

## CHAPTER 1

### APPROACHING AND PROBLEMATISING SLAVERY IN CHRYSOSTOMIC LITERATURE

#### 1 INTRODUCTION TO AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

One of the greatest moral and social problems one encounters in the study of early Christian literature and history is slavery. What is even more troubling is that while slavery, to the modern eye, is one of the greatest human rights violations imaginable, very few early Christian authors exhibit this same disposition. In almost all instances when reading the New Testament, it simply seems as if slavery was quietly accepted and managed as any other social institution. In most instances, the famous baptismal formula used by Paul in Galatians 3:28, that in Christ ‘there is neither...slave nor free,’ had lost its original impetus, if it ever had it, and was reduced to a dead, spiritual metaphor in its use among later Christian authors.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, slavery had become such an embedded and well-maintained social-institution that it would be impossible to simply avoid it, especially since the ancient Roman economy was a slave-dependent economy.<sup>2</sup> In fact, slavery may be described as the one social phenomenon from antiquity that discerns it from our world today. While there are still many forms of modern-day slavery, such as human trafficking, Roman slavery had its own, unique character, one that even shows much difference from the Atlantic slave enterprise. Slavery is therefore, to use more blunt language, a tricky and messy problem for cultural historians of late antiquity.

My own interest in the topic of slavery, however, did not result directly from reading scholarly works on slavery as such; rather, my curiosity began via a different route, namely cultural historical studies on embodiment, as well as from gender studies, philosophy and critical theory. My reading on this topic led me to a book that in fact first made me consider slavery in

---

<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey E. M. de Ste. Croix, “Early Christian Attitudes to Property and Slavery,” SCH 12 (1975): 18–22.

<sup>2</sup> Jennifer A. Glancy, *Slavery as Moral Problem in the Early Church and Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 1.

late antiquity as a topic for my dissertation. The book I read was Jennifer Glancy's, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (2006). In this book slavery is approached from the perspective of the rhetoric of the body, and I saw an opportunity for a novel research project, especially since this book did not venture into the late ancient context in much detail.<sup>3</sup> At that point I had just finished an M.Th. dissertation on John Chrysostom's homilies on the spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12, and I decided that approaching slavery, from the perspective of embodiment as cultural historical enterprise in the homilies of John Chrysostom would suffice as an intriguing topic. It was also very convenient since slavery would fit in perfectly with the project my supervisor, Prof. Hennie Stander, was involved in, namely 'Early Christianity and the Ancient Economy,' (headed by Proff. Fika van Rensburg and John Fitzgerald), active as a program unit within the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) and also as a sub-group with the New Testament Society of South Africa (NTSSA). Before embarking on this study, I had published some preliminary findings in an article entitled, 'John Chrysostom on Slavery.'<sup>4</sup> But after finishing the article, there were many questions left unanswered and this supported the idea of writing a dissertation on the topic. As the study developed, I was very fortunate to present and test many of the ideas here as papers at academic conferences. A rough outline and summary of the most important points of the dissertation was presented in August 2011 at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies at the University of Oxford. I was also very fortunate to have had the opportunity to present some of the main points of chapter 3, on the domesticity of the slave-body, at a departmental research seminar in that same month hosted by the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Studies at the University of South Africa (UNISA). In November 2011, a large part of chapter 4, on the heteronomous body, was presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL in San Francisco and a very abridged version of chapter 5, on the carcerality of the slave-

---

<sup>3</sup> Jennifer A. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006). Only later did I discover that she also published an extremely well-written paper on the topic of slaveholding in the late ancient church; cf. Jennifer A. Glancy, "Christian Slavery in Late Antiquity," in *Human Bondage in the Cultural Contact Zone: Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Slavery and Its Discourses* (Raphael Hörmann and Gesa Mackenthun (eds); Münster: Waxmann, 2010), 63–80.

<sup>4</sup> Chris L. de Wet, "John Chrysostom on Slavery," *SHE* 34, no. 2 (2008): 1–13. There was also a conference on Philemon that I attended and subsequently published a paper related to this topic entitled, "Honour Discourse in John Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Letter to Philemon," in *Philemon in Perspective* (BZNW 169; D. Francois Tolmie (ed.); Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 317–32.

body, was read in May 2012 at the Annual Meeting of the North American Patristics Society (NAPS) in Chicago. Much of the information found in the final chapter on the commodification of the body, as well some comments on carcerality were presented as a main paper at the NTSSA conference in June 2012 in Pietermaritzburg.

Most importantly, also in June 2012, I had arranged a research workshop at UNISA entitled, ‘Redescribing Ancient Slavery and Its Modern Legacies: Problems, Approaches and Possibilities.’ The purpose of this project was to revisit and also to redescribe the corporeal discourse of ancient slavery. The critical enterprise of redescribing implies that ancient slavery as it is understood today is a scholarly construction, one that should always be subject to scrutiny, revision and further theoretical and systematic exploration. It therefore implies the re-problematisation of core issues addressed in scholarship on ancient slavery, along with endeavours to expand on its foundational discursivities. Redescription, moreover, nuances to dissatisfaction with some conceptualisations and enunciative modalities which have surfaced in the scholarly discourse of ancient slavery. In redescribing ancient slavery, along with its modern legacies, the need not only for new, interdisciplinary approaches is recognised, but the necessity for developing a new way of conceptualising about ancient slavery – that is, a new, critical language – is stressed. Manners in which ancient slavery as a discourse ‘speaks itself’ through the bodies of men, women and children are at the center here. Behind this pervasive and degrading practice, several discourses operate which are still very prevalent in modern society. The project aimed to account for these discourses and conceptualise and problematise their functioning in both ancient and modern society (with a focus on the African context). The project was interdisciplinary, incorporating scholarship from the fields of Biblical and Ancient Historical Studies, but also from Roman Law, Linguistics, Critical Theory, Philosophy, Gender Studies, Cultural Anthropology and Sociology. It was a very productive day with papers read by scholars from the fields of Jurisprudence, African Culture and Linguistics as well as Sociology. Many of these issues also surface in this dissertation. This was also the instance in which I invited Jennifer Glancy to contribute, the scholar whose work inspired this very project. I am also very fortunate to have had her read large selections from chapters 2, 3 and 5, and even more fortunate for the gracious comments she provided.

This is then the history and development of this research project and dissertation. The completion of the dissertation does not imply the completion of the project itself, which will still

continue for at least 3 years. The point of this dissertation was to critically investigate how slavery functions in John Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews. I will now provide some preliminary remarks on this excursus, a *status quaestionis*, problem statement and methodological remarks, as well as an outline of the study

## 2 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, SLAVERY AND LATE ANCIENT STUDIES

In his prodigious study on slavery in the late Roman world, Kyle Harper lists John Chrysostom as 'an unparalleled source for the realities of Roman slavery'.<sup>5</sup> This is no trifling matter, since the evidence for slavery in the late Roman world, both literary and archaeological, is sparse. Harper's work is one of a number of recent studies on slavery in the first four centuries CE. Along with Harper, another compelling book also appeared in 2011, namely volume 1 of the *Cambridge World History of Slavery*, which examines slavery in the ancient Mediterranean world.<sup>6</sup> In the nascent decade of this new millennium, nearly every year boasted a new title on slavery in the ancient world. The revival of interest in slavery in the ancient world is part of a larger project of writing a new cultural history of antiquity. This was especially signalled by scholars such as Paul Veyne, Peter Brown and Averil Cameron. Paul Veyne's ground-breaking study entitled, *Le pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (1976)<sup>7</sup> set the scene for scholars who began utilizing methods and trajectories from New Cultural Theory to understand the history and historiography of late antiquity. Along with Veyne, there is also Peter Brown, who wrote several works of extreme importance for advancing the field of late antiquity.<sup>8</sup> Another example is Averil Cameron, who especially helped scholars to understand

---

<sup>5</sup> Kyle Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275–425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 205.

<sup>6</sup> Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (eds), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

<sup>7</sup> Paul Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque: Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1976).

<sup>8</sup> Most notably: Peter R. L. Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *JRS* 61 (1971): 80–101; Peter R. L. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971); Peter R. L. Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Haskell Lectures on the History of Religions 13; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Peter R. L. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women & Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); Peter R. L. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992); Peter R. L. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (London: University Press of New England, 2002).

how rhetoric and discourse function in the culture of late antiquity.<sup>9</sup> This scholarly *coup d'état* would only grow stronger in the years after these foundational studies. The multi-authored book, *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (2005) is an example of the development of the study of late antiquity.<sup>10</sup> Studies on the body and sexuality such as those by Brown,<sup>11</sup> Clark,<sup>12</sup> Glancy,<sup>13</sup> and Burrus,<sup>14</sup> among others, stand out in this array of scholarship. Finally, the new *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (2008)<sup>15</sup> and the *Blackwell Companion to Late Antiquity* (2009)<sup>16</sup> have taken the lead in presenting this scholarship into mainstream teaching. Having said this, neither of these two titles have a chapter devoted to slavery. The *Blackwell Companion* does not refer to slavery at all, while the *Oxford Handbook* has two pages (out of

---

<sup>9</sup> Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Sather Classical Lectures 55; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

<sup>10</sup> Dale B. Martin and Patricia Cox Miller (eds), *The Cultural Turn in Late Ancient Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005). It especially illustrates the transition of the traditional field of Patristics to Early Christian and Late Ancient Studies; cf. Elizabeth A. Clark, "From Patristics to Early Christian Studies," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter (eds); Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 7–41; Chris L. de Wet, "Editorial: The Rise of Early Christian Studies," *APB* 21, no. 1 (2010): 1–2.

<sup>11</sup> Brown, *Body and Society*.

<sup>12</sup> Elizabeth Clark was especially influential in this regard; cf. Elizabeth A. Clark, "Sexual Politics in the Writings of John Chrysostom," *ATHR* 59 (1977): 3–20; Elizabeth A. Clark, "Foucault, the Fathers, and Sex," *JAAR* 56, no. 4 (1988): 619–41; Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Elizabeth A. Clark, "Ideology, History and the Construction of 'Woman' in Late Ancient Christianity," in *A Feminist Companion to Patristic Literature* (Amy-Jill Levine and Maria M. Robbins (eds); London: T&T Clark, 2008), 101–24.

<sup>13</sup> Besides her works on slavery, cf. also: Jennifer A. Glancy, *Corporal Knowledge: Early Christian Bodies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>14</sup> For instance: Virginia Burrus, *The Sex Lives of Saints: An Erotics of Ancient Hagiography* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Virginia Burrus, *Saving Shame: Martyrs, Saints and Other Abject Subjects* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Virginia Burrus, Mark D. Jordan, and Karmen MacKendrick, *Seducing Augustine: Bodies, Desires, Confessions* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010).

<sup>15</sup> Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

<sup>16</sup> Philip Rousseau (ed.), *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

nearly 1000) devoted to slavery.<sup>17</sup> Yet ancient slavery has played a key role in the formation of many concepts central to this historiography, such as gender, honour/shame and the economy.

We have then two important points to stress; on the one hand, as Harper as stated, John Chrysostom is one of our most important sources for slavery (and most other subjects) in late antiquity; and on the other, slavery is a keystone in the project of writing a cultural history of late antiquity. Yet there is no decisive cultural historical study of slavery focussed on the writings of John Chrysostom. The two studies on slavery and Chrysostom, Kontoulis<sup>18</sup> and Jaeger,<sup>19</sup> are both socio-historical and theological studies, which follow a conventional approach to the topic. These two writings will be discussed below, but it is also worth mentioning that they are difficult to obtain, both written in German, and somewhat dated. Moreover, there have been astronomical leaps in research on slavery since the publication of these two works that need to serve as background to reading slavery in the writings of John Chrysostom. Notwithstanding the latter, Jennifer Glancy said it best in the introduction to her seminal study, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (2006):

[W]e have to remember that the picture of slavery we derive from these sources is pieced together rather than given. Any description of slavery in antiquity is the product of multiple scholarly decisions...<sup>20</sup>

The reason for this ambiguity lies in the fact that our sources for slavery in antiquity, especially late antiquity, are limited, complex and problematic. Due the scarcity of literary and archaeological evidence for understanding late ancient slavery, the historian is constantly under threat of writing a history that is lacunaic and biased. The single greatest obstruction to this is that we do not possess one source from the first four centuries depicting slavery from the slave's

---

<sup>17</sup> Francine Cardman, "Early Christian Ethics," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter (eds); Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 943–44.

<sup>18</sup> Georg Kontoulis, *Zum Problem der Sklaverei (ΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ) bei den kappadokischen Kirchenvatern und Johannes Chrysostomus* (Bonn: Habelt, 1993).

<sup>19</sup> Wulf Jaeger, "Die Sklaverei bei Johannes Chrysostomus" (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation; University of Kiel, 1974).

<sup>20</sup> Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, 3.

perspective.<sup>21</sup> All writings are composed by slaveholders rather than slaves, and only one side of the story is therefore present. Harrill has argued that the majority of references to slaves in the literary sources of early Christianity are more often based on literary stereotypes than reality - so even the opinions of ancient authors are ideological constructs.<sup>22</sup> These scholarly constructions act like tainted glass windows, through which the curious observer must look. Each tint may highlight certain scenes, and darken others. And so our observer would move to another window to see the picture differently. The scenes highlighted by the cultural historical tint of this study are by no means all embracing or kaleidoscopic. It aims to highlight some milieux that may have been neglected and darkened by others. There is then a very urgent need for a new cultural historical analysis of slavery exclusively in the writings of John Chrysostom. This study aims to fill this gap and provide new insights based on recent research, in English, and therefore accessible to a wider scholarly public. It aims to address the lack of a cultural historical analysis of slavery in John Chrysostom's writings, and, as it will be demonstrated at the end of this chapter, how Chrysostom specifically views slavery in the context of Pauline ethics found in the New Testament, since the main sources used will be Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews (which Chrysostom assumes was written by Paul). The dissertation is therefore both a cultural historical analysis of Chrysostom's views on slavery, but also an investigation into the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of slavery in the Pauline Epistles.

### **3 STATUS QUAESTIONIS: SLAVERY AND JOHN CHRYSOSTOM**

This section will now examine the history of research on slavery in the writings of John Chrysostom. There are only two studies that directly and extensively treat the issue of slavery in Chrysostom, Jaeger<sup>23</sup> and Kontoulis,<sup>24</sup> and these studies merit discussion. In addition, Harper's<sup>25</sup> study will also be discussed here since his use of Chrysostom is so extensive, more than any other source not solely devoted to Chrysostom. Although there are numerous other studies that

---

<sup>21</sup> Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 16–23.

<sup>22</sup> J. Albert Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social and Moral Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006).

<sup>23</sup> Jaeger, "Sklaverei."

<sup>24</sup> Kontoulis, *Problem der Sklaverei*.

<sup>25</sup> Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*.

mention Chrysostom, none provide a detailed discussion of slavery in Chrysostom's writings, which excludes them from the present discussion.

### 3.1 Wulf Jaeger: 'Die Sklaverei bei Johannes Chrysostomus' (1974)

One of the earliest studies discussing John Chrysostom's approach to slavery is that of Johann A. Möhler, 'Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der Aufhebung der Sklaverei';<sup>26</sup> the dating of the particular article is obscure, possibly 1840, as only secondary references are available on this work that is out of print. The discussion remains basic, touching on all aspects from manumission to the treatment of slaves. The article provides a good overview of relevant passages in the homilies. The problem is that it remains a discussion within a larger, general discussion of slavery, so Möhler's discussion remains cursory and mostly descriptive.

The first study fully devoted to slavery in the writings of Chrysostom is Wulf Jaeger's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 'Die Sklaverei bei Johannes Chrysostomus' (1974).<sup>27</sup> Jaeger's study has done some important groundwork for the study of slavery in the writings of Chrysostom. It provides a rather thorough lexicographical survey, and an interesting section on the social aspects of slavery in Chrysostom's writings.<sup>28</sup> But the focus of the study is the metaphor of slavery and its theological implications.

After the lexicographical examination, Jaeger looks at slavery as a social institution in late antiquity.<sup>29</sup> The section is rather conventional, and touches on most basic aspects of slavery in the later Roman world. The character and nature of slavery is discussed very briefly, followed by a section on the conditions of impoverished freed persons.<sup>30</sup> This point is interesting, since Jaeger argues that many freed persons, after they were manumitted, led very impoverished lives. Hence Chrysostom's advice to teach slaves a trade before manumitting them. Jaeger's point here is convincing and very important for the social context of freed persons in late antiquity. It is then followed by a section on the numismatics of slavery. He is concerned with the very high

---

<sup>26</sup> Johann A. Möhler, "Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der Aufhebung der Sklaverei," in *Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze II* (Johann J. I. von Döllinger (ed.); Regensburg: Manz, 1939–40), 54–140.

<sup>27</sup> Jaeger, "Sklaverei."

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 3–24.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 24–42.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 27–33.



number of slaves and slaveholders, but the section is unfortunately very terse.<sup>31</sup> Harper's assessment of slave numismatics is much better and more sophisticated than Jaeger's, who could have given more thought to the subject.<sup>32</sup> The trading of slaves is also discussed.<sup>33</sup>

After Jaeger's cursory discussion of the institution of slavery (a mere 18 pages), the discussion on the character and morality of slaves follows.<sup>34</sup> This is especially examined in the light of Chrysostom's statements on the vice and bad character of slaves.<sup>35</sup> He even lists some possible reasons why slaves were unsavoury characters and how Chrysostom seeks to improve their behaviour.<sup>36</sup> He also looks at some characteristics that may have remained after the slave was manumitted.<sup>37</sup> This section is contrasted by the image of the good and faithful slave. The focus here is on domestic slaves, and their duties.<sup>38</sup> This section on the domestic slave is more detailed; it is mostly descriptive - based on the Chrysostomic sources. Attention is given to slaves' duties in the house, including medical, sexual and administrative duties.<sup>39</sup> The relationship between slaves and children is also discussed.<sup>40</sup> Jaeger also provides a discussion of manumission, including its forms, representation and the issue of slaves with priests and monks.<sup>41</sup>

The majority of the study is reserved for the theological aspect of slavery.<sup>42</sup> The metaphor of slavery and its comparisons with sin affords much discussion. Jaeger also focuses a lot on the role of the church in the salvation of people from the 'slavery of sin'. This section is basically a thorough discussion of the metaphor of slavery in the theology of Chrysostom.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 34–36.

<sup>32</sup> Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 33–66.

<sup>33</sup> Jaeger, "Sklaverei," 36–42.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 43–58.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 43–48.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 49–55.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 58–141.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 62–82.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 132–40.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 141–50.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 155 ff.

This dissertation is the first and almost the only thorough discussion of slavery in Chrysostom's writings. The main problem with Jaeger is that his hypothesis assumes that Chrysostom's teachings on slavery were ameliorative to the issue. In other words, Chrysostom's advice improved conditions for slaves. I would argue the opposite in this study. On the surface it may seem true, but the cultural historical dynamics need to be examined more closely. Furthermore, Jaeger assumes that Chrysostom's descriptions of slaves, and in particular, their character, is based on real life. Although Chrysostom's descriptions are not entirely fictive, a more sophisticated approach is needed than merely contrasting 'good' and 'bad' slaves. Chrysostom often uses hyperbole and other rhetorical techniques of persuasion and dramatisation to get his point across - often an exaggerated point. In the context of the New Testament and early Christianity, both Glancy<sup>43</sup> and especially Harrill<sup>44</sup> have convincingly shown that slaves in ancient literary sources are often popular slave stereotypes that are not always based on reality. Chrysostom is no exception to this, and Jaeger perhaps takes Chrysostom too seriously in this regard. Chrysostom speaks to slaveholders and therefore speaks the language of the slaveholders.

The most important point Jaeger stresses is that Chrysostom aims to provide corrective measures for improving the morality of slaves. But unfortunately he does not explore the dynamics behind this concept. Sadly, only 12 pages are reserved for this crucial aspect of understanding slavery with Chrysostom. But Jaeger is clear in his point. He aims to focus on the theology of Chrysostom and how slavery fits in that theology, especially the metaphor of slavery in terms of sin and salvation. Jaeger's study is valuable in this area, the Chrysostomic theology - but in terms of understanding slavery as a social, cultural and historical phenomenon in late antiquity, it has little to offer.

### **3.2 Georg Kontoulis: *Zum Problem der Sklaverei (ΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ) bei den kappadokischen Kirchenvatern und Johannes Chrysostomus (1993)***

As with Jaeger, this study is also based on the author's doctoral thesis. Slavery is discussed in the writings of the Cappadocian fathers and Chrysostom, and also like Jaeger, is an investigation into the theological-ethical aspects of slavery. The metaphor of slavery and its relationship to sin

---

<sup>43</sup> Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, 102–29.

<sup>44</sup> Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament*, 1–59.

dominates most of the discussion.<sup>45</sup> It is especially focussed on how the four ancient writers view slavery in relation to the human passions, and how the human being is also a slave to her/his passions. The origin of slavery is discussed in its theological-ethical guise. Both Kontoulis and Jaeger stress that Chrysostom never calls for the abolition of slavery, which is an easy observation to make, but both have an nuance that these authors made life a bit easier for slaves, and thus supports the amelioration thesis. There is a strong ecclesiological focus in the section discussing Chrysostom, which discusses aspects of theological anthropology, equality, poverty and the role of the church in the protection of runaway slaves and asylum-seekers.<sup>46</sup>

The wide scope of the study does not allow Kontoulis the luxury of very detailed investigations into the Chrysostomic literature, which is the greatest weakness of the study. It does pose some interesting questions, especially on how Chrysostom views equality.<sup>47</sup> The discussion of the origins of slavery is certainly more sophisticated than that of Jaeger.<sup>48</sup>

The strength and value of the study is that it contextualises Chrysostom's views in the light of the Cappadocians, and trends are easy to spot between the ancient authors. It shows how the East was influenced by Stoic teachings on slavery and their important emphasis on ethics and virtue. It illustrates general tendencies related to slavery in the East, especially due to the influence of asceticism, and this explanation of the inter-ideology of slavery among the four famous eastern fathers is a valuable contribution.

### **3.3 Kyle Harper: *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275-425* (2011)**

Kyle Harper's work can be described as the single most important and comprehensive work on late Roman slavery to date. Although this book does not have a direct focus on Chrysostom, he is still one of the primary sources used in the book, and Harper provides important discussions on many of Chrysostom's views. Its only weakness is that it does not have a systematized discussion of Chrysostom's views on slavery, but then, that is not the purpose of the book. The most important hypothesis in the book is that late Roman slavery was alive and well during the time of Chrysostom, and in accordance with Wickham's monumental study of the early medieval

---

<sup>45</sup> Kontoulis, *Problem der Sklaverei*, 355–65.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 317–24.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 320–22.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 325–54.

period,<sup>49</sup> there was no slow transition of late Roman slavery into early medieval serfdom. Harper rather argues that slavery almost disappeared due to a complete systemic collapse of supply and demand due to the gradual disintegration of the Roman Empire.

The book examines the economic, social and legal aspects of late Roman slavery in the minutest of detail, and provides an impressive array of sources, models and hypotheses for scholarship on the issue. Harper's views will be examined and critiqued throughout this study.

Despite the importance of this book, it is still not a focussed discussion of John Chrysostom's views on slavery. Chrysostomic texts are cited and discussed, but mostly to illustrate a greater trend in Roman society. Often Harper only skims over crucial passages, for instance Chrysostom's *Homiliae in epistulam I ad Corinthios* 40, probably the single most important reference, which merits only the briefest of comment.<sup>50</sup> In all fairness, this is not what Harper's book sets out to do, nor can it be described as a cultural history of slavery in the late Roman world. Much hard work has gone into this book (also revised from a dissertation), and Harper has done most of the groundwork for scholars working with slavery in the late Roman world. He has addressed some issues that are of crucial importance (especially his refutation of the 'transition' and 'amelioration' hypotheses),<sup>51</sup> and has now enabled us to go further and ask other questions in order to understand slavery better. With his extensive dependence on Chrysostom as a source, Harper, in fact, prompts the need for a focussed study of slavery in Chrysostom's works.

### 3.4 Other Studies of Importance

In this discussion of the *status quaestionis* I have attempted to remain close to sources that are specifically focussed on Chrysostom (Jaeger and Kontoulis), or rely heavily upon him as a source (Harper). I did not wish to list other general works on slavery, which would lead to an almost endless discussion, since there are so many. I do wish to highlight some important works on slavery in the late Roman world that are relevant for this study, even though they do not have direct focus on John Chrysostom.

---

<sup>49</sup> Chris Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

<sup>50</sup> Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 473–74.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 3–66.

### 3.4.1 Richard Klein

A number of articles have been published by Klein on slavery in the writings of late ancient Christian authors, and these studies are also important in viewing the milieu of Chrysostom and his discussions on slavery. Especially important for this discussion, in supplementing the work of Kontoulis, is Klein's, *Die Haltung der kappadokischen Bischöfe Basilius von Caesarea, Gregor von Nazianz, und Gregor von Nyssa zur Sklaverei* (2000),<sup>52</sup> in which the stance of the Cappadocians on slavery is critically discussed and evaluated, following his 1988 study of the same topic focussed on the writings of Ambrose and Augustine.<sup>53</sup> Although still very theologically oriented, it is a helpful source, along with most of Klein's other publications. The importance of Klein's work is highlighted in his demonstration that Christianity was not ameliorative, and shows continuity of mass-scale slavery into the fifth century. In his article entitled, 'Zum Verhältnis von Herren und Sklaven in der Spätantike' (1999),<sup>54</sup> Klein focuses on the western Empire during the fifth century, especially Italy and Gaul.<sup>55</sup> He argues that Christian and non-Christian authors differed sharply on the nature of slavery, and that Aristotle's notion of natural slavery was still very prevalent among non-Christian authors (an issue that is questioned in this dissertation). It was not ameliorative though, since the number of slaves did not really decrease, and conditions were still set against slaves. Klein has also published an article on Jerome and slavery, 'Der Kirchenvater Hieronymus und die Sklaverei: Ein Einblick' (2001),<sup>56</sup> which is without the typical theological and metaphorical emphases. There are interesting

---

<sup>52</sup> Richard Klein, *Die Haltung der kappadokischen Bischöfe Basilius von Caesarea, Gregor von Nazianz, und Gregor von Nyssa Zur Sklaverei* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2000).

<sup>53</sup> Richard Klein, *Die Sklaverei in der Sicht der Bischöfe Ambrosius und Augustinus* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1988).

<sup>54</sup> Richard Klein, "Zum Verhältnis von Herren und Sklaven in der Spätantike," in *Roma Versa Per Aevum: Ausgewählte Schriften zur Heidnischen und Christlichen Spätantike* (Raban von Haehling and Klaus Scherberich (eds); Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1999), 356–93.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. also: Noel Lenski, "Captivity, Slavery, and Cultural Exchange Between Rome and the Germans from the First to the Seventh Century CE," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences* (Catherine M. Cameron (ed.); Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2008), 80–109.

<sup>56</sup> Richard Klein, "Der Kirchenvater Hieronymus und die Sklaverei: Ein Einblick," in *Fünfzig Jahre Forschungen zur Antiken Sklaverei an der Mainzer Akademie, 1950–2000: Miscellanea zum Jubiläum* (Heinz Bellen and Heinz Heinen (eds); Stuttgart: Steiner, 2001), 401–25.

discussions of slavery in monasticism, and most importantly for this study, there is a focus on the role of Pauline literature in Jerome's views on slavery, especially the household codes and the letter to Philemon.

### 3.4.2 Jennifer Glancy

Glancy has done extensive research on slavery in early Christianity, with a unique focus on the concept of slaves as 'bodies'.<sup>57</sup> Glancy argues that slaves should be understood as surrogate bodies for their owners, and especially focuses on the sexuality of these surrogate bodies, the issue of gender and the issue of slaves' participation in the nascent early church.

For this current study, Glancy's views have proven to be the most influential. Her proposition of understanding slaveholding as the management and regulation of bodies serve as the basic axiom for this study. Furthermore, Glancy's application of Bourdieu's notion of the habitus is also applied here, and serves as a very helpful and creative way of approaching ancient slavery.<sup>58</sup> Much more will be said on Glancy's views of slaveholding through the course of this dissertation.

### 3.4.3 Youval Rotman

Rotman's study on slavery in the Byzantine world has shed light on some of the most important aspects of the institution during the Byzantine period.<sup>59</sup> It is especially welcome since the only definitive study of the topic was that of Hadjinicolaou-Marava, a monograph entitled, *Recherches sur la vie des esclaves dans le monde Byzantin* (1950).<sup>60</sup> Despite its emphasis on

---

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*; Glancy, *Corporal Knowledge*; Jennifer A. Glancy, "Early Christianity, Slavery, and Women's Bodies," in *Beyond Slavery: Overcoming Its Religious and Sexual Legacies* (Bernadette J. Brooten (ed.); New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 143–58; Jennifer Glancy, "Slavery and the Rise of Christianity," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Keith R. Bradley and Paul Cartledge (eds); Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 456–81; Glancy, *Slavery as Moral Problem*.

<sup>58</sup> Glancy, "Christian Slavery in Late Antiquity."

<sup>59</sup> Youval Rotman, *Byzantine Slavery and the Mediterranean World* (Jane M. Todd (trans.); London: Harvard University Press, 2009).

<sup>60</sup> Anne Hadjinicolaou-Marava, *Recherches sur la vie des esclaves dans le monde Byzantin* (Athens: Institut Francais d'Athènes, 1950).

medieval slavery, this study remains of direct importance for working on slavery in Chrysostom's writings; it also offers a compelling view of the nature of slavery, which is very much the same as in this current study. Rotman especially argues for an emphasis on the socio-cultural nature of slavery. Interestingly enough, he is one of the few authors who critiques the oft-supposed dichotomy between slaves and masters, which is problematic for autocratic societies like Byzantium. Rotman convincingly illustrates various continuities between slavery from late antiquity and that of Byzantium, making it an interesting reading-partner for the seminal and crucial study of Wickham.<sup>61</sup>

There is unfortunately not that much reference to Chrysostom himself - mostly only in passing. The study is conventional in that it prefers to rely on several *loci classici* from late antiquity, namely Jerome's *Vita Malchi*, Pseudo-Nilus' *Narrationes*, and Gregory of Nyssa's *Homiliae in Ecclesiasten 4*. It is nevertheless a crucial study for understanding the context and continuity of slavery in Chrysostom's writings and their possible impact in the centuries following.

There are many other studies that focus on slavery in the late Roman world or in early Christianity that are of utmost importance. These will be utilized in the body of the study. What is evident from this discussion is that a genuine need for a new, in-depth and focussed discussion of slavery in John Chrysostom's writings. This brings me to the next and most important point of this chapter, namely the problem statement and methodology.

#### **4 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND METHODOLOGY**

The problem that this study addresses has already been articulated in a very general sense. It aims to provide a systematic account of Chrysostom's treatment of slavery in his homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews. This, however, needs more delimitation and methodological refinement. I therefore present a more sophisticated problem statement: how does John Chrysostom negotiate and reimagine the habitus of Roman slaveholding in his homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews? I will now delineate the most crucial aspects of such an investigation.

The terms *negotiate* and *reimagine* have been carefully selected in order to capture the essence of Chrysostom's ideas on slaveholding. The term *negotiate* implies, firstly, resistance;

---

<sup>61</sup> Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages*.

this asks in which ways Chrysostom rejects certain discursivities of Roman slaveholding. While many scholars have shown that early Christian views on slaveholding were not ameliorative as such, it does not imply that their writings were totally devoid of resistance. The notion of resistance has been expanded in the classic work of Keith Bradley.<sup>62</sup> It implies that with certain authors, one finds on the one hand a discomfort with slavery, and also, on the other, that ancient society exhibited both overt and covert measures of resistance, from slaves themselves, as in the cases of slave-revolts, fleeing and counter-surveillance, or from the free(d), especially from literary accounts like those of Seneca's *Epistula* 47 and Gregory of Nyssa's *Homiliae in Ecclesiasten* 4. The problem statement will therefore also ask if Chrysostom resists certain aspects of Roman slaveholding, and how he does it.

Secondly, the term *negotiate* implies that while the promotion of slavery is not always present, there is still a quiet acceptance of the institution. This I have already explained in a previous article.<sup>63</sup> Glancy has shown that despite the resistance found in some late ancient Christian authors on slavery, the corporal habituation that has taken place over the centuries would not be overcome so easily.<sup>64</sup> Negotiation, in this study, therefore implies the relation between resistance and acceptance - what does Chrysostom accept regarding slavery in the light of his points of resistance.

The term *reimagine* implies that Chrysostom had a new social vision for slaveholding and slave-management. It asks how Chrysostom envisions the ideal slave/slaveholder relationship in the light of his theological and ethical understanding of scripture. Since he does not at all abolish slavery, what does he recommend and how does this fit in with his wider social vision?

The most important aspect of these terms, and the problem statement in general, is that they assume the habitus of Roman slaveholding. What is meant by habitus? The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu uses the concept of the habitus in his practice-centered social theory.

---

<sup>62</sup> Keith Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 107–31; cf. also: Niall McKeown, “Resistance Among Chattel Slaves in the Classical Greek World,” in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (eds); Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 153–75; Henrik Mouritsen, *The Freedman in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 28–29.

<sup>63</sup> De Wet, “John Chrysostom on Slavery.”

<sup>64</sup> Glancy, “Christian Slavery in Late Antiquity,” 73–74.



It is by means of practice that a society defines, shapes and regulates itself, and also promotes its social and ethical dispositions. This is most explicitly manifested in embodiment. Bourdieu refers to the notion of habitus as a ‘system of structured, structuring dispositions...’<sup>65</sup> The habitus is also a strategy for socialisation, and it is directly translated or superscribed onto the body. Bourdieu further states:

As a system of practice-generating schemes which expresses systematically the necessity and freedom inherent in its class condition and the difference constituting that position, the habitus apprehends differences between conditions, which it grasps in the forms of differences between classified, classifying practices (products of other habitus), in accordance with principles of differentiation which, being themselves the product of these differences, are objectively attuned to them and therefore tend to perceive them as natural.<sup>66</sup>

Chrysostom therefore finds himself in this symbolic social space and functions within its ‘naturalness’ or rather, its banality. But Chrysostom is also produced by another habitus, namely Christianity, and the negotiation and reimagination represent what Bourdieu above calls the apprehension of differences and their perception. Thus this study finds itself, in fact, at the conjunction of two systems of ‘practice-generating schemes,’ namely Roman slaveholding and late ancient Christian doctrine and ethics, and it aims to take account of the interaction inherent in such a conjunction. This is then the understanding of the habitus in the context of the problem statement above.

Furthermore, I propose here that the Roman habitus of slaveholding and slave-management occurs or is practiced (*pratiquer*, in the French theoretical sense, ‘to practise’ [itself]), at the intersection of four discursive lines. The first discursivity is that of the domesticity of the slave-body. Slave-bodies, especially in the context of Chrysostom, function as domestic bodies that need to be managed. This is in fact the defining trait of ancient slaveholding,

---

<sup>65</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice* (Richard Nice (trans.); Cambridge: Polity, 1990), 52.

<sup>66</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Richard Nice (trans); London: Routledge, 1984), 167.

and is foundational to the other three discursivities. Slave-management falls within the ancient discourse of *oikonomia*, or household management. The second discursivity is that of heteronomy. It will be shown that, in antiquity, the view that all bodies are made to be ruled was quite common. This discursivity then provides an essential element for perpetuating a system of slaveholding. It also provides an important insight into how slave-metaphors functioned. The metaphor of slavery and its institutional equivalent cannot be separated; they are discursively linked. It also shows how concepts of domination, manumission and freedom functioned in this world. Notions of how subjects are formed and regulated, thus ancient subjectivities, as well as the concept of agency gain precedence in this instance. The third discursivity, namely the slave-body as a carceral body, will be examined. The concept of carcerality, that is, being in a symbolic or physical sense of imprisonment, is also crucial to understanding ancient slavery, since the management of slave-bodies is more specifically the management of their carcerality and mobility. This is related to how slave-bodies are contained, confined and regulated in all aspects. Finally, the notion of the slave-body as a commodified body will be discussed. The Roman habitus of slaveholding assumes that slaves are both persons and objects or commodities, thus, property. Slaveholding is then directly related to the management of wealth and property, as well as social honour and shame. The discussion of these four discursivities will therefore represent the outline of this dissertation, and the process of negotiation and reimagination will be located within these discursivities.

Finally, the scope of investigation must be delimited and validated. The choice of Chrysostom's homilies has already been discussed above, especially in the light of their potential for understanding late ancient cultural history. But any scholar working on Chrysostom knows how important it is to limit the literary evidence to be discussed, simply because Chrysostom has written so much. The choice for the corpus of homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews (as stated, he believed Paul wrote Hebrews) is based on the assumption that such a selection would in essence not only then provide an investigation into Chrysostom's thought on slaveholding, but also as we mentioned, provide a *Wirkungsgeschichte* on Paul's views on slavery. The texts used for the homilies will be taken from Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* and translations of Chrysostom's works are my own unless otherwise indicated in the footnotes.<sup>67</sup> In most instances I have tried to

---

<sup>67</sup> In this instance I must acknowledge an awareness of the fact that Migne's text is not the preference for Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline Epistles, and that the corpus of texts by Frederick Field, while not perfect, is

strike a middle ground between a literal and functional equivalent translation, and in a few instances I have chosen to simply use an existing literal translation of Chrysostom's work.

The subtitle of the dissertation, 'A Cultural-Historical Analysis,' indicates the methodology followed in the study. Much of the cultural-historical method has already been discussed above. But how exactly does this study understand and utilise cultural historiography? Cultural historiography is peculiar in that it utilises insights from the fields of Anthropology and History in order to understand cultural phenomena. It also exhibits moments of interaction with critical philosophical theories, such as Marxism and structuralism, and also postcolonialism and feminism.<sup>68</sup> Cultural history is often divided into two periods, namely the classic period of cultural history, and the period of the new paradigm. In the classical period of cultural history, the most notable scholars would be Burckhardt<sup>69</sup> and Huizinga,<sup>70</sup> but it also exhibits much interaction with Marxism and also Hegelian philosophy.<sup>71</sup> While this study takes cognisance of this period and its scholarship, the theorists of the new paradigm serve as trajectories for this dissertation. More specifically, I will primarily use the hypotheses of two French theorists of cultural history. In the first instance, the work of Michel Foucault will be predominantly used in the study. This is especially due to Foucault's emphasis on embodiment. Foucault's work stands out in the sense that it represents a highly critical reaction against established fields and disciplines, especially History, Sociology, Literature Studies and Psychology. Foucault's recognition and problematization of power-dynamics in relation to knowledge-matrices and social systems are especially valuable. He has argued that social systems are in essence

---

certainly a preference here. Unfortunately these texts in their various volumes were not at my disposal due to their limited availability and very old date of publication. Since the impetus of this study is not text critical or based on translation, I am convinced that Migne's texts will suffice. Migne's texts as well as many other ancient authors' texts were accessed from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG), and when page numbers were not available, the bibliographic reference will be given with an indication that it comes from the TLG. I would also like to thank Mr. Erastus Jonker for his assistance in obtaining the Hebrew texts in the dissertation, and Prof. Phil J. Botha for his assistance with the Syriac.

<sup>68</sup> Peter Burke, *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2008), 20–30, 51–76.

<sup>69</sup> Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (Samuel G. C. Middlemore (trans.); New York: Modern Library, 1860).

<sup>70</sup> Johan Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische Verkenningen* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink, 1929).

<sup>71</sup> For a critical discussion of this issue, cf. Ernst Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

discursive, and that history is in itself a product of various power-discourses. Burke states: ‘Where [Norbert] Elias stressed self-control, Foucault emphasized control over the self, especially control over bodies exercised by the authorities.’<sup>72</sup> The formation, regulation and control of subjectivities by means of power-discourses are crucial for Foucault, and these concepts would be especially useful in a study of slavery. For the purposes of this study, the following Foucaultian theories will be used.

Firstly, Foucault’s works on the nature of knowledge and systems of classification are crucial for this dissertation. This is mostly covered in two of his works,<sup>73</sup> and one of his main premises here is based on the dynamic between power, knowledge and identity formation.<sup>74</sup> In another article, I state the following:

Power and identity formation are inseparable. Foucault demonstrated that the subject, or the self, is not free but a production of power-discourses and scripted by various social forces. People craft and/or negotiate their identities as ‘subjects’ in the context of institutions, experiences and doctrines that inexorably exert influence on the process of subject-formation and subject-embodiment. Furthermore, this process is inevitably discursive, and there exists a cyclical flow between discursive formations (i.e. objects of knowledge) and the formation of the subject within their embodied temporal and spatial positions. Discursive formations therefore produce individuals/bodies, who in turn, construct their reality by means of interpretation of the very objects of knowledge that shaped them.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Burke, *What is Cultural History?* 55–56.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* (Alan M. Sheridan-Smith (trans); London: Tavistock, 1972); and; Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Charles Ruas (trans.); London: Routledge, 1970).

<sup>74</sup> Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972–1977* (Colin Gordon et al (ed. & trans.); New York: Pantheon, 1980).

<sup>75</sup> Chris L. de Wet, “The Priestly Body: Power-Discourse and Identity in John Chrysostom’s *De Sacerdotio*,” *R&T* 18, no. 3–4 (2011): 2–3.

When this dissertation utilizes terms like discursivities and discourses, this is the context. A discursive formation is a combination of discourses that form the objects they speak of; slavery is in itself a discursive formation, shaped by various discourses as will be illustrated in the study. The second important concept of Foucault utilized in this study is that of governmentality. Governmentality is used to describe the changes in the technologies of, and dispositions towards, governance.<sup>76</sup> While Foucault especially spoke about governmentality in eighteenth-century Europe, the implications of governmentality during the Christian Empire is crucial for understanding discourses related to the management of slave-bodies. The Christian state, with its shepherd-flock model, still had to manage its resources in an economic way, and with the development of the episcopate as a technology of state governance, there is a direct intervention from the state into the lives of the citizens. The consequences of this is that the Christian state, via the episcopate and its sub-structures as government institutions and discourses, aimed, in Foucault's terms, to regulate the bodies of the citizens. Bodies are then in turn educated to monitor and regulate their own subsequent behaviour, and this is nowhere more clear than in the case of slave-management. In the third instance, stemming from his history of the modern prison-system, Foucault's concept of discipline will be used quite extensively in this study since they are directly related to slave-management.<sup>77</sup> This is especially related to the punishment and reformation of delinquent bodies in the institutions governed by the state and, in a more informal manner, by the household. Foucault uses the French term *surveiller* in his work on this topic, which does exhibit a nuance of surveillance, also crucial to understanding slave-management. It is also from this concept that Foucault's notion of carcerality is deduced - the notion that bodies are incarcerated and confined for very specific purposes related to control, surveillance and regulation, mostly for the security of society or, in the case of slaveholding, for its labour-modes. Finally, the study will also use Foucault's notions of normalcy and abnormalcy in the regulation of bodies and the formation of subjects.<sup>78</sup> It will be argued that

---

<sup>76</sup> Michel Foucault, "Governmentality," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Graham Burchell and Colin Gordon (eds); Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 87–104.

<sup>77</sup> Michel Foucault, *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Alan Sheridan (trans.); New York: Random House, 1977).

<sup>78</sup> Michel Foucault, *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975* (Valerio Marchetti and Antonella

slave-bodies were considered to be delinquent and abnormal bodies that were often subjected to processes of normalization, on the one hand, and on the other, that the slave-body as abnormal body was also essential to maintaining and forming the notion of the normal, free, Roman/Christian male. These issues tie in with the discourse of sexuality, and Foucault's link between sexuality and society will often be stressed.<sup>79</sup> These concepts then represent the main Foucaultian methodological apparatus that will be utilized in this study. The concepts will be discussed in more detail within the chapters themselves. Foucault's concepts will especially feature in chapters 2 to 5 of this dissertation.

The second important theorist contributing to the cultural historical analysis of this dissertation is Pierre Bourdieu. We have already seen that Bourdieu's concept of the habitus is central to the problem statement of this study, and the concept of the habitus has already been discussed. But the concept of the habitus is not the only Bourdieuan notion used in this investigation. Bourdieu's notions of economic and symbolic capital will serve as the primary point of departure in chapter 6 of the study, the chapter that focuses on the objectification and commodification of the slave-body.<sup>80</sup> This theory is extensively discussed at the beginning of this chapter, although some preliminary remarks may be made. Bourdieu discerns between symbolic and economic capital and, although they are inextricably related and influential to each other, they have different manifestations in society. While economic capital primarily serves economic needs, symbolic capital function as markers of what Bourdieu calls distinction or social worth and honour. Since honour and shame were core values of the Roman world, also to Chrysostom, the notion of slaves as both economic and symbolic capital, as logical inferences of their objectification and commodification, are crucial to any discussion of ancient slavery. Since slave-bodies were also objects and commodities, they are subjected to the same dynamics as goods in the ancient world.

---

Salomoni (eds.); Graham Burchell (trans.); London: Penguin, 2003).

<sup>79</sup> This was especially highlighted in Foucault's three-volume history of sexuality; cf. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction* (Robert Hurley (trans.); New York: Random House, 1978); Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure* (Robert Hurley (trans.); New York: Vintage, 1985); Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality Volume 3: The Care of the Self* (Robert Hurley (trans.); New York: Vintage, 1986).

<sup>80</sup> Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice*, 112–21.

Further elaborations on the critical theory used in the methodology of this dissertation may be found at the commencement of the various chapters, since most function well when used with examples directly from the primary sources.

In summary then, to outline the cultural historical method used in this study, the following issues are relevant. The fact that the problem statement entails the investigation of a habitus is central. Since slaveholding is approached as a habitus (Bourdieu), its various discursivities (Foucault) need to be delineated. Since slaves are understood in the cultural-historical sense as bodies, these bodies are discursively formed and regulated by means of four discourses, namely domesticity, heteronomy, carcerality and commodification.

The dissertation therefore boasts, in addition to a novel analysis of Chrysostom's views on slaveholding and a *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Pauline notions of slaveholding, also a new methodological framework for studying slavery, both ancient and early modern, from a cultural historical perspective.

In the light of this problem statement and methodological framework, the structure of the study may be outlined. The first chapter of the investigation, chapter 2, entitled 'Revisiting and Reconstructing the Roman Habitus of Slaveholding: The Management of Slave-Bodies in Hellenistic, Roman, Judaistic and Christian Antiquity,' serves as a preliminary point of departure for the rest of the study. In this chapter, the habitus of Roman slaveholding is discussed, and attention is given to its cultural-historical formation from the ancient Hellenistic, Roman, Judaistic and Christian contexts. I have chosen the terms *revisiting* and *reconstructing* to highlight the fact that, in the light of the methodological trajectory of this study, namely cultural historiography, the most important sources for understanding the Roman habitus of slaveholding, the point of negotiation and reimagination for Chrysostom, need to be revisited and re-read from the perspective of cultural history. This chapter therefore sets the scene for the others in that it provides a point of reference when reading the Chrysostomic sources. The Hellenistic and Roman contexts are important since they were still very active in the society of which Chrysostom is part, while the early Christian and Judaistic sources provide the background for Chrysostom's disposition as a late ancient Christian homilist shaped by three centuries of Judeo-Christian discourse. This chapter will also conclude with a synthesis of some prominent Christian and non-Christian authors from late antiquity for the sake of highlighting continuities and discontinuities between Chrysostom and his close contemporaries.

The rest of the dissertation is devoted to the reading of the most important Chrysostomic sources for domestic slavery. I stress the term *domestic slavery* here, since Chrysostom's homilies are in most instances concerned with the management of domestic slaves in the urban context.<sup>81</sup> Chapter 3, entitled, 'Managing the Domestic Body: John Chrysostom, Slaves and the Ancient Discourse of *Oikonomia*,' examines how Chrysostom approaches the domesticity of slave-bodies. The emphasis will especially be on his homilies on the Pauline *haustafeln*. In chapter 4, Chrysostom's understanding of the slave-body as a heteronomous body will be delineated from the basis of his exegesis of the ambiguous text in 1 Corinthians 7:21. This chapter problematizes the link between the metaphor and reality of slaveholding, and situates Chrysostom within the development of this discourse. Chapter 5, conceptually the most challenging chapter of the thesis, approaches the slave-body as a carceral body, specifically from the wealth of information provided by Chrysostom in his *Homiliae in epistulam ad Philemonem*. Finally, in chapter 6, the objectification and commodification of the slave-body is discussed with reference to two of the *loci classici* from Chrysostom's homilies, namely his *Homiliae in epistulam I ad Corinthios* 40 and his *Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos* 28. Chapter 7 will present the conclusion of the dissertation.

## 5 CONCLUSION

While this dissertation is part of a much larger project on ancient slavery, its findings aim to provide a definitive cultural-historical analysis of slaveholding in the homilies of Chrysostom. While this remains the main focus of the dissertation, it also exhibits a new framework for approaching ancient slavery, one that may be applied to any other author of antiquity. Finally, it also represents a study in the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Pauline thinking on slaveholding. While the sources from Chrysostom that will be focussed on are his homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, other writings of Chrysostom will also be brought into light for the sake of clarification, elaboration and comparison. Numerous other authors from antiquity will also appear in the course of the study, from Hellenistic philosophical literature to Roman agricultural writers, from texts in the Mishnah to those in the Pauline Epistles themselves - all voices and witnesses that shaped the world of the fourth century preacher that dominates the scene in this dissertation and in many instances, directly influenced him.

---

<sup>81</sup> De Wet, "John Chrysostom on Slavery."