'judging the twelve tribes of Israel'? This is 'condemning them'. For they are not surely to sit as judges, but like as he said the Queen of the South should condemn that generation, and the Ninevites shall condemn them; so now these also. Therefore he said not, the nations, and the world, but the tribes of Israel. For since both the Jews alike and the apostles had been brought up under the same laws, and customs, and polity;

¹⁰² *PENT*, 5, PG 550,461.

¹⁰³ See Mat 13:39, 16:27, 24:31, 25:31; Mark 8:38; Lk 9:26; 2Tim 1:7.

¹⁰⁴ *ICOR*, 39.3, PG 61,337.

when the Jews said, that for this cause they could not believe in Christ, because the law forbade to receive his commandments, by bringing forward these men, who had received the same law, and yet had believed, he condemns all those; like as even already he had said, "therefore they will be your judges" (Mat 12:27). And what great thing does he promise them, it may be said, if what the Ninevites have and the Queen of the South, these are to have also? In the first place he had promised them many other things before this, and after this does promise them, and this alone is not their reward. And besides even in this he intimated by the way something more than these things. For of those he simply said, 'The men of Nineveh will rise up and condemn this generation' and, 'The Queen of the South shall condemn it;' but concerning these, not merely thus, but now? 'When the son of Man will sit upon the throne of his glory, then shall you also sit upon twelve thrones', says he, declaring, that they also will reign with him and partake of that glory. 'For if we suffer', it is said, 'we shall also reign with him'. For neither do the thrones signify a sitting (in judgement), for he alone is the one that shall sit and judge but honour and glory unspeakable did he intimate by the thrones"¹⁰⁵.

The parallel examples of the men of Nineveh and of the Queen of the South which Chrysostom uses are particularly characteristic and helpful in the direction of clearly presenting the bearers of the Apostolic Office as judges in the Last Judgement. By means of these examples it becomes clear that when the apostles are referred to as judges this does not imply the specific legal judgement which belongs to the absolute Judge, the God-man coming in glory, but a comparison between the apostles and their fellow country men who did not believe in the One sent by the Father. This fact alone proves them guilty and leads to their conviction.

In the above Chrysostom's interpretation it is important to note that the fact that the Twelve will be seated in the twelve thrones does not imply assuming and exercising legal authority, but partaking of the glory of King Jesus and enjoying unspeakable honour. If there is something which will distinguish the apostles from the other believers after the Second Coming in God's eternal kingdom, this is the degree of the exceeding honour and glory. The energy of their office is not mentioned: connected to the ministry of reconciliation and comfort it seems to be completed in the Second Coming, as Chrysostom characteristically points out: "Do

¹⁰⁵ *MAT*, 64.2, PG 58,610-611. See, also, "For that throne is inaccessible to everybody, I do say, not to men only, saints and apostles, but also to angels and archangels" (*MAT* 65,3, PG 58,620).

not therefore, because He has sent some to exhort you, deem that this will always be so. It will be so until his Second Coming; until then he beseeches, so long as we are here; but after that is judgement and punishment. Therefore, he says, 'we are constrained'¹⁰⁶.

When Chrysostom refers to the eschatological reality after the Last Judgement, he, usually, describes it as the kingdom of heaven (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), or rest (κατάπαυσις)¹⁰⁷, or repose (ἀνάπαυσις)¹⁰⁸, in which the saints of the Church rule alongside with the Lord; and in a sample of them the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and all saints are mentioned. "Therefore we, looking steadily at it, hold our city Jerusalem in our mind, always thinking of its beauty. It is the metropolis of the King of the ages, where there are Spirits of righteous, choirs of patriarchs, apostles and all saints. There everything is peaceful and never passes away"¹⁰⁹. In this eternal city, which is "the Church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven"¹¹⁰, the apostles, being rid of the heavy responsibilities of their office, will remain its glorified members and valuable ornaments¹¹¹.

3.7. Conclusions

1. In Chrysostom's works connections between the Apostolic Office and its bearers and eschatology are not only clear but also of a determining nature. Chrysostom places these connections within the general framework of the eschatological perspective.

On the basis of the New Testament eschatological texts which he interprets, Chrysostom perceives the eschata not simply as an anticipated event, but as a complete reality which exceeds the categories of time and is expressed through the

¹⁰⁶ 2COR, 7,1, PG 61,481.

¹⁰⁷ See, "What other rest then is there, except the Kingdom of Heaven of which the Sabbath was an image and type?" (HEBR, 6,1, PG 63,55).

¹⁰⁸ See, "For that is indeed rest, where 'pain, sorrow and sighing are fled away' (Is 35:10): where there are neither cares, nor labors, nor struggle, nor fear of stunning and shaking the soul; but only that fear of God which is full of delight" (Ibid., 6,4, PG 63,58-59).

¹⁰⁹ PSALM, 47,4, PG 55,221. Origen describes the situation in the eternal city in a similar way: "And the Lord will ascend to the Jerusalem above, driving the believers from the circumcision and the gentiles, that is, prophets and apostles, or angels serving him, who precede or succeed him" (Commentarii in evangelium Joannis (ed. C. Blanc), 10,29,182).

¹¹⁰ PHILOG, 1, PG 48,749. Cf., also, Rev 21:12 and Hebr 12:23.

¹¹¹ Gregory of Nyssa vividly describes the heavenly city as follows: "...in heavenly tabernacles, where there are orders of angels, choirs of prophets, thrones of apostles, joy of martyrs, rejoicings of saints, splendour of teachers, festival of first-born and clear sound of those who celebrate there" (In sanctum Ephraim, PG 46,848).

glory and kingdom of God. More particularly his interpretation of the New Testament term "ὁ ἄρραβὼν" proves to be the typological measure in determining the connections between eschatological reality and history. This joining of the eschata to history is based on time being intersected by the Son of God through his inhomination, but also on the working of the Paraclete Spirit. Beyond any implication of the so-called "eschatology to be" or "fulfilled eschatology" it clearly shows the presence of the eschata in the present of history.

2. Referring to Jesus Christ's words to the apostles about the eschata, Chrysostom shows that, a) during the time they were Christ's disciples the apostles gradually familiarised themselves with the eschatological reality. b) Jesus enabled the apostles to experience the eschatological reality to a certain degree within history. This fact is the best guarantee that they will also enjoy the perfect eschatological communion with God. c) Jesus revealed the eschata to the apostles as a present reality from which they can draw courage so that they could tackle the adversities in their work. d) Jesus attributed eschatological content to the truth of events which became the infallible criterion with which the apostles judged.

3. Chrysostom accepts that eschatological reality colours both the mindedness and the preaching of the bearers of the Apostolic Office. More particularly, a) the apostles perceived the eschata in the way Jesus did and preached exactly the same teaching which they had received from him. b) The eschatological mindedness of the apostles is additionally expressed through their joy which is characterized by its eschatological content. c) The eschatological reality as preached by the apostles is presented affirmatively as enjoyment of secret gifts and negatively as "judgment of God" and "hell fire". d) By performing signs the apostles testified to the presence of the kingdom of God in history.

4. Chrysostom connects the Apostolic Office with the eschata through the "καιρός". More particularly, he points out that, a) "καιρός" is the intersection of history achieved through God's making his way into it through the inhomination. b) The bearers of the Apostolic Office exploited this very time in order to carry out their work.

5. Chrysostom sees the Apostolic Office as the bridal procession of the Church towards Bridegroom Christ, since its bearers a) are connected both to the Bride-

groom Lord and the Bride Church; b) are sent out by God to invite (people) to the marriage.

6. Finally, as regards the Lord's second coming and everything else beyond it, Chrysostom believes that, a) Even though the apostles will be following the Lord coming in glory, their work will have been completed; b) The twelve tribes of Israel being judged by the twelve apostles does not imply real legal authority and verdict; it only means that the apostles' lives will be used as a criterion by which their fellow countrymen will be judged; c) After the Last Judgement the Apostolic Office will cease to have a field of action, but its bearers will enjoy exceptional glory and will be distinguished members of the heavenly Jerusalem of the Church of the first-born.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Being a bishop of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, John Chrysostom belongs to the successors of the bearers of the Apostolic Office, the holy apostles, and as such he is able to bear witness to that office.

He does this in his voluminous work which is based on both the Tradition of the Church, oral and written, and his personal experience. Even though he does not write any special treatise on the Apostolic Office, yet in his numerous references to the apostles and their office he exploits the relevant Biblical elements to the full so that one can easily reconstruct his position.

In his handling of the Biblical texts referring to the Apostolic Office Chrysostom is never arbitrary. When the necessary evidence is missing he maintains his reservations. He employs interpretative methods which have been tested before and takes into account time, place and quality of the persons in connection to whatever is being said or done. He searches for the deeper reasons of the apostolic actions and reaches his conclusions after making masterly combinations of the Biblical extracts.

As far as the approach to the Apostolic Office is concerned, according to Chrysostom, it is not based on a historical - philological examination of the term "ἀπόστολος", but on the Biblical ecclesiology. Instead of the Jewish shaliach, upon whom the most contemporary theories concerning the Apostolic Office are based, Chrysostom uses as basis Paul's images of the Church as a building, a human body and Christ's bride, which offer us completely different perspectives. On this basis and having exploited almost all the relevant Biblical texts Chrysostom sees the reality of the Apostolic Office globally, that is, in all its main dimensions. These dimensions are the theological, the ecclesiological and the eschatological ones.

More specifically,

1. Chrysostom points out the theocentric character of the Apostolic Office. He considers it as a divine energy which is distinguished from the divine essence and

is given to chosen men as a gift. According to holy father, man being created in his essence as God's creature is unable to hold any office by nature.

Chrysostom locates the source of the Apostolic Office in the Triune God. He finds its origin not merely in historical Jesus, who sent his apostles in a particular time, but in common energies of all the Persons of the Holy Trinity. Furthermore he relates these divine energies with common will, common authority and common glory of the three divine Persons. At the same time Chrysostom shows that each Person of the Holy Trinity has undertaken a special role in divine economy in connection to the Apostolic Office. To God the Father belongs the beginning (ἡ ἀρχή) and the first cause (αἰτία ἡ πρώτη) of the Apostolic Office. God the Son, sent by the Father as the great prophet, the high-priest and the great king, fulfills Father's will through his inhomination and becomes the archetype for the apostles and their office. God the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father in the name of the Son, perfects the apostles and remains in them as the activator of their office and source of all their charismata.

2. Chrysostom puts emphasis on the ecclesiological dimension of the Apostolic Office. It is proven by the fact that he often associates the apostles and their office with the Old Testament prophecies on the Church, the structure of the Church, Church's Eucharistic gatherings and, generally, with all his teaching concerning the Church. He considers that the Apostolic Office is inherent in the Church because its origin is in God's will, as the origin of the Church. On the basis of the crucial event of Christ's incarnation he finds the Apostolic Office both in the Church's periods that preceded it and those that followed it. Moreover he sees the Apostolic Office both in historical and eschatological dimensions of the Church.

Chrysostom determines the relationship between the Church and the Apostolic Office on the basis of Paul's Church images. Interpreting the image of a building he shows that the apostles constitutes the structural framework of the ecclesiastical building based on the fundamental cornerstone, the Lord Jesus Christ. This means that the Apostolic Office is the ministry which serves the shape taking of the ecclesiastical building. Using the image of a human body Chrysostom considers the apostles as the most vital vessels of the ecclesiastical body connected with the head and all the body members. Therefore, the Apostolic Office is the function of the vessels, which serves the growth of the ecclesiastical body. This means that the

apostles and their office are neither above nor under the Church, as many contemporary researchers believe, but are an organic function of the Church's body connected to its head directly. This perspective of the Apostolic Office makes clear the meaning of the Church's unity and becomes the foundation on which the Church's feature as "apostolic" is based.

3. Chrysostom underlines the eschatological dimension of the Apostolic Office on the basis of his broader eschatological teaching. According to it the eschata are identified with the whole reality. He says that we living in history know only a part of that reality. Using the image of ἀρχαβών holy father attempts to find a connection between the eschata and history. This joining of the eschata to history is based on time being intersected by the Son of God through his incarnation as well as worked by the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit.

Chrysostom points out that Christ prepared his apostles for their ministry making them familiar with the eschatological reality. According to the holy father Christ attained it preaching his kingdom, performing signs, being transfigured and initiating his apostles into his mysteries. In chrysostomic teaching of apostolic mindness, apostolic life and apostolic ministry the eschatological reality is the criterion for understanding them providing inhuman Jesus Christ is the central person of the eschata.

Chrysostom stresses the fact that the apostles exercising their office serve the joining of the eschata to history. The bearers of the Apostolic Office exploit the fit time (τὸν καιρὸν) in order to serve the above mentioned joining by worshiping God and celebrating the mysteries. As long as the Church proceeds within history the Apostolic Office appears to be a bridal procession through which the believers can be connected to the bridegroom Christ and participate in enjoying the eschatological reality.

In Lord's second coming, according to Chrysostom, the apostles will be following him and will judge the twelve tribes of Israel not as real judges but in comparison with their reaction to Jesus' presence in history. After the final Judgment, the Apostolic Office does not seem to have a field of action, since the work for which it was given will have been completed. However, its bearers will be enjoying exceptional glory, being distinguished members of the Church of heavenly Jerusalem.

Finally I could observe that Chrysostom examining the several aspects of the Apostolic Office uses a method of distinction and synthesis. He distinguishes apostle's human nature from his office as divine energy as well as divine energy from divine essence. At the same time he describes an apostle synthesising the two factors, human nature and divine energy. He distinguishes the apostles from the other members as well as their office as a special function in the body of the Church from other members' function. However he sees the apostles in a synthesis of common nature with all the other members and their special function in the body of the Church. Finally, he distinguishes history from eschata. Again he speaks of a fit time (καιρός), that is a synthesis of history and eschata achieved through the inhomination of the Son of God.

I think that it now becomes clear that chrysostomic examination of the Apostolic Office is basically theological, ecclesiological and eschatological. Besides, in this examination Chrysostom uses the theological method of distinction and synthesis. I believe that unfolding of this theological process is Chrysostom's most important contribution to a fuller understanding of the topic I dealt with in the present work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ancient Sources

JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Omnia opera*, J. P. Migne, PG, vols. 47-64.

- , *De virginitate*, H. Musurillo-B. Grillet, *Jean Chrysostome, Sur la virginité*, SC 125. Paris 1966, pp. 92-394.
- , *De incomprehensibili Dei natura*, 1-5, A. M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l' incomprehensibilité de Dieu*, SC 28 bis, Paris 1970, pp. 92-322.
- , *In Isaiam*, J. Dumortier, *Jean Chrysostome. Commentaire sur Isaie*, SC 304. Paris 1983, pp. 36-356.

ATHANASIUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG 27,60-545. 548-589.

- , *De incarnatione*, PG 25,96-200.
- , *Contra Arianos*, PG 26,12-468.
- , *Ad Serapionem*, PG 26,529-676.
- , *Ad Adelphium*, PG 26,1072-1084.
- , *Apologia contra Arianos*. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1. Berlin, 1940, pp. 87-168.
- , *De Synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleucia in Isauria*, H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940: 231-278.
- , *De Decretis Nicaeni Synodi*, H. G. Opitz, *op. cit.*, 1-45.

BASILIIUS MAGNUS, *Adversus Eunomium*, PG 29,497-669. 672-768.

- , *De baptismo*, PG 31,424-444.
- , *De fide*, PG 31,464-472.
- , *Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*, PG 31,600-617.
- , *Epistulae*, PG 32,220-1112.
- , *De Spiritu Sancto*, PG 32,68-217.
- , *De Spiritu Sancto*, B. Pruche, *Basile de Cesarée. Sur le Saint Esprit*, 2nd ed., SC 17 bis, Paris 1968, pp. 250-530.
- , *Enarratio in prophetam Isaiam*, P. Trevisan, *San Basilio*. Commento al profeta Isaia, Turin 1 (1939) 3-397. 2 (1939) 3-575.

GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, *In Theophania*, PG 36,312-354.

- , *Carmina*, PG 37,397-1600.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, *Stromata*, O. Stählin, L. Früchtel und U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 2 (3rd ed.) & 3 (2nd ed.), GCS 52 (17), 17, Berlin 2 (1960) 3-518. 3 (1970) 3-102.

- , *Paedagogus*, PG 8,247-681.
- CLEMENS ROMANUS, *Epistula i ad Corinthios*, Jaubert, *Clement de Rome. Épître aux Corinthiens*, SC 167. Paris 1971, pp. 98-204.
- CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Commentarius ad Johannem* PG 74,9-696.
- DIDACHE, *Διδαχή τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, Φ. Βρυεννίου, Κωνσταντινούπολις 1883.
- , *Διδαχαὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, (ed. J. P. Audet) *La Didache. Instructions des Apôtres*. Paris. Le coffre 1958: 226-242.
- EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG 23,66-1396.
- , *Historia Ecclesiastica*, G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*, SC 31,41,55. Paris 1 (1952) 3-215. 2 (1955) 4-231. 3 (1958) 3-120.
- , *Commentarius in Isaiam*, J. Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke, Band 9, "Der Jesajakommentar"*, GCS, Berlin 1975, pp. 3-411.
- , *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Stephanum*, PG 22,880-957.
- GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *De deitate Filii et Spiritu Sancto*, PG 46,553-577.
- , *De Spiritu Sancto*, PG 46,696-701.
- , *De instituto Christiano*, (ed. W. Jaeger), *Nysseni opera*: vol. 8.1 (1963): 40-89.
- , *In Sanctum Ephraim*, PG 46,820-852.
- , *In Basilium fratrem*, J. Stein, *Encomium of Saint Gregory, bishop of Nyssa on his brother saint Basil*, Washington D. C. 1928, pp. 2-60.
- , *Epistulae*, G. Pasqali, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 8,2, 2nd ed, (1959) 3-95.
- , *Contra Eunomium*, W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, Leiden: Brill, 1,1 (1960) 3-409. 2,2 (1960) 3-311.
- , *In Canticum Canticorum Commentarium*, H. Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, Leiden: Brill, vol. 6 (1960) 3-469.
- , *Ad Ablabium*, F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, Leiden: Brill v. 3,1, pp 37-57.
- HERMAS, *Visiones Pastoris*, in J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, London 1898.
- IGNATIUS ANTIOCHENUS, *Epistulae*, P. T. Camelot, *Ignace d' Antioche. Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettre. Martyre de Polycarpe*, 4th ed., SC 10. Paris 1969, pp. 56-154.
- IRENÆUS LUGDUNENSIS, *Elenchus*, PG 7,433-1119.
- , *Adversus haereses*, 1-2, W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis libri quique adversus haereses*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1857, pp. 1-188, 192-198, 204-207, 209-212, 214-216, 220-230, 232-233, 241-242, 331, 345-347, 351-352, 360-362, 370, 374-375, 380.
- , *Adversus haereses*, A. Rouseau-J. Doutreleau, *Irenée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies*, livre 3, SC 211. Paris 1974, pp. 22-24, 28, 32-44, 50, 84-86, 106-108, 128, 160-170, 176-178, 182-184, 190-192,

196-198, 206-208, 214-216, 246-248, 320-350, 364-374, 378,
398-406, 414, 428-430, 434-436.

OECUMENIUS TRICCAE, *Commentarium in Epistulam i Corinthios*, PG
118,636-904.

ORIGENES, *Annotationes in Deutoronomium*, PG 17,24-36.

- , *Commentarii in Johannem*, PG 14,9-829.
- , *In Genesim*, 12,9-145.
- , *Commentarium in euangelium Matthaei*, (libri 12-17), E.
Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 10,1-10,2, GCS 40,1-40,2. Leipzig
10,1(1935) 69-304. 10,2 (1937) 305-703.
- , *In Jesu Nave homiliae XXVI*, W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*,
vol. 7, GCS 30. Leipzig 1921, pp. 290-291, 293, 298-302, 305,
308,310, 312, 394-398, 406-445, 448 456, 460-463.
- , *Fragmenta in Lucam*, M. Rauer, *Origenes Werke*, vol. 9, 2nd ed.,
GCS 49. Berlin 1959, pp. 3-51, 54-90, 92-96, 99-109, 111, 114-123,
125-130, 132-129, 141-145, 154-155, 157-158, 160-166, 168 174,
177-179.
- , *Commentarium in euangelium Joannis* (libri 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13),
C. Blanc, *Origene. Commentaire sur saint Jean*, SC 120, 157, 222.
Paris 1 (1966) 56-390. 2 (1970) 128-580. 3 (1975) 34-282.
- , *Commentarii in euangelium Joannis*, E. Preuschen, *Origenes
Werke*, GCS 10. Leipzig 1930, pp. 483-574.
- , *Commentarium in epistulam ad Romanos*, K. Staab, «Neue
Fragmente aus dem Kommentar des Origenes zum Römerbrief», *BZ*
18 (1928) 74-82.
- , *Fragmenta ex Commentariis ad Ephesios*, J. A. F. Gregg,
«Documents: The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the
Ephesians», *JTS* 3 (1902) 234-244, 398-420, 554-576.
- , *Fragmenta ex Commentariis in epistulam ad i Corinthios*, C.
Jencins, «Documents: Origen on 1 Corinthians», *JTS* 9 (1908)
232-247, 353-372, 500-514. 10 (1908) 29-51.
- , *Contra Celsum*, M. Borret, *Origene. Contre Celse*, SC 132, 136,
147,150. Paris 1 (1967) 64-476. 2 (1968) 14-434. 3 (1969) 14-382. 4
(1969) 14-352.
- , *Philokalia*, 23,25-27, E. Junod, *Origene. Philocalie 21-27: sur le
libre arbitre*, SC 226. Paris 1976, pp. 130-314.

PALLADIUS HELENOPOLITANUS, *Διάλογος περι τοῦ βίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ
Χρυσοστόμου*, P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Paladii Dialogus de vita St.
Joannis Chrysostomi*, Cambridge 1928.

SOZOMENOS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen, 8,2-28.

THEODORETUS CYRI, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, PG 82,801-1280.

2. Books and Articles

- ABRAHAM, M. V., "Paul, the Unique Apostle", *IJT*, 26 (1977) 63-72.
- , "Diakonia in the Early Letters of Paul", *IJT*, 32,1-2 (1983) 61-67.
- ACHTEMEIER, P. J., "Paul and the Apostolic Office: Bible Study on 1 Corinthians 4", *RW*, 36,7 (1981) 299-305.
- , "Paul the Apostle", *Interpretation*, 43 (1989) 339-392.
- AGNEW, F., "On the Origin of the Term 'Apostolos'", *CBQ*, 38 (1976) 49-53.
- ΑΓΟΥΡΙΔΗ, Σ., *Ἡ καύχησις τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου πρὸ τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς καὶ μετὰ ταύτην*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1957.
- , Χριστολογία καὶ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία ἐν ταῖς ποιμαντικαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, *ΒΛΜλ* 1 (1966) 59-66.
- , «Ἡ ἀρχιερατικὴ προσευχὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ἰω 17). Χαρακτήρ Ὑπόμνημα», *ΕΕΗSH*, 9 (1964) 395-498.
- ALBORNOZ, A. C., "Aspectos sociales des s. IV atrures de las orbas de Juan Crisostomo», *Razon y Fe* (1933) 204-217, 507-525.
- ALTANER, B., *Patrology*, (translated into English) 1960.
- ANDERSON, G., "The Elements of Chrysostom's Power as a Preacher", *DPUCH*, τ. 3, σ. 53-66.
- ANDRES, P., *Der Missionsgedanke in den Schriften des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus*, Hunfeld 1935.
- ΑΝΔΡΟΥΤΣΟΥ, Χ., *Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, Ἀθήναι 1956².
- ASHCRAFT, M., "Paul Defends his Apostleship: Galatians 1 and 2", *REx*, 69,4 (1972) 459-469.
- , "Paul's understanding of Apostolate", *REx*, 55,4 (1958) 400-412.
- ATTWATER, *St. John Chrysostom*, Milwaukee 1939.
- , *St. John Chrysostom, Pastor and Preacher*, London 1959.
- BADGER, A. B., "The Role of the New Testament Apostolate in the Eschatological Plan of God", *Dallas Theological Seminar*, 1987.
- BARNARD, L. R., *Christology and Soteriology in the preaching of John Chrysostom*, (Dissertation. Southwestern Theological Seminary), 1974.
- BARRETT, C. K., "The Apostles in and after the New Testament", *SvEA* 21 (1956) 30-49.
- , *The Signs of an Apostle*, London 1970.
- , "Shaliah and Apostle", *Donum Gentilicium. New Testament Studies in honour of David Daube*, ed. E. Bammel (1978), s. 88-102.
- , *Essays on Paul*, London 1982.
- , "Apostles in Council and in Conflict", *ABR*, 31 (1983) 14-32.
- BAUR, C., *John Chrysostom and his Time*, Westminster, Newman Press, 1959-1960 (translated into English from, *Der Heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, München 1 (1929), 2 (1930)).
- BAUR, P. C., "Wann ist Chrysostomus geboren?", *ZKTh*, 52 (1928) 401-406.
- BAUR, F. C., *Paul: His Life and Works*, (Williams & Norgate) 1873.

- BENOIT, A., "L' apostolicité au IIe siècle", *VerbCar*, 58 (1961) 173-184.
- BERGER, K., "Apostle", *EnTh*, N. York 1991.
- BEST, E., *One Body in Christ. A Study in the Relationship of the Church in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*, London 1955.
- , "Mark's use of Twelve", *ZAW*, 69,1-2 (1978) 11-35.
 - , *Following Jesus. Discipleship in the Gospel of the Mark*, Sheffield 1981.
- BETHUNE- BAKER, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, London 1903.
- BETZ, H. D., "Apostles", *EnRl*.
- BEUMER, "Die altchristliche Idee einer präexistierenden Kirche und ihre theologische Anwendung", *WW*, 9 (1942) 16é.
- , "Apostle", *ABD*, 1992.
- BINDLEY, T. H., *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, 1989.
- BLUM, G. G., "Apostolische Tradition und Sukzession bei Hippolyt", *ZNTW*, 55 (1964) 95-109.
- BLUNT, J. J., *Lectures on the right use of the early Fathers*, 1857.
- BOWKER, J. W., «'Merkabah' visions and the visions of the Paul», *JSS*, 16,2 (1971) 157-173.
- BRIGGS, C. A., "The Twelve and the Seventy", *ExTi*, 15 (1903) 14.
- BRIGHTMAN, E. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896.
- BROWN, S., "Apostleship in the New Testament as a historical and theological problem", *NTS*, 30 (1984) 474-480.
- BRUCE, A. B., *The Training of the Twelve*, Kregel 1979.
- BRUCE, F. F., "The Apostolic Decree of Acts 15", *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, W. Schrage, *BZNW* 47 (1986) 115-124.
- , *The Book of the Acts*, Michigan 1988.
- BUHNER, J. A., "Ἀπόστολος", *ExDNT*.
- BULTMANN, R., *Theology of the New Testament* (transl. K. Grobel), London 1959³.
- BURTON, E. W., "Ἀπόστολος", *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, Edinburgh 1921, pp. 363-384.
- CAIRD, G. B., *The Apostolic Age*, Duckworth 1955.
- CAMPBELL, J.Y., "Twelve", *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, London 1972.
- CAMPENHAUSEN, H., "Apostolic authority", *SearTo*, 1,1 (1984) 17-20.
- CAMPIER, J., "Le critère paulinien de l'apostolat en 2 Cor 12:6", *Biblica*, 43,4 (1962) 482-518.
- CARILLO DE ALBORNOZ, A., "Aspectos sociales del s. IV a través de las obras de Juan Crisostomo", *RF* (1933) 204-217.
- CASURELLA, A., *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers. A study in the History of Exegesis*, Tübingen 1983.

- CATCHPOLE, D. R., "Paul, James and Apostolic Decree", *NTS*, 23,4 (1977) 428-444.
- CAYRE, A. A., *A Manual of Patrology and History of Theology*, Paris 1 (1936), 2 (1940).
- CERFAUX, L., "La vocation de Saint Paul", *EuDo*, 14,1 (1961) 3-35.
 – , "La mission apostolique de Douze et sa portée eschatologique", *Mélanges E. Tisserant*, 1 (1964) 43-66.
- CHASE, F. H., *Chrysostom. A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation*, Cambridge 1878.
- CHATZIEFREMIDES, E. (ΧΑΤΖΗΦΡΑΙΜΙΔΗ, Ε.), 'Αγίου Εἰρηναίου ἐπισκόπου Λουγδούνου, Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. Εἰσαγωγή - μετάφρασι - σχόλια, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991.
- CHAVALIER, U., *Repertoire Sources historiques du Moyen Age*, Paris 1894-1895.
- CHAVASSE, C., *The Bride of Christ*, London 1930.
 – , "Studies in Texts. 2 Cor 4:7", *Theology*, 54 (1951) 99-100.
- CHILTON, B. D., "God in Strength", *Lins*, (1979), σ. 27-96.
 – , "The Transfiguration: Dominical Assurance and Apostolic Vision", *NTS*, 27 (1980) 115-124.
- CHRISTOU, P. (ΧΡΗΣΤΟΥ, Π.), 'Ο Ἀπόστολος Βαρνάβας, 1951.
 – , «Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς», *ΘΗΕ*, vol. 4, pp. 775-794.
 – , «Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος», *ΘΗΕ*, Ἀθήναι 1966, vol. 6, pp. 1170-1192.
 – , «Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ οἱ Καππαδόκαι», *Studies on St. John Chrysostom*, Ἀνβλ 18 (1973) 13-22.
 – , *Ἑλληνικὴ Πατρολογία*, vols. 1-5, Θεσσαλονίκη 1981-1994.
 – , «Ἄκτιστον καὶ κτιστὸν, ἀγέννητον καὶ γεννητὸν κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἀθανάσιον», *Τόμος ἐόρτιος Μ. Ἀθανασίου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1974, pp. 11-22.
 – , "Notes on the Subjects of Salvation", *ΘΜελ*, 1 (1973) 127-133.
- CHRISTOPHIS, G., *The Church's Identity established through Images according to St. John Chrysostom*, (unpublished Dissertation, University of Durham) 1992.
- CIGNAC, F. T., "The Text of Acts in Chrysostom's Homilies", *Traditio*, 26 (1970) 308-315.
- CLARK, A. C., "Apostleship: Evidence from the New Testament and early Christian Literature", *VoxEv* 19 (1989) 49-82.
- COBHAM, Cl., "The Preaching of Chrysostom", *The Expositor*, VIII (23) (1923) 359-368.
- COLEMAN-NORTON, P. R., "Saint John Chrysostom and the Greek philosophers", *CIPhI*, 25 (1930) 305-317.
- COLLINS, R. F., "Qualities on the Apostolate", *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians*, Leuven 1984, s. 191-197.

- , "The Twelve. Another Perspective: John 6:67-71", *MeTh* 40 (2, 1989) 95-109.
- COLSON, J., *Le ministère apostolique dans la littérature chrétienne primitive. Apôtres et évêques sacrificateurs des nations. L'Épiscopat et l'Église Universelle*, Paris 1962
- , "La succession apostolique au niveau du 1er siècle", *VerbCar*, (1961) 138-172.
- CONDON, K., "Κλήσις-Call and Calling", *IrBS*, 6,2 (1984) 71-84.
- CONGAR, M. J., *Esquisse de mystère de l'Église*, Paris 1941.
- CONGAR, Y., "L'Église une, sainte, catholique et apostolique", *Mysterium Salutis* 15 (1970).
- , *The Mystery of the Church*, London- Baltimore 1960.
- CONSTANZA, M., *Der heil. Joh. Chrysostomus*, Harl 1952.
- CRAMER, J. A., *Catena in Sancti Pauli Epistolas*, Oxford 1841-1844.
- CREDEL, E. M., "Apostle", *BEnBT*.
- CULMANN, O., *Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament*, Cambridge 1956.
- , *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, (translated into English by F. V. Filson), London 1963.
- CULVER, R. D., "Apostles and Apostolate in the New Testament", *BS*, 134 (1977) 131-143.
- D'ALTON, J. F., *Selections from St. John Chrysostom*, London 1940.
- DANIELOU, J., "L'Incompréhensibilité de Dieu d'après Saint Jean Chrysostome", *RSR*, 37 (1950) 176-194.
- , "The Priestly Ministry in the Greek Fathers", *SHO*, (1962) 116-130.
- , "The Apostolic Tradition", *A History of Early Christian Doctrine*, t. 2, London 1973.
- , *L'Église des apôtres*, Paris 1970.
- DARES, J. G., "Pentecost and Glossolalia", *JTS*, 3 (1952) 228-231.
- DEISSMANN, A., *Paul. A Study in Social and Religion History*, (translated into English by W. E. Wilson), London 1926 .
- DELLING, "Καίρος", *TDNT*, vol. 3, pp. 455-464.
- DELORME, J., "La mission des Douze en Galilée", *Assemblées du Seigneur*, 46 (1974) 43-50.
- DICKENSON, G. F., *Religion Index One: Periodicals*, Evanston 1949- 1993.
- , *Religion Index Two: Books*, Evanston 1960-1990.
- DIONYSIOS (ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ), Metropolitan of Kozani, *Οικοδομή και Παράκλησις*, Κοζάνη 1972-1973.
- DODD, C. H., *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, N. York 1962.
- DOIKOS, D. (ΔΟΪΚΟΣ, Δ.), «Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ Διαθήκῃ», *ΓρΠ*, 51 (1968) 460-474.

- DORSEY, C., "Paul's use of 'Apostolos'", *RQ*, 28,4 (1985-86) 193-200.
- DRAGAS, G. D., *The meaning of Theology. An essay in Greek Patristics*, Darlington 1980.
- , *Ecclesiasticus*, Darlington 1984.
 - , "St. John Chrysostom's doctrine of God's providence", *EΦ*, 57 (1975) 375-406.
- DRUMMOND, J., *The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, Edinburgh 1901.
- DUNN, J. D. G., "Spirit and Fire-Baptism", *NovT*, 14 (1972) 81ff.
- , *Jesus' Call to Discipleship*, Cambridge 1990.
- DUPONT, J., "Le douzième aptre (Acts 1,15-26): a propos d'une explication récente", *The New Testament Age*, (ed. V. Weinrich), 1 (1984) 139-145.
- , "La première Pentecôte Chrétienne", *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1967.
- DURRWELL, F-X., *The mystery of Christ and Apostolate* (translated into English by E. Quinn), N. York 1972.
- EHRHARDT, A., *The Apostolic Succession*, London 1953.
- ETTLINGER, G. H., "Some Historical Evidence for the Date of St. Chrysostom's Birth in the Treatise Ad Viduam Juniorem", *Traditio*, 16 (1960) 373-380.
- EVDOKIMOV, P., *La Prière de l' Église d' Orient. La Liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Mulhouse 1966.
- , *Τὸ Ἅγιο Πνεῦμα στὴν Ὁρθόδοξη Παράδοση*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1973.
- FERGUSON, G., "Ἀπόστολος", *EnECh*.
- FILIS, L. (ΦΙΛΗ, Λ.), *Τὸ πρόβλημα τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα ἀποστόλων*, Ἀθήναι 1977.
- FITTKAU, G., *Der Begriff des Mysterium bei Johannes Chrysostomus, eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Begriff des Kultmysteriums in der Lehre O. Casels*, Bonn 1953.
- FLANAGAN, M. H., *Chrysostom on the Condensation and Accuracy of the Scripture*, Nabien 1958.
- FLOROFSKY, G. (ΦΛΩΡΟΦΣΚΥ, Γ.), «Ἅγιος Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος, ὁ προφήτης τῆς ἀγάπης», *Ἀκτίνες*, 156 (1955) 5-10.
- , *Δίδυμος*, *ΘHE*.
 - , "Scripture and Tradition: An Orthodox point of view", *Dialog* 2 (4, 1963) 288-293.
 - , *Τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ζῶντος Χριστοῦ. Μία Ὁρθόδοξος ἐρμηνεία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1972.
 - , *Θέματα Ὁρθοδόξου Θεολογίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1973.
 - , *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*, Belmont 1987.

- , «Πατερικές σπουδές και σύγχρονη θεολογία», *ΓρΠ* 73 (1990) 803-809.
 - , *Άγία Γραφή, Έκκλησία, Παράδοσις, Θεσσαλονίκη* 1991.
- FOERSTER, T., *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zur Antiochenischen Schule*, Gotha 1869.
- ΦΟΥΓΙΑ, Μ., *The social message of John Chrysostom*, Athens 1968.
- ΦΟΥΝΤΟΥΛΗ, Ι., *Βυζαντινὰ θεῖα Λειτουργία Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978.
- FRANZMANN, M., "The Apostolate: Its enduring significance in the apostolic word", *CTM*, 28,3 (1957) 144-191.
- FREYNE, S., *Twelve: Disciples and Apostles. A study in the theology of the first three Gospels*, London 1968.
- FROMM, F., *Das Bild des verkörpert Christus beim hl. Paulus nach den Kommentaren des hl. J. Chrysostomus*, Rom 1938.
- FUDGE, E., "The eschatology of Ignatius of Antioch: Christocentric and historical", *JETS*, 15,4 (1972) 231-237.
- FULLER, R. H., "Apostolicity and Ministry", *CTM*, 43,2 (1972) 67-76.
- , "The Choice of Matthias", *SEv*, 6 (1973) 140-146.
- GALER, J. G., "Functional diversity in Paul's use of End-Time language", *JBL*, 89,3 (1970) 325-337.
- GALITIS, G. (ΓΑΛΙΤΗ, Γ.), *Χριστολογία τῶν λόγων τοῦ Πέτρου ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων*, Ἀθήναι 1962.
- , *Ἡ σάρκωση τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ἡ θέωση τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, Λάρνακα 1990.
 - , *Ἡ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολή τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου*, Ἀθήνα 1992³.
 - , «Ὁ Πατὴρ δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ποιεῖ τὰ πάντα», *ΠΘΣΜΘ*, Ὁ ἐπουράνιος Πατήρ, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.
- GALUSHA, A., *The elements of Chrysostom's power as a preacher*, Chicago 1903.
- GAVIN, F., "Shaliah and Apostolos", *ATHR*, 9 (1927) 250-259.
- GENNADIUS (ΓΕΝΝΑΔΙΟΣ), Metropolitan of Ilioupolis, «Ὁ ἱερός Χρυσόστομος καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος», *Ὁρθοδοξία*, 3 (1954)...
- , «Ἡ περὶ Ἐκκλησίας διδασκαλία τοῦ ἱεροῦ Χρυσοστόμου», *Ὁρθοδοξία*, 29 (1954) 241-259.
- GILBERTE, A. M., "Ethique, Liturgie et Eschatologie chez Saint Jean Chrysostome", *Liturgie, Ethique et peuple de Dieu*, ἐκδ. Α. Triacca, (1991), σ. 33-51.
- GILES, K., "Apostles before and after Paul", *ChJATH*, 99 (1985) 241-256.
- GOMEZ - LOBO, *Συμβεβηκὸς in der Metaphysik des Aristoteles*, München 1966.
- GONZALEZ, J., *A History of Christian Thought*, Abington-Nashville 1970.

- GOODSPEED, E. N., *The Twelve. The story of Christ's Apostles*, N. York 1962.
- GOODSPEED, E. J., *Matthew: apostle and Evangelist*, Philadelphia 1959.
- GOPPELT, L., *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, Black 1970.
- GOSEVIC, S., «Ἡ περὶ θείας χάριτος διδασκαλία Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου», *Θεολογία*, 27 (1956) 206-239. 367-389.
- GRANFIELD, C. E. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, Edinburgh 1 (1975), 2 (1979).
- GREELEY, D. L., "John Chrysostom, On the Priesthood: a Model for Service", *SP*, 22 (1989) 121-128.
- , *The Church as Body of Christ according to the Teaching of John Chrysostom*, University of Notre Dame, 1971.
- GRILLMEIER, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London 1965.
- GUILLOU, M. J., *Church and Christ, A theology of the Mystery* (translated into English by C. E. Schaldenbrand), N. York 1966.
- GUTHRIE, D., *The Apostles*, (1974).
- GWATKIN, H. M., "Apostle", *Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. J. Hastings) .
- HADZEGA, J., *The life of St. John Chrysostom with an analysis of his works in Russian*, Uzgorod 1936.
- HADACHER, *Die Lehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus über die Schriftinspiration*, Salzburg 1897.
- HAMILTON, N. Q., "The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul", *SJT* (Occasional Papers No 6), Edinburgh-London 1957.
- HANSON, S., *The unity of the Church in the New Testament*, Upsala 1946.
- HARNACK, A., *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*, Leipzig 1884.
- , *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (translated into English), London 1904-1905.
- HARRISON, E. F., "Apostle-Apostleship", *EDTh*.
- HARTUNG, E., "Johannes Chrysostomus und die Heidenmission", *AMZ*, 21 (1894) 320-326.
- HAY, C., "St. John Chrysostom and the integrity of the human nature of Christ", *FrSt*, 19 (1959) 298-317.
- HEDRICK, C. W., "Paul's Conversion/Call: A comparative Analysis of the Three reports in Acts", *JBL*, 100 (1981) 415-432.
- HELD, M. L., "Apostle", *NCEn*.
- HERON, A., "The Eucharist in the New Testament", *Table and Tradition*, Edinburgh 1983, pp. 3-54.
- HERRON, R. W., "The origin of the New Testament Apostolate", *WTJ*, 45 (1, 1983) 101-131.
- HILL, R., "Akribeia: a principle of Chrysostom's exegesis", *Colloquium: The Australian and New Zealand Theological Society* (Adelaide), 14 (1981) 32-36.

- , "Chrysostom as Old Testament Commentator" *EsBi*, 46,1 (1988) 61-77.
- HILL, T., "St. Paul and the Apostles", *UnRe*, 11 (1879) 65.
- HOFMANN, A., "Das Paulusverständnis des Johannes Chrysostomus", *ZNTW*, 38 (1938) 181-188.
- , "Der Mysterien Begriff bei Johannes Chrysostomus", *FZPT* 3 (1956) 418-422.
- HORNSCHUCH, M., "The Apostles as bearers of the tradition", E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, Philadelphia 1965.
- HOWART, G., "Was James an apostle? A reflection on a new proposal for Galatians 1:19", *NovT*, 19,1 (1977) 63-64.
- HRISTOV, V., "La Notion de l' Église d' après St. Jean Chrysostome", *StTh*, 12 (1960) 76-92.
- HSIANG, P. S., "St John Chrysostom on the Priesthood", *HPR*, 55 (1954-1955) 920-926.
- HULL, J. H. E., *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*, Lutterworth 1967.
- HULTGREN, A. J., *Paul's Gospel and Mission*, Philadelphia 1985.
- HUNT, E. N., *Portrait of Paul*, London 1968.
- HUNTER, A. M., *The Parables then and now*, London 1971.
- HUXHOLD, H. N., *Twelve who followed*, 1987.
- IOANNIDES, B. (ΙΩΑΝΝΙΔΗ, Β.), *Ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης*, Ἀθῆναι 1955.
- , «Ἀπόστολου», *ΘHE*, vol. 2, pp. 1176-1182.
- , «Γλωσσολαλία», *ΘHE*, vol. 4, pp. 574-577.
- , «Οἱ θεῖοι παράγοντες ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ ζωῇ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Χρυσοστόμου», *ΕΕΘΣΑ* (1955-1956) 179-208.
- , «Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον», *Τόμος πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ καθηγητοῦ Α. Ἀλιβιζάτου*, Ἀθῆναι 1958.
- JAVIERRE, A., «Notes on the traditional teaching on apostolic succession», *Concilium*, 4 (1968) 10-15.
- JERVELL, J., "The Signs of an Apostle", *The Unknown Paul*, Minneapolis 1984.
- JONES, P. R., "1 Corinthians 15:8: Paul the last apostle", *TB*, 36 (1985) 3-34.
- JONSON, L. T., *The Acts of the apostles*, SPS 5, Minnesota 1992.
- JUZEK, J. H., *Die Christologie des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Dogmatik der Antiochener*, Breslau 1912.
- , "Die Lehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus über den Heiligen Geist", *Der Katholik*, 93 (1913) 309-320.
- KACZYNSKI, R., *Das Wort Gottes in Liturgie und Alltag de Gemeinden des Johannes Chrysostomus*, Freiburg 1974.
- KALOGEROU, I. (ΚΑΛΟΓΗΡΟΥ, Ι.), «Τὸ Τριαδικὸν δόγμα κατὰ τὸν Δ' αἰῶνα», *ΕΕΘΣΘ* 14 (1969) 283-379.

- KANTIOTIS, A. (ΚΑΝΤΙΩΤΟΥ Α.), *Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι*, Ἀθήναι 1989³.
- KAPSANIS, G. (ΚΑΨΑΝΗ, Γ.), *Θέματα ἐκκλησιολογίας καὶ ποιμαντικῆς*, Ἰ. Μ. Γρηγορίου, "Ἅγιον Ὅρος.
- KARABIDOPOULOS, I. (ΚΑΡΑΒΙΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ι.), «Περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων», *ΕΑΣ*, (1966) 260-273.
- , «Ἡ ἀποστολικὴ συνείδησις τοῦ Παύλου καὶ ἡ σχέσις αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς δώδεκα ἀποστόλους», *ΓρΠ*, 49 (1966) 249-254. 301-310.
 - , «Αἱ παραβολαὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ», *ΕΕΘΣΘ*, 15 (1970), Παράρτημα 5.
 - , «Ἀπαρχαὶ ἐκκλησιολογίας εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον», *ΕΕΘΣΘ*, 17 (1972) 81-82.
 - , «Ὁ ρόλος τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἡ σημασία του στὴν Ἐκκλησία τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης. Σύγχρονη ἐξηγητικὴ προβληματικὴ», *ΔΒΜ*, 10 (1991) 47-66.
 - , «Χαρίσματα τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ ἀξιώματα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας», *Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα*, ΣΘΘ 5 (1971) 21-33.
 - , «Εἰκὼν θεοῦ καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ Παύλῳ», *ΕΕΘΣΘ* 8 (1963).
 - , *Τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον. Ἑρμηνεῖα Καινῆς Διαθήκης 2*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1988.
 - , *Ἀποστόλου Παύλου ἐπιστολὲς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, Φιλιππησίους, Κολοσσαεῖς, Φιλήμονα. Ἑρμηνεῖα Καινῆς Διαθήκης 10*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992.
- KARMIRIS, I. (ΚΑΡΜΙΡΗ, Ι.), «Νέαι ἔρευναι πρὸς λύσιν τῶν προβλημάτων τῶν πηγῶν τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ πολιτεύματος τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ (34-156 μ.Χ.)», 1 (1953-1955) 219.
- , «Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ», *Ἐκκλησία*, 46 (1969) 552-555.588-589.615-617.
 - , *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τῶν Τριῶν Ἱεραρχῶν*, Ἀθήναι 1962.
 - , *Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Ἐν Ἀθήναις 1952-1953.
- KARRER, O., *Peter and the Church*, N. York 1963.
- KAUPEL, H., "Die Wertung des Alten Testaments in Römerbrief-Kommentar des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus", *ThG* 30 (1898) 17-25.
- KEE, D., "Who were the 'super-apostles' of 2 Cor. 10-13?", *RQ*, 23,2 (1980) 65-76.
- KELLY, J. D. N., "Catholic and Apostolic in the Early Centuries", *OChr.* 6,3 (1970) 281-287.
- , *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1960.
- KERR, A. J., "Ἀραβῶν", *JTS*, 39,1 (1988) 92-97.
- KERTELGE, K., "Das Apostelamt des Paulus, sein Ursprung und seine Bedeutung", *BiZ*, 14,2 (1970) 161-181.

- KESICH, V., "The problem of Peter's primacy in the New Testament and the Early Christian Exegesis", *SVSQ*, 4,2-3 (1960) 2-25.
- KILMARTIN, E. J., "Apostolic Office: sacrament of Christ", *ThS*, 36 (1975) 243-264.
- KILPATRICK, G. D., "Galatians 1:18: ιστορήσαι Κηφᾶν", *New Testament Essays in memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester 1959⁶, pp. 144έ.
- KIRILOV, «Ἡ περὶ θείας Εὐχαριστίας διδασκαλία τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου» (in Russian), *ChCt* (1906) 26-52.
- KIRK, J. A., "Apostleship since Rengstorf: Towards a synthesis", *NTS*, 21 (2, 1975) 249-264.
- KIRK, K. E., *The Apostolic Ministry*, London 1946.
- KITTEL, G., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT)*, 1-10 (translated into English by G. W. Bromiley-D. Litt), B. Eermans, Michigan 1969.
- KLAUSNER, J., *From Jesus to Paul*, N. York 1943.
- KLEIN, G., *Die zwölf Apostel*, Göttingen 1961.
- KLOSTERMANN, F., "Apostle", *NCE*.
- KOULOMZINE, N., "Images of the Church in Saint Paul's Epistles", *SVTQ*, 14,1-2 (1970) 5-27.
- KRAMER, H. J., *Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles. Zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der platonischen Ontologie*, Amsterdam 1967².
- KREDEL, E. M., "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese", *ZKTh*, 78 (1956) 169-193.
- , "Apostle", *Bauer, EnBT*.
- KRIKONIS, CH. (ΚΡΙΚΩΝΗ, Χ.), «Ὁ οἰκουμενικὸς χαρακτήρας τοῦ ἱεραποστολικοῦ ἔργου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας», *Τιμητικὸς τόμος καθηγητοῦ Ἰ. Καλογήρου*, *ΕΕΘΣΘ/ΤΡ* (1990) 377-406. .
- , *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Πατερικαὶ ἀπόψεις*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991.
- , «Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὸν Μ. Βασίλειον», *Τόμος ἐόρτιος Μ. Βασιλείου* 1974, σ. 301-327.
- KRUPP, R. A., *Saint John Chrysostom. A scripture index*, Lanham, N. York, London 1984.
- KYRIAKIDES, S. (ΚΥΡΙΑΚΙΔΗ, Σ.), «Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος ὡς λαογράφος», *Λαογραφία*, 11 (1934) 634-641.
- LAKE, K., "The Gift of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost", *The Beginning of Christianity*, τ. 5, σ. 111-121.
- LANE, W. L., *Hebrews 1-8, WBC*.
- LAMPE, G. W. H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.
- LARENTZAKIS, G. (ΛΑΡΕΝΤΖΑΚΗ, Γ.), *Ἡ Ἐκκλησία τῆς Ρώμης καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αὐτῆς βασιεὶ ἀρχαίων πατερικῶν πηγῶν*, σ. 45. 107-120.

- LATEGAN, B., "Is Paul defending his apostleship in Galatians?", *NTS*, 34,3 (1988) 411-430.
- LAWRENCE, G. J., *'Priest' as Type of Christ. The Leader of the Eucharist in Salvation History according to Cyprian of Carthage*, N. York 1984.
- LAWRENZ, M. E., "The Christology of John Chrysostom", *SP*, 22 (1989) 148-153.
- LEBUC, F., "L' eschatologie une préoccupation centrale de St. J. Chrysostome", *POC*, 19 (1969) 109-134.
- LEGRAND, P. E., *Saint Chrysostome*, Paris 1924.
- LEUBA, J. L., *L' institution et l' événement*, Neuchatel-Paris 1950.
- LIEBESCHUETZ, J. H., "Friends and enemies of John Chrysostom", *Maistor, Studies for Robert Browning*, Canberra 1984, σ. 85-112.
- LIETZMANN, H., "Johannes Chrysostomus", Pauly-Wissowa, *REn* 9 (1916) 1811-1828.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London 1892¹⁰.
- , *St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and to the Philemon*, London 1892³.
 - , *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, London 1879⁴.
 - , *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, London 1892.
 - , *Apostolic Fathers*, London 1898.
- LONGENECKER, R. N., *Paul: Apostle of Liberty*, Harper 1964.
- LOSSKY, V., *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, London 1957.
- LOVESTAM, E., *Son and Saviour*, Lund 1961.
- LUDEMANN, G., *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles, Studies in Chronology*, (translated into English by F. S. Jones), London 1984.
- MALAN, F. S., "The relationship between apostolate and office in the theology of Paul", *Ministry in the Pauline letters*, ed. by J. Roberts and others, 1980, pp. 53-68.
- MANEK, J., "Fishers of men", *NovT*, 2,2 (1957) 138-141.
- MANSON, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge 1955.
- MANTZARIDES, G. (ΜΑΝΤΖΑΡΙΔΗ, Γ.), *Ἡ περί θεώσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1963.
- MARKOT, J. C., "L'apostolat dans le Nouveau Testament et la succession apostolique", *VerbCar*, 11 (1957) 213-226.
- MARSHALL, J. H., "The significance of Pentecost", *SJT*, 30,4 (1977) 347-369.
- MARTIN, R. P., *2 Corinthians*, *WBC* 40, Dallas, Texas 1986.
- MARTZELOS G. (ΜΑΡΤΖΕΛΟΥ, Γ.), *Οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργειαι κατὰ τὸν Μ. Βασίλειον*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.
- , *Γένεση καὶ πηγές τοῦ ὄρου τῆς Χαλκηδόνας. Συμβολή στην ιστορικοδογματική διερεύνηση τοῦ ὄρου τῆς Δ' Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1986.
- MATERA, F., *Galatians*, *SPS* 9, Minnesota 1992.

- MATSOUKAS, N. (ΜΑΤΣΟΥΚΑ, Ν.), «Ἐκκλησιολογία ἐξ ἐπόψεως τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ δόγματος», *ΕΕΘΣΘ* 17 (1972) 113-214.
- , «Θεολογία καὶ ἀνθρωπολογία κατὰ τὸν Μ. Ἀθανάσιον», *Τόμος ἐόρτιος Μ. Ἀθανασίου* 1974, σ. 47-128.
 - , *Δογματικὴ καὶ Συμβολικὴ Θεολογία*, vols. Α' καὶ Β', Θεσσαλονίκη, 1985.
- MATTHEWS, R. J. H., "Pillars of the Church", *Prudentia*, 18,1 (1986) 55-59.
- McCANT, J. W., "Paul's thorn of rejected Apostleship", *NTS*, 34,4 (1988) 550-572.
- McGUCKIN, J. A., "The Patristic exegesis of the Transfiguration", *SP*, 17,1 (1985) 335-341.
- McINTYRE, J., "The Holy Spirit in Greek patristic thought", *SJT* 7 (1954) 353-375.
- McKIBENS, T. R., "The exegesis of John Chrysostom: Homilies on Gospels", *ExTi*, 93,1 (1982) 264-270.
- MELCHIORRE, S. M., "S. Paolo nella prospettiva di s. Giovanni Crisostomo", *Analecta Biblica, investigationes scientificae in res biblicas*, 17-18, τ. 2, Romae 1963.
- ΜΗΝΑΙΟΝ ΔΕΚΕΜΒΡΙΟΥ, ed. Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας, Ἀθῆναι 1963.
- MENDIETA, E. A., "L' incompréhensibilité de l' essence divine d' après Jean Chrysostome", *Symposium: Studies on St John Chrysostom*, *ΑνΒλ* 18 (1973) 23-40.
- MENOUD, P. H., "La mort d' Ananias et de Saphira (Actes 5:1-11)", *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne, Bibliothèque Theologique Neuchatel*, Delachaux et Niestle, 1950, σ. 146-154.
- MERCER, S. A. B., "The Anaphora of St John Chrysostom", *JSOR*, 4 (1920) 35-42.
- MERSCH, E., *The Whole Christ*, London 1959.
- METSOPOULOS, N. (ΜΗΤΣΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ν.), *Τὰ τρία θεῖα ιδιώματα καὶ τὸ τρισσὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀξίωμα*, Ἀθῆναι 1972.
- MEYENDORFF, J., *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, N.York 1974.
- MEYER, H., *The Gospel of St. Matthew*, *CECNT*, τ. 2, Edinburgh 1879.
- MICHAUD, E., "Saint Jean Chrysostome et l' Eucharistie", *RITH*, 11 (1903) 93-111.
- , "L'Ecclesiologie de S. J. Chrysostome", *RITH*, 11 (1903) 491-620.
 - , "La Christologie de S. J. Chrysostome", *RITH*, 17 (1909).
 - , "La Soteriologie de S. J. Chrysostome", *RITH*, 18 (1910).
 - , "St. J. Chrysostome et l' Apocatastase", *RITH*, 18 (1910) 672-696.
- MICHEL, O., "Οἰκοδομή", G. Kittel, *TDNT*, vol. 5, pp. 144-147.
- MOFFATT, J., *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, London 1938.
- , *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, *ICC*, Edinburgh.

- MOISESCU, I., «Ἡ ἅγια Γραφή καὶ ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῆς στὰ ἔργα Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου» (in Rumanian), *Candela*, 50-51 (1939-1941) 116-238.
- MOLLAND, E., "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession", *JEH*, 1 (1950) 26-28.
- MONNIER, H., *La notion de l' Apostolat d' Origenes a Irenée*, 1903.
- MORRIS, L., *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, London 1965 (3).
- MOULTON, J. H. & MILLIGAN, G., *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (VGT), London 1963.
- MOURATIDIS, K. (ΜΟΥΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ, Κ.), *Ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστομου*, Ἀθῆναι 1958.
- , *Ἀπεδέχεται ὁ ἱ. Χρυσόστομος τὸ παπικὸν πρωτεῖον;*, Ἀθῆναι 1959.
- MOUTSOULAS, E. D. (ΜΟΥΤΣΟΥΛΑ, Η. Δ.), *Ἡ σάρκωσις τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ἡ θέωσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσσης*, Ἀθῆναι 1965.
- ΜΡΟΥΓΑΤΣΟΣ, Ν. (ΜΠΟΥΓΑΤΣΟΥ, Ν.), *Κοινωνικὴ διδασκαλία Ἑλλήνων πατέρων*, vol. 2, Ἀθῆναι 1982.
- ΜΡΑΤΣΙΟΤΙΣ, Ρ. (ΜΠΡΑΤΣΙΩΤΟΥ, Π.), *Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Ἀθῆναι 1959.
- , *Ἡ ἀνάστασις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Ἀθῆναι 1966².
- MULLER, D., "Apostle", *NIDNT*.
- MUNCK, J., "Paul, the Apostles and the Twelve", *STh*, 3(1949).
- , *Paul and the salvation of mankind*, (translated into English by F. Clarke), Richmond 1959.
- MURPHY, F. X., "Conflagration: The eschatological perspective from Origen to John Chrysostom", *SP*, 17,1 (1985) 179-185.
- NAEGELE, A., *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus, des Doctor Eucharistiae*, Freiburg 1900.
- NEANDER, *Der hl. Johannes Chrysostomus und die Kirche*, Berlin 1821-1822.
- NELSON, J. R., "Many images of the One Church", *EcRe*, 9 (1957) 105-113.
- NESTLE, E., "Chrysostom on the life of John the Apostle", *AJTh*, 9 (1905) 519-520.
- NIKOLAU, T., *Der Neid bei Johannes Chrysostomus unter Berücksichtigung der griechischen Philosophie*, Bonn 1969.
- NORRIS, R. A., "The beginnings of Christian priesthood", *AThR*, 66 (1984) 18-32.
- OGARA, F., "De Typica apud Chrysostomum Prophetia", *Gregorianum*, 24 (1943) 62-77.
- O' COLLINS, G., "Power Made Perfection in Weakness: 2 Cor 12,9-10", *CBQ*, 33 (4, 1971) 528-537.

- OIKONOMOU, CH. (ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΥ, Χ.), *Ἡ κλήση καὶ οἱ ἀπαρχές τῆς ἱεραποστολικῆς δράσεως τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992.
- PANAGOPOULOS, I. (ΠΑΝΑΓΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ι.), "'Diakonia tes Katalages' (2 Cor 5,18). Eine Orthodoxe Studie zur exegetischen und dogmatischen Problematik des Amtes", *UnSa*, 20 (1965) 126-151.
- , Θεολογικὸ ὑπόμνημα στὶς Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, Α', chapters 1-8,3.
 - , *Ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῆς ἁγίας Γραφῆς στὴν Ἐκκλησία τῶν πατέρων. Οἱ τρεῖς πρῶτοι αἰῶνες καὶ ἡ ἀλεξανδρινὴ ἐξηγητικὴ παράδοση ὡς τὸν πέμπτο αἰῶνα*, vol. Α', Ἀθήνα 1991.
- PANNENBERG, W., "La signification de l' eschatologie pour la compréhension de l' apostolicité et de la catholicité de l' Église", *Istina*. 14 (1969) 154-170. (translated into English in *OnChr*, 6 (1970) 410-429).
- PAPADOPOULOS, A. (ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Α.), «Ὁ Ἐμμανουήλ, Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὸν ἅγιο Κύριλλο Ἀλεξανδρείας», *ΠΘΣΜΘ*, *Πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Παμβασιλέως Χριστοῦ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1991.
- PAPADOPOULOS, S. (ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ Σ.), *Πατρολογία*, Ἀθήνα, 1 (1974), 2 (1990).
- PAPADOPOULOS, CH. (ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Χ.), «Περὶ τῶν Ὁ Ἀποστόλων», *ΕΦ*, 16 (1907) 457-465.
- , *Ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος*, Ἀλεξανδρεία 1908.
- PAPARETROU, K. (ΠΑΠΑΠΕΤΡΟΥ, Κ.), «Χάρις, Χάρισμα, Ἀξιώματα», *Περὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ΣΟΘ*, Ἀθήναι (1971) 11-17.
- PATRICK, W., "Apostles", *DCG*.
- PATRONOS, G. (ΠΑΤΡΩΝΟΥ, Γ.), «Ἀπόστολος καὶ Ἀποστολή», *ΔΒΜ*, 2,7 (1974) 230-247.
- , «Ἡ κλήσις τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν παράδοσιν», *Θεολογία*, 46,4 (1975) 882-900. 47,2 (1976) 391-401.
 - , *Βιβλικὴ θεμελίωσις τῆς Ἀποστολικότητος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Ἀθήναι 1975.
 - , *Βιβλικὲς προϋποθέσεις τῆς ἱεραποστολῆς*, Ἀθήνα 1983.
 - , *Ἡ ἱστορικὴ πορεία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, Ἀθήνα 1991.
- PEARSON, J., "Conciones ad Clerum". *The Minor Theological Works*, Oxford 1844.
- PEITZNER, V. C., "Office and charism in Paul and Luke", *Coloquium* (Auckland/Sydney), 13,2 (1981) 28-38.
- PENTHKOSTARION, ed. *Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας*, Ἀθήναι 1959.
- PERRIMAN, A., "The pattern of Christ's suffering: Col 1:24 and Phil 3:10-11", *TB*. 42,1 (1991) 62-79.

- PERRIN, N., *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, Philadelphia 1963.
- PIEPKORN, A. C., "Charisma in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers", *CTM*, 42 (1971).
- PLITZNER, V. C., "'Pneumatic' apostleship: Apostle and Spirit in the Act of the Apostles", *Wort in der Zeit*, ed. W. Hanbeck, 1980, σ. 210-235.
- POLLARD, T. E., "Martyrdom and Resurrection in the New Testament", *BJRL*, 55,1 (1972) 240-251.
- PRESTIGE, G. L., *God in Patristic Thought*, London 1952².
 – , *Fathers and Heretics*, London 1954.
- PREUSCHEN, E., "Origenes und Chrysostomus", *Unsere religiösen Erzieher*, I, Leipzig 1917.
- PRUEM, K., "Der Abschnitt über die Doxa des Apostolats 2 Cor.3,1-4,6 in: des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus", *Biblica*, 30 (1949) 161-196 and 377-400.
- PUECH, A. S., *S. Jean Chrysostome*, Paris 1905⁵.
- QUASTEN, J., *Patrology*, vols. 1-4 (translated into English by, F. Solari), Maryland 1994⁷.
- QUINN, J. D., "St. John Chrysostom on history in the Synoptics", *CBQ*, 24 (2, 1962) 140-147.
- RACKHAM, R. B., *The Acts of the Apostles, Westminster Commentaries*, London 1947¹³
- RAMSAY, W. M., "Paul's attitude towards Peter and James", *The Expositor*, 5 (1896) 43-56.
 – , *St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen*, London 1930¹⁷.
- RATHAI, O., "Johannes Chrysostomus als Exeget", *PB*, 3 (1918) 342-351.
- REISNER, F., "Relations of St. Peter and St. Paul", *DuRe*, 60 (1866) 26.
- RENGSTORF, K. H., "Apostolos", *TDNT*, vol. 1, pp. 407-447.
 – , "Μαθητής", *TDNT*, vol. 4, pp. 415-460.
 – , "Δώδεκα", *TDNT*, vol. 2, pp. 321-328.
 – , *Apostolate and Ministry. The N. Testament doctrine of the office of the Ministry* (translated into English) 1969.
- REUMANN, J., *The Use of οἰκονομία and related Terms in Greek Sources to about A. D. 100, as a background for Patristic Applications*, University of Pennsylvania 1957.
- REYNDERS, B., "Paradosis. Le progrès de l' idée de Tradition chez Saint Irenée", *RTAM*, 5 (1933) 155-194.
- RIDDERBOS, H. N., *Paul and Jesus*, Philadelphia 1958.
- RIDDLE, M. B., "St. Chrysostom as an exegete", *NPNF* 10,20.
- RIGAUX, B., "The Twelve Apostles", *Concilium*, 34 (1968) 5-15.
- ROBBINS, V. K., "Δυνάμεις and Σημεῖα in Mark", *BiRe* 18 (1973) 5-20.
- ROBERTSON, A.- PLUMMER, A., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, ICC, Edinburgh 1961³.
- ROBINSON, J. A., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, London 1928².

- , *The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology*, London 1952.
- RODGERSON, Ph., "Making Christian the Christians: The Baptismal Instructions of St John Chrysostom (use of Paul's Christology)", *GOTR*, 34 (1989) 379-392.
- ROLOFF, J., *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche*, Gütersloh 1965.
- , "Anfänge der Soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu", *NTS*, 19 (1972) 38-64.
- ROMANIDES, J. (ΡΩΜΑΝΙΔΗ, Ι.), «The Ecclesiology of St. Ignatius of Antioch», *GOR*, 7 (1961-1962) 53-77.
- , *Κείμενα Δογματικής και Συμβολικής Θεολογίας τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1982.
- , *Δογματική και Συμβολική Θεολογία τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, τ. 1-2, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.
- ROSREY, "Paul's use of Apostolos", *RQ*, 28 (1985-1986) 193.
- RUNCIMAN, S., *Byzantine Civilization*, London, 1959.
- SABRE, M., "Enkele aspecten van het apostolaat bij Paulus", *CBG*, 3 (1957) 507-521.
- SADOWSKI, F., *The Church Fathers on the Bible*, N. York 1987.
- SAKKOS, S. (ΣΑΚΚΟΥ, Σ.), «Ἀπόστολοι», *Ἡ ἔρευνα τῆς Γραφῆς*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1968.
- , *Ἐπίσημα εἰς τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ Ἰούδα*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1970.
- , *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Καινὴν Διαθήκην*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1971.
- , *Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1972.
- , *Ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ἡ Ρώμη*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1989.
- , *Συμβολισμοὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας στὴν Καινὴ Διαθήκη. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὡς νύμφη*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1994.
- SANDAY, W.- HEADLAM, A. C., *The Epistle to the Romans*, *CEC*, Edinburgh 1955.
- SAWHILL, J. A., *The use of Athletic Metaphors in the Biblical Homilies of John Chrysostom* (Dissertation), Princeton 1928.
- SCHAFER, K. T., "Zur Bedeutung von ἀκρογωνιαίος Eph 2,20", *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift J. Schmid*, pp. 8-219.
- SCHIWIETZ, S., "Die Eschatologie des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus und ihr Verhältnis zu der origenistischen", *Der Katholik* 93 (1913) 445-455. 94 (1914) 45-63. 271-281. 436-448.
- SCHMITHALS, W., *Paul and James* (translated into English by D. M. Barton), London 1965.
- , *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*, (translated into English by J. E. Steely), London 1971.
- SCHNACKENBURG, R., *The Church in the New Testament*, London 1965.

- , "Apostolicity: The present position of Studies", *OChr*, 6,3 (1970) 243-273.
 - , "Apostle before and during Paul's time", *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Presented to F. F. Bruce*, Paternoster 1970, pp. 287-303.
- SCHRENK, G., "Εκλογή", *TDNT*.
- SCHUTZ, J. H., "Apostolic authority and the control of the tradition: 1 Cor 15", *NTS*, 15 (4, 1969), 439-457.
- , *Paul and the anatomy of apostolic authority*, N. York 1975.
- SEELEY & CO., *Apostles and Martyrs. Brief meditation in prose and verse on the Acts of the Apostles. Selected from the works of Chrysostom, Augustine, bishop Newton and other writers*, London 1867.
- SELWYN, E. G., *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London 1946.
- SEMMELOTH, O., "Die Kirche als Ursacrament", G. Barauna, *De Ecclesia, Beiträge zur Konstitution 'über die Kirche' des II Vatikanischen Konzils*, vol. 1, Freiburg 1966.
- SERARIUS, N. D., *Paulus apostolus et Judas Iscariotes proditor*, Wirtzeburgi 1591.
- SIMONETTI, M., Sabellius, Sabellianism, *EnECh*.
- SIOTIS, M. (ΣΙΩΤΗ, Μ.), *Τὸ πρόβλημα τῶν ἀδελφῶν τοῦ Κυρίου*, Ἀθῆναι 1950.
- , *Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος ὡς πνευματικὸς ἡγέτης*, Ἀθῆναι 1961.
 - , *Οἱ τρεῖς Ἱεράρχαι ὡς ἐρμηνευταὶ τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*, Ἀθῆναι 1963.
 - , *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη περὶ τῆς σχέσεως τῶν μυστηρίων Βαπτίσματος, Χρίσματος καὶ θείας Εὐχαριστίας*, Ἀθῆναι 1969.
 - , *Προλεγόμενα εἰς τὴν πρὸς Γαλάτας Ἐπιστολὴν*, Ἀθῆναι 1972.
 - , *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἡ ἐρμηνεία τῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν*, Ἀθῆναι 1973.
- STAMOS, P. (ΣΤΑΜΟΥ, Π.), *Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστομοῦ, τὸ μέγα ἀξίωμα*, Ἀθῆναι 1959.
- STEPHEN, W. R. W., *Saint John Chrysostom. His life and times*, London 1880.
- STOECKER, C., "Eucharistische Gemeinschaft bei Chrysostomus", *TU*, 64 (1957) 309-316.
- STOGIANNOS, B. (ΣΤΟΓΙΑΝΝΟΥ, Β.), *Πέτρος παρὰ Παύλῳ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1968.
- , «Ἡ περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης», *ΣΘΘ* 5 (1971) 7-20.
 - , «Ἡ Ἀποστολικὴ Σύνοδος», *ΕΕΘΣΘ* 18 (1973) 29-218.
 - , *Ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. Εἰσαγωγικὰ προβλήματα καὶ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Α' Κορ. 15*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1977.

- , «Ἡ Πεντηκοστή (Πρξ 2,1-13)», *ΕΕΘΣΘ* 24 (1979) 135-323.
- SWAIN, L., «Apostolate and priesthood in the New Testament», *ClRe*, London, 55 (9, 1970) 679-691.
- SWETE, H. B., *The Holy Spirit in the Early Church*, London 1912.
- , "The Teaching of Christ in the Gospel", *The Expositor*, VI/8 (1903) 116-130.
- TARDIF, H., *Jean Chrysostome*, Paris 1963.
- TELFER, W., "The fourth century Greek Fathers as Exegetes", *HTR*, 50 (1950) 91-105.
- THEODOROU, A. (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ, Α.), *Ἡ περι θεώσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία τῶν ἐλλήνων πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέχρι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ*, Ἀθήναι 1961.
- THEODOROU, E. (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ, Ε.), «Λειτουργικά στοιχεία ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου» *Ἐφημέριος*, 2 (1979) 200-204. 232-235. 265-268.
- THEISSEN, G., *The First Followers of Jesus*, London 1978.
- THORNTON, T. C. G., "Satan-God's agent for punishment", *ExTi*, 83,5 (1972) 150-151.
- THRALL, M. E., "Super-Apostles, servants of Christ and servants of satan", *JSNT*, 6 (1980) 42-57.
- , "Salvation proclaimed: v. 2 Cor 5: 18-21", *ExTi* 93 (1982) 227-232.
- TOWERS, J., "The value of the Fathers", *ChQR*, 66 (1965) 291-302.
- TRAKATELLIS, D. (ΤΡΑΚΑΤΕΛΛΗ, Δ.), *Ἐξουσία καὶ πάθος. Χριστολογικὲς ἀπόψεις τοῦ κατὰ Μᾶρκον εὐαγγελίου*, Ἀθήνα 1983.
- TREMPELAS, P. (ΤΡΕΜΠΕΛΑ, Π.), *Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος ὡς ἱεροκῆρυξ*, Ἀθήναι 1924.
- , *Αἱ τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Ἀθήναι 1935.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν*, Ἀθήναι 1968.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον*, Ἀθήναι 1958.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸ κατὰ Μᾶρκον εὐαγγέλιον*, Ἀθήναι 1972².
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον*, Ἀθήναι 1972².
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον*, Ἀθήναι 1969.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, Ἀθήναι 1955.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης*, vols. Α', Β', Γ', Ἀθήναι 1956.

- , *Δογματική*, vols. 1-3, Ἀθήναι 1959.
- TRENCH, R., *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*, London 1913.
- TRUDINGER, L. P., ""Ἐτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον". A note on Galatians 1,19", *NovT*, 17 (3, 1975) 200-202.
- TZORTZATOS, B. (ΤΖΩΡΤΖΑΤΟΥ, Β.), *Ἡ περὶ τῶν Ἀγίων Γραφῶν διδασκαλία Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου*, Ἀθήναι 1947.
- , *Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος βάσει τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ*, Ἀθήναι 1952.
- VAKAROS, D. (ΒΑΚΑΡΟΥ, Δ.), *Ἡ ἀποστολή τῶν Δώδεκα κατὰ τὰ συνοπτικὰ Εὐαγγέλια*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983.
- VANDENBERGHE, B. H., "Chrysostome et Paul", *VSp*, 34 (1952) 161-174.
- , *Saint Jean Chrysostome et la Parole de Dieu*, Paris 1961.
- , "Les Raisons de Souffrir d' après Saint Jean Chrysostome", *VSp*, 100 (1959) 187-206.
- VAPHEIDIS, PH. (ΒΑΦΕΙΔΟΥ, Φ.), *Ὁ ἰ. Χρυσόστομος καὶ ἡ δρᾶσις αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1931.
- VENIAMIN, C., *The Transfiguration of Christ in Greek Patristic Literature: From Irenaeus of Lyon to Gregory Palamas* (D. Ph Thesis), Oxford 1991.
- VERGOTIS, G. (ΒΕΡΓΩΤΗ, Γ.), «Ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ στὰ κείμενα τῆς θείας Εὐχαριστίας τῶν ἁγίων Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου καὶ τοῦ Μ. Βασιλείου», *ΠΘΣΜΘ*, *Ὁ ἐπουράνιος Πατήρ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993, σ. 79-102.
- VERHEUL, A., "De moderne exegese over apostolos", *Sacris Erudiri*, 1948, pp. 380-396.
- VIA, D. O., "The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew", *SJT*, 11,3 (1958) 271-286.
- VIELHAUER, P., *Oikodome, Das Bild von Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clement Alexandrinus*, Heidelberg 1940.
- VOGELSTEIN, H., "The development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its transformation in Christianity", *HUCA*, 2 (1925) 99-123.
- VOULGARIS, CH. (ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΗ, Χ.), "Εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν: 2 Cor 5,16 and the problem of St. Paul's opponents in Corinth", *Θεολογία* 46 (1, 1959) 148-164.
- , *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1974.
- , *Ἐπίκλημα εἰς τὴν πρώτην Καθολικὴν Ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου Πέτρου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979.
- , *Χρονολογία τῶν γεγονότων τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου*, Ἀθήναι 1983.

- , «Ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ. Τὸ τυπολογικὸν ὑπόβαθρον τοῦ Ἑβρ. 3,1», *ΕΕΘΣΠΑ*, 26 (1984) 321-348.
- , *Ἐπίτομη εἰς τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν*, Ἀθήναι 1993.
- WACE H.-PIERCY W., "Apostles", *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature*, (ed. Wace H. & Piercy W.), London 1911.
- WALLS, A. F., "A note on the apostolic claim in the Church order Literature", *SP*, 2 (1957) 83-92.
- WARD, R. B., "James of Jerusalem", *RQ*, 16 (3-4, 1973) 174-190.
- WATKINS, H. W., *The Gospel according to St. John*, (ed. C. J. Ellicott), 3rd edition, London.
- WEAVER, J. A., «Catechetical themes in the post-baptismal teaching of St. John Chrysostom» (Thesis), Catholic University of America, 1964.
- WEISH, J., *Earlier Christianity*, N. York 1959.
- WEIZSAECKER, C., *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church* (translated into English by J. Millar), N. York 1984.
- WESTCOTT, B. F., "Additional note on chap. 20,21", *The Gospel according to St John*, London 1890.
- WHALE, J. S., "Christians and Time", *CJT*, 4,2 (1958) 86-94.
- WHITAKER, G. H., "Chrysostom on 1 Cor 1,13", *JTS*, 15 (1914) 254-257.
- WIESER, T., "Notes on the meaning of the Apostolate", *IRM*, 64 (1975) 129-136.
- WILES, M., *The Divine Apostle: The interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the early Church*, Cambridge 1967.
- , *The Spiritual Gospel. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, Cambridge 1960.
- WINDRISCH, H., *Paulus und Christus*, Leipzig 1934.
- W. J. J., "Apostles", *CDTh*.
- WOOD, J. D., *The interpretation of the Bible*, London 1958.
- WOULDER, W. J., "The Old Testament Background and the Interpretation of Mk 10,45", *NTS*, 24 (1977) 120-127.
- YAZIGI, P., *Ἐσχατολογία καὶ Ἠθικὴ, ἡ ἐσχατολογικὴ θεμελίωσις τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992.
- YIEVTITS, A. (ΓΙΕΦΤΙΤΣ, Α.), *Ἡ ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου κατὰ τὸν ἱ. Χρυσόστομον*, Ἀθήναι 1967.
- YOUNG, J. E., "That some should be Apostles", *EvQ*, 48 (1976) 96-104.
- ZISIS, TH. (ΖΗΣΗ, Θ.), «Ὁ Μ. Ἀθανάσιος ὡς πηγὴ τῆς περὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλίας τοῦ Μ. Βασιλείου», *Τόμος ἐόρτιος Μ. Ἀθανασίου*, 1974, σ. 197-233.
- , «Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ Ἰωάννης Χρυσόστομος», *Κληρονομία*, 14 (1982) 313-323.

- , *Ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1992.
- , *Ἐπόμενοι τοῖς θείοις πατράσι. Ἀρχές καὶ κριτήρια τῆς πατερικῆς θεολογίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1993.

ZIZIOULAS, J. (ZHIZIOYLA, I.), *Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐν τῇ θεῖα Εὐχαριστία καὶ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς πρώτους αἰῶνας*, Ἀθῆναι 1965.

- , "Some Reflection on Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist", *Sobornost* 5 (1969) 644-652.
- , "Apostolic continuity and Orthodox Theology: Towards a synthesis of two perspectives", *SVTQ*, 19,2 (1975) 75-108.
- , "The Ecclesiology of the Orthodox Tradition", *Search*, 7 (1984) 46έ.
- , *Being as Communion*, (St Vladimir's Seminary Press), N. York 1985.

