

CHAPTER 3

THE DOMESTIC BODY: JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, SLAVERY AND THE ANCIENT DISCOURSE OF *OIKONOMIA*

1 INTRODUCTION

From this point on the study will specifically focus on John Chrysostom's views on *oikonomia* and slave-management. It will use his homilies, which also serve as commentaries, on the New Testament *haustafeln* as the basis, but will also examine other relevant texts. We have seen that the New Testament *haustafeln* represented a very early and primitive move towards a pastoral form of governmentality in which slave-management was a key discourse both literally and metaphorically. There are two sides to this issue; in the first instance, the Christian bishops of the later Roman Empire would use these texts as scriptural apparatus in their role as domestic advisors and, secondly, their domestic advice would also be applied in a larger, more holistic sense - ecclesiastical governmentality. The first part of this section will therefore aim to understand this role of the bishop as domestic advisor and what the implications were for church governance. Thereafter we will focus on Chrysostom's comments on the *haustafeln* in his homilies, specifically focussing on slave-management.

2 THE BISHOP AS DOMESTIC ADVISOR

The formation of the Christian household in late antiquity was directly related, as Sessa has shown, to the formation of episcopal authority.⁴⁷⁴ The family and household in this instance were

⁴⁷⁴ Kristina Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy: Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1–34.

used as a strategy for implanting certain matrices of power-knowledge and forms of authority outside and within the church. Sessa states:

The household, however, also played a formative cultural role in the making of episcopal authority. The ancient household was not a marginal female space only obliquely relevant to the governing of the city and state. It was a highly masculine institution, the empire's primary unit of production and wealth, and the most morally revealing realm with respect to the character and capacities of its leaders.⁴⁷⁵

Sessa has convincingly linked the formation of the late Roman Christian household with the formation of ecclesiastical modes of authority. In this process, we find that bishops act as domestic advisors, instructing Christians how to govern their households, and at the same time, having to govern their own 'household,' namely the church. In the Christian period of the Roman Empire, we find that the form of governmentality was pastoralism, with pastoral discourses already permeating Christian formations of household codes, as we have seen. The holistic and duplicatory nature of this type of government was not novel in ancient times, and we have seen that the views of authors like Xenophon or Plato on holistic *oikonomia* certainly paved the way for a holistic (not pastoral, though) type of governmentality. At this point, I want to reflect a bit more on Michel Foucault's discussion of the development of the Christian pastorate in late antiquity as a form of government, and delineate its relevance for the study at hand.⁴⁷⁶

Notwithstanding the conceptual linkage with Hellenistic politicology, Foucault argues that the shepherd-flock model of government was something that has its roots especially in the ancient Near East, most notably from Egyptian, Assyrian and Israelite sources.⁴⁷⁷ The history of the Israelites is often seen as God's flock's 'wanderings in search of its pasture.'⁴⁷⁸ He has also

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid., 1.

⁴⁷⁶ Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures Collège de France, 1977–1978* (Michel Senellart (ed.); Graham Burchell (trans.); New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 115–226.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 136.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid., 151.

shown that pastoral governmentality was not a common theme in ancient Greek literature. The Christian adoption of this metaphor and model for directing governance was directly related to its Yahwehistic and Judaistic heritage. Although some Greek sources, like Homer's *Illias* and *Odyssea*, do use the term shepherd to refer to the king, its influence may have been from Assyrian sources.⁴⁷⁹ There are then also the Neo-Pythagorean references to Zeus as god-shepherd, but these are also limited and somewhat marginal. The metaphor is therefore quite rare.

The one important exception from Greek literature that Foucault points out is that of Plato, specifically from his *Respublica*, *Leges* and *Politicus*.⁴⁸⁰ The importance of these writings has been discussed earlier in this study, and it is not surprising that their relevance resurfaces here. According to Foucault, the *Respublica* and *Leges* exhibit three important features for understanding the shepherd-flock model of governance. In the first instance, the metaphor has a theological origin. The gods are considered as the original shepherds of humanity. In his *Critias*, Plato states (*Crit.* 109-b-c):

...[T]hey [i.e., the gods] tended us, their nurselings and possessions, as shepherds tend their flocks, excepting only that they did not use blows or bodily force, as shepherds do, but governed us like pilots from the stern of the vessel, which is an easy way of guiding animals, holding our souls by the rudder of persuasion according to their own pleasure; thus did they guide all mortal creatures.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., 136. It was a metaphor that would also develop with the eschatology of Second Temple Judaism; cf. Zech. 11:4-17.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., 136-43.

⁴⁸¹ Translation: Benjamin Jowett, *Dialogues of Plato: Translated Into English, With Analyses and Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 600; Greek text: Burnet [TLG]: ...δίκης δὴ κλήροις τὸ φίλον λαγχάνοντες κατώκιζον τὰς χώρας, καὶ κατοικίσαντες, οἷον νομῆς ποιμνία, κτήματα καὶ θρέμματα ἑαυτῶν ἡμᾶς ἔτρεφον, πλὴν οὐ σώμασι σώματα βιαζόμενοι, καθάπερ ποιμένες κτήνη πληγῇ νέμοντες, ἀλλ' ἢ μάλιστα εὖστροφον ζῶον, ἐκ πρύμνης ἀπευθύνοντες, οἷον οἶακι πειθοῖ ψυχῆς ἐφαπτόμενοι κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν διάνοιαν, οὕτως ἄγοντες τὸ θνητὸν πᾶν ἐκυβέροντων.

We see here an understanding of theological pastoralism functioning as the mythical and archetypal model of governance, almost a prelapsarian, if we can use this term, or utopian form of governance. There is no violence, but rather gentle yet stern rulership. The second feature Foucault highlights is the instances in which the magistrates are seen as shepherds of the human flock. The magistrate does not function as the founder-figure of the city, but rather its overseer, as Foucault states: ‘The magistrate-shepherd - this is completely typical and entirely clear in *The Laws* - is in fact a subordinate magistrate. He is something between a watchdog strictly speaking, let’s say brutally, a policeman, and someone who is the real master or legislator of the city-state.’⁴⁸² The third feature, as found in book 1 of *Respublica* is the notion that the shepherd is not egoistic, but devotes himself entirely to the well-being of the sheep (*Resp.* 1.343b-344c). This concept also became popular in the Gospel literature of the New Testament. Foucault then continues to note Plato’s *Politicus* as an anomaly. Plato’s politician is someone who *governs* the flock, who gives commands to a herd of people. Here the shepherd receives an emphasis of imperativity that defines his being and essentially, his function. This would have a significant impact on how we would understand mastery, since mastery is, after all, in its very basic form, the giving of commands. Along with the shepherd metaphor, Foucault also highlights Plato’s use of the metaphor of the weaver.⁴⁸³ The image of the weaver is more related to *oikonomia* than that of the shepherd. The weaver has several tasks that define his role: shearing, twisting the yarn etc. In the same manner, the politician has tasks of governmentality, or political tasks, that define his role. Foucault states: ‘In this way, with his specific art, very different from all the others, the political weaver forms the most magnificent fabric and “the entire population of the state, both slaves and free men,” Plato goes on to say, “are enveloped in the folds of this magnificent fabric”’ (cf. Plato, *Pol.* 311c).⁴⁸⁴

But in terms of the history of the development of the pastorate, except for the Neo-Pythagoreans and Plato, there are few other sources that show its prevalence in Greek thought. Plato’s own concept also received much critique in Hellenistic literature.⁴⁸⁵ Despite its prevalence in Israelite sources, Foucault concludes by saying:

⁴⁸² Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 139.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, 145–47.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 147.

[T]he real history of the pastorate as the source of a specific type of power over men, as a model and matrix of procedures for the government of men, really only begins with Christianity...The Church is a religion that thus lays claim to the daily government of men in their real life on the grounds of their salvation and on the scale of humanity...⁴⁸⁶

The rise and function of pastoral power in early Christianity was considered in itself an art. Ambrose, in *De officiis ministrorum* and Chrysostom himself, in *De sacerdotio*, would write long, emotional treatises on the subject. The governance and organization of the church is therefore based on pastoral power. Although the church professes to remain separate and distinct from political power, it was inevitably intertwined with state politics especially after the Edict of Milan.⁴⁸⁷

It also had direct implications for the formation of Christian morality in late antiquity, and even earlier, as seen in the discussions on the *haustafeln* above. Most importantly, this new Christian morality based on pastoral domestic rulership would, on the one hand, accept and utilize Stoic and Epicurean notions of the mastery of the passions of the self, also called ἀπάθεια (literally, the absence of the passions), but would also transform them into, according to Foucault, ‘the renunciation of egoism, of my own singular will.’⁴⁸⁸ This is a very important observation - mastery now becomes something more complex, it is not only the renunciation of the bodily passions, but it also transforms the notion of caring for the self into the caring for others. This mutual curativity was already seen in the analyses of the *haustafeln*, the forerunners of pastoralism, in that the husband should also take care of the wife as he does his own body. As this thought developed further, the notion of what defined a bishop or priest would also develop. Whereas Plato considered the magistrate as a shepherd, in late antiquity, the bishop would now become the shepherd par excellence. The bishops defined their role and function in terms of

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid., 147–48.

⁴⁸⁷ Chris L. de Wet, “The Priestly Body: Power-Discourse and Identity in John Chrysostom’s *De Sacerdotio*,” *R&T* 18, no. 3–4 (2011): 351–79.

⁴⁸⁸ Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 178.

householding or *oikonomia*, somewhat similar to Plato's notion of the weaver, but with subtle differences. They also saw it, like Xenophon, as a holistic enterprise. In this instance, Sessa points to a very important feature within the discourse of pastoral power, namely the notion of *oikonomia* as stewardship.⁴⁸⁹ We now find a shift, according to Sessa, from domination to dispensation and, as I will argue, reformation. It was more than simply the management of wealth and distribution of goods to the poor. As demonstrated by Brown⁴⁹⁰ and several others,⁴⁹¹ wealth and poverty were especially important for the development of the pastorate in late antiquity. But Sessa is correct in noting that it was not only expressed in these terms of wealth and poverty, but in the management of subordinate bodies within the household.⁴⁹² It is here where the notion of *auctoritas*/ἐξουσία would be transformed by late ancient Christian pastoralism. The pastor now also became the heavenly steward. Sessa remarks in this instance that in late antiquity most *vilici* (or *actores*, managers who would oversee a number of estates) were not slaves but free.⁴⁹³ The evidence, especially that examined above, does not seem to be adequate to support such a view for the fourth century. While Sessa's statement, if applied to the later fifth and sixth centuries (a period which she does cover), may have more merit, the late fourth and early fifth century do not exactly reflect a preference for free persons for the steward or manager despite the negativity seen with authors like Columella.⁴⁹⁴ The prevalence of the slave-metaphor in early Christian thinking, and the belief in the heteronomy of the body, at least

⁴⁸⁹ For a general discussion of theological or divine *oikonomia* in John Chrysostom, cf. Gerhard Richter, *Oikonomia: Der Gebrauch des Wortes Oikonomia im Neuen Testament, bei den Kirchenvatern und in der Theologischen Literatur Bis Ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 336–58.

⁴⁹⁰ Peter R. L. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (London: University Press of New England, 2002).

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Susan R. Holman, *The Hungry Are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Wendy Mayer, "Poverty and Society in the World of John Chrysostom," in *Social and Political Life in Late Antiquity* (Late Ancient Archaeology 3.1; William Bowden, Adam Gutteridge, and Carlos Machado (eds); Leiden: Brill, 2006), 465–86; Wendy Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity Toward the Poor in the Time of John Chrysostom," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society* (Susan R. Holman (ed.); Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 140–58.

⁴⁹² Sessa, *Formation of Papal Authority*, 1–2.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, 49–50.

⁴⁹⁴ This uncertainty is also noted by Kyle Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World AD 275-425* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 123.

suggest that the concept of the steward of God is also like a slave is not totally implausible. In Chrysostom's thinking, the bishop as well as the *pater familias* seem to be considered as metaphorical slaves, as he states (*Hom. Heb. 24.6*): 'And I will make it clear to you by means of an example; as in the case of [slaves] in large households, when any of those placed over the household are very highly respected, and manage everything themselves, and can use great freedom of speech toward their masters, the master is called after them, and anyone may find many being called in this way.'⁴⁹⁵ In the very next section of this homily, he discusses issues of slaveholding, which we will return to at a later stage.

Whether most *vilici* and *actores* on late ancient estates were free or not does not really make a difference, since the notion of the Christian being a slave of God was still very prevalent. To continue, we have seen especially with the Roman agricultural treatises that the household manager had a curative role, something that was even more stressed in the early Christian writings. Sessa especially refers to the steward as a *dispensator*.⁴⁹⁶ How did this manifest in late ancient Christianity?

In the first instance, bishops had to disseminate knowledge to ordinary Christians on how to manage and run their own households. Preaching would have a profound effect on the process of knowledge-transfer in late antiquity, unlike anything encountered in the previous centuries.⁴⁹⁷ Even though the audiences that could physically fit into the late ancient basilicas were small,⁴⁹⁸ the effects still seemed to have been far-reaching. A bishop (or earlier in his life, a priest) like Chrysostom would have substantial influence, both religious and political, within his see. Bishops were highly political figures, even though their agenda was more social and religious. Chrysostom also had a very specific agenda in mind - he wanted to promote a type of popular,

⁴⁹⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 63.169.26-33: Ἐπὶ δὲ ὑποδείγματος ὑμῶν αὐτὸ ποιήσω φανερόν. Οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις οἰκίαις, ὅταν τινὲς εὐδοκιμῶσι τῶν προεσθηκότων τῆς οἰκίας, καὶ σφόδρα εὐδοκιμῶσι, καὶ πάντα αὐτοὶ διέπωσι, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς δεσπότης πολλὴν τὴν παρῴησιαν ἔχωσιν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ δεσπότης καλεῖται· καὶ πολλοὺς ἂν τις εὖροι οὕτω καλουμένους.

⁴⁹⁶ Sessa, *Formation of Papal Authority*, 49.

⁴⁹⁷ Jaelyn L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 11–41.

⁴⁹⁸ Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200–400* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 1–32.

everyday asceticism that people in the cities could live by, and in this way avoid the evils that defined the city.⁴⁹⁹ Regarding Chrysostom's comments on slave-management, we see that most of his comments are directed toward domestic slaveholding, rather than agricultural slaveholding.⁵⁰⁰ Christianization affected urban slaves much more directly than rural slaves. He had very specific views on Christian domesticity, with advice to everyone from the *pater familias* to the lowly slave. We will examine these views more closely in the next section. Thus, as shepherd or pastor, Chrysostom had to care for his flock by means of surveillance and developing their skills as householders.⁵⁰¹ He gave very specific guidelines for the conduct between husbands and wives, parents and children, and of course, slaves and masters. By understanding Chrysostom as the typical domestic advisor within the pastoral system of governance, the next section will specifically examine his interpretation of the respective deuterio-Pauline household codes and focus on his comments on how to manage slaves within this complex system.

3 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON EPHESIANS 6:5-9 (*HOM. EPH. 22*)

The entire *Homilia in epistulam ad Ephesios 22* is dedicated to the statements directed to slaves in the Ephesian *haustafeln*. While the provenance of the homilies is mostly difficult to determine, it does seem that the homily may have been preached in Antioch at some point between 393-397.⁵⁰² Quasten also confirms this on the grounds of the mention of Babylas in homily 9 and Julian in homily 21.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁹ Peter R. L. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women & Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 305-322.

⁵⁰⁰ He does comment quite critically about how some rich landowners employ thousands of slaves and on how some peasants have to pay a very high rent on these landholdings (*Hom. Matt.* 61.3); cf. John H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 64–65.

⁵⁰¹ For a detailed discussion of Chrysostom's pastoral theology, cf. Robert A. Krupp, *Shepherding the Flock of God: The Pastoral Theology of John Chrysostom* (American University Studies: Theology and Religion; New York: Peter Lang, 1991).

⁵⁰² Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom. Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations* (OrChrAn 273; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Orientalium Studiorum, 2005), 187–88.

⁵⁰³ Johannes Quasten, *Patrology Volume 3: The Golden Age of Patristic Literature* (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1990), 447.

In the very beginning of the homily, Chrysostom acknowledges the common hierarchical relationships and status indicators in the text. Like many of the other late ancient authors discussed above, Chrysostom highlights the fact that simply addressing slaves directly in the text is unique. They are mentioned last because of their inferior status as slaves, but they receive lengthy instructions because, despite their social inferiority to children, they are still mentally more advanced. What is also important is the fact that Chrysostom emphasizes that slaves should be virtuous if they are to be useful in the organization of the house. These statements also show how little the nucleus of the ancient Mediterranean household has changed in terms of status and honour between the period of the New Testament and Chrysostom.⁵⁰⁴

Furthermore, Chrysostom understands the Ephesian *haustafeln* to be typically Stoic, and he interprets it in a very Stoic manner. In his exegesis of the phrase in Ephesians 6:5, namely ‘according to the flesh’, he provides a Stoic explanation. He states (*Hom. Eph.* 22.1): ‘Slavery is nothing but a name. The domination is according to the flesh, brief and temporary; for whatever is of the flesh, is not permanent.’⁵⁰⁵ Not in one instance in the homily does Chrysostom reject the institution of slavery, he exhibits the same type of Stoic indifference we saw, for example, with Seneca when it comes to institutional slavery. The metaphor of the slavery to the passions is also very common in Chrysostom’s thinking.⁵⁰⁶ Chrysostom seems to take up this Stoic stance since it is also implied in the text of Ephesians. The typical Stoic thinking of the deutero-Pauline author of Ephesians becomes highly contagious for the late ancient Christian authors, Chrysostom included. Mitchell has explained the immense popularity of Paul with Chrysostom;⁵⁰⁷ he also then accepts Paul’s statements on slave-management in the *haustafeln* without any questions.

The next phrase that Chrysostom chooses to focus on in Ephesians 6:5 is ‘with fear and trembling.’ It is very interesting that Chrysostom initiates here an almost identical discussion on

⁵⁰⁴ John N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom - Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 99–100.

⁵⁰⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.155.34-36: ὄνομα δουλείας ἐστὶ μόνον· κατὰ σάρκα ἐστὶν ἡ δεσποτεία, πρόσκαιρος καὶ βραχεῖα· ὅπερ γὰρ ἂν ἦ σαρκικόν, ἐπίκηρόν ἐστι.

⁵⁰⁶ Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 48–51.

⁵⁰⁷ Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (HUTH 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

the topic found with both Origen and Jerome.⁵⁰⁸ His answers are also more or less the same. He contrasts the fear of the slave with the fear that the wife is supposed to show the husband. As Origen has remarked, the occurrence of the phrase ‘with trembling’ seems to point to a different type of fear. Chrysostom then enters into a diatribe in which the tension between the Stoic and early Christian considerations of slaves as kin and its imperative to fear the masters is discussed. Since a slave is considered ‘a brother, he enjoys the same benefits, he belongs to the same body. Even more, he is the brother, not of his own master only, but also of the son of God, he shares all the same benefits’ (*Hom. Eph. 22.1*).⁵⁰⁹ This statement is almost ideologically identical to Seneca’s arguments. The mutual kinship of slave and master, as well as their divine origin - for Seneca, it was the divine universal seed, for Chrysostom, it is being a brother of Christ. The diatribe in the homily seems to represent a response to or even an attack against Stoic indifference from an imaginary opponent; perhaps to question its integrity and consistency. How can there be equality along with fear and submission? Chrysostom retorts by stating that the equality between husband and wife is also, perhaps shockingly, applicable to the slave and the master, and then finishes: ‘It is no sign of common birth, rather it is real nobility, to understand how to humble ourselves, to be modest and unpretentious, and to be courteous to our neighbor. The free have also served the free with much fear and trembling’ (*Hom. Eph. 22.1*).⁵¹⁰ What we have here is the redefinition and transformation of the concepts of submission and servitude. This was mentioned earlier in the section when referring to the curative impetus of pastoral leadership. Servitude is now positively grouped with the virtues of humility and modesty, and now, in a reversal of traditional Roman values of mastery and masculinity, ‘real nobility’ are marked by mutual submission and servitude. Freedom does not rule out the imperative to care for and serve one another. The Stoic notion of the care of the self, which Foucault has so masterfully

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. Ronald E. Heine, *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 248-50.

⁵⁰⁹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.155.43-46: ἀδελφός ἐστι, τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπέλαυσεν, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ σῶμα τελεῖ· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀδελφός ἐγένετο οὐ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύει πάντων...

⁵¹⁰ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.155.53-57: Οὐ γὰρ δυσγένεια τὸ πρῶγμά ἐστιν, ἀλλ’ ἡ πρώτη εὐγένεια, τὸ εἰδέναι ἐλαττοῦσθαι, καὶ μετριάζειν, καὶ εἵκειν τῷ πλησίον. Καὶ ἐλεύθεροι ἐλευθέρους μετὰ πολλοῦ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἐδούλευον.

discussed,⁵¹¹ is now expanded and transformed to include the care of the other. This concept is found in the authentic Pauline Epistle to the Galatians, in chapter 5 verse 13b: ‘...[S]erve one another in love.’⁵¹² In Chrysostom’s discussion of this verse we find very much the same reasoning and the same terminology as in his *Homilia in epistulam ad Ephesios 22*. The will to dominate, Chrysostom states, leads to arguments and strife (cf. *Comm. Gal.* 5.13). Through the democratization of care, humility and servitude, Chrysostom introduces in the homily the new requirements of nobility and honour. These are all the characteristics of the slave of God. He also emphasizes that slaves should behave properly out of their own volition, and not from the compulsion of the master. He then provides the same argumentation found in the Petrine *haustafeln*, which may be alluded to here in the homily. By becoming humble, the possibility for suffering is immediately present - as Christ lowered himself and suffered, so too may the slave of God suffer in this. And then, predictably, Chrysostom promotes the virtue of endurance. We have discussed the development of the notions of suffering and endurance in early Christianity and Chrysostom is no exception when it comes to the proliferation of the virtue of endurance. He refers to Matthew 5:39, in which Christians are advised to turn the other cheek, thus, accept suffering and corporeal violation. It should be remembered, as Walters has shown, that nobility and free citizenship in the Roman world were exactly defined by the trait of corporal inviolability.⁵¹³ Chrysostom states (*Hom. Eph.* 22.1):

For the one who suffers wrong in abundance, claims an act for himself which he did not initiate, by allowing himself to be beaten on the other cheek as well, and not simply by enduring the first blow. For this last act may perhaps resemble cowardice; but it is in fact a mark of a high philosophy. In this way you will show that it was for the sake of wisdom that you also endured the first blow.

⁵¹¹ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 3: The Care of the Self* (Robert Hurley (trans.); New York: Vintage, 1986), 40-64.

⁵¹² Translation: NIV; Greek text (UBS⁴): ...διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις.

⁵¹³ Walters, “Invading the Roman Body.”

And so in the case at hand [slavery], show here too, that you bear slavery also willingly...⁵¹⁴

What we see here is that by means of making the passive virtues of suffering and endurance the norm, slavery becomes acceptable. Being able to bear slavery ‘willingly’, like receiving a second blow to the cheek, raises the issue of agency, and Chrysostom wants to illustrate in this point that having control of one’s (re-)actions and passions is a mark of true freedom and not a symbol of weakness or cowardice. Moreover, when we examined Theodoret’s remarks on slave-management, it was seen that he promotes institutional slavery subtly by pointing to its similarity in lifestyle to asceticism. Chrysostom follows the same strategy here. To be a noble Christian, according to Chrysostom, means to embody the passive virtues of suffering, violability and endurance - but these are all identical to the characteristics of slavery. Thus, by being a slave and accepting the state of slavery willingly, one partakes in the making of the virtuous Christian. The other strategy Chrysostom incorporates is that through just suffering one creates a type of rewards-account with God. This further promotes the passive virtues, especially for the slave, since the reward now becomes heavenly, a type of spiritual capital. Chrysostom acknowledges that Christian slaves may suffer under non-Christian masters, but this is in fact a blessing, since it grows their eschatological reward with God: ‘For as they who receive a benefit, when they make no return, make God a debtor to their benefactors; so too, I say, do masters, if, when served well by you, they fail to repay you, repay you even more, by making God your debtor’ (*Hom. Eph. 22.1*).⁵¹⁵ Concurrently with this imagery of euergetism, he states that when

⁵¹⁴ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.156.31-38: ‘Ο γὰρ ἐπιδαψιλευσάμενος τῷ παθεῖν κακῶς, καὶ ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῦ, ἐποίησεν ἑαυτοῦ τῷ ῥαπισθῆναι καὶ τὴν ἄλλην σιαγόνα, μὴ τῷ μόνον ἐνεγκεῖν. Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἴσως δόξει καὶ φόβου εἶναι· ἐκεῖνο δὲ φιλοσοφίας πολλῆς. Οὐκοῦν ἔδειξας, ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο διὰ φιλοσοφίαν ἤνεγκας. Ὡστε καὶ νῦν δεῖξον ἐνταῦθα, ὅτι καὶ ταύτην ἔκοντι φέρεις τὴν δουλείαν...

⁵¹⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.157.13-18: Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ καλῶς πάσχοντες, ὅταν μὴ ἀμείβωνται τοὺς εὐεργέτας, τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῖς ὀφειλέτην ποιοῦσιν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ δεσπότες, ἂν παθόντες εὖ παρὰ σοῦ μὴ ἀμείψωνταί σε, μᾶλλον ἡμείψαντο, τὸν Θεὸν ὀφειλέτην σοὶ καταστήσαντες.

earthly masters do not reward slaves, they in fact reward them even more since it forces God to reward them. The socio-theological manipulative strategies become very clear. In the eschatological sense, God's judgement also then implies a correction of social inequalities and the repaying of debts. The suffering slave is now the slave who will receive the most during the final judgement.

In his comments on the slave-directed *haustafeln*, Chrysostom is squarely in line with the early Christian tradition of the proliferation and promotion of passive virtues. Slavery, on the one hand, is described in Stoic fashion as only a name, and thus not important. The Philonic slave of God metaphor is then extensively utilized to approve and perhaps even promote the suffering of slaves. He does not make any calls to social justice for suffering slaves, since they will be rewarded in heaven. It does not imply that he encourages the persecution of slaves, but their fair and just treatment is not a priority. It should be remembered in this instance, at least, that the Roman agricultural authors Cato, Varro and especially Columella, promulgated quite intensely the just and fair treatment of slaves. Chrysostom does not do this here, but rather advises slaves to endure suffering with the hope of some heavenly reward. This is certainly one of the premises that supports the view that early Christianity was in fact not ameliorative to the institution of slavery; in fact, by the promotion of the passive virtues of suffering, endurance and servitude, core values in both martyrdom and asceticism, along with the prevalent Stoic indifference, the institution of slavery was perpetuated (perhaps even indirectly promoted) by Christian pastoral governmentality and virtuosity.

He then provides his view on the slaveholder-directed comments in the Ephesian *haustafeln* (Eph. 5:9). In this section of the homily, Chrysostom relies on the discourse of the heteronomy of the body of the slaveholder as a slave of God: 'For the master also presents service like a slave. Not as people-pleasers, he means, and with fear and trembling; that is, toward God, fearing that He may one day accuse you for your negligence toward your slaves' (*Hom. Eph. 22.2*).⁵¹⁶ It is interesting that Chrysostom then builds on a theologico-juridical argument in the homily. We have seen that this type of argumentation was common among other late ancient Christian authors, for instance, with Peter of Alexandria or Basil the Great. The

⁵¹⁶ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.157.21-25: δουλεύει γὰρ καὶ ὁ δεσπότης. Μὴ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι φησὶ, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, τουτέστι, τοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, δεδοικότες μήποτε ὑμῖν ἐγκαλέσῃ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τοὺς δούλους ἀμελείας.

heteronomy of the body has eschatological implications. In terms of God's judgement, offences committed against slaves will count as offences committed against human beings. Chrysostom is very aware and judgmental about those typical shameful duties slaves are compelled to perform (*Hom. Phlm.* 1.2): 'In this way many have forced their domestics and slaves. Some have drawn them into marriage against their will, and others have forced them to perform disgraceful services, perverse sexual deeds, acts of theft, and financial fraud, and violence.'⁵¹⁷ Since slaves are body-surrogates, the punishment of such deeds is primarily enforced on the owner, yet, as we have seen, the slave is not entirely acquitted. We also get a very important glimpse into the 'underworld' of slaveholding. Among the shameful acts, Chrysostom is fully aware of the sexual abuse of slaves, as well as acts of robbery and fraud. As with the previous discussion on suffering and punishment, social equality is only achieved in a later, eschatological dispensation. Chrysostom interestingly remarks (*Hom. Eph.* 22.1):

Do not assume, he would say, that what is done to a slave will simply be forgiven because it was done to a slave. For the laws of other nations, typically being human laws, does acknowledge a difference between these kinds of crimes. But the law of the common Slaveholder of all, who does good towards all in common, and conferring the same rights to all, does not acknowledge such a difference.⁵¹⁸

Chrysostom refers here to the typical Graeco-Roman laws of punishment based on social status, very much like those seen with Plato in the previous chapter. While according to these laws a slave may be ill treated and severely punished, God's eschatological laws do not regard

⁵¹⁷ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.706.36-40: Πολλοὶ πολλοὺς οἰκέτας ἠνάγκασαν, καὶ παιδας· οἱ μὲν εἰς γάμους εἴλκυσαν μὴ βουλομένους, οἱ δὲ ὑπηρετήσασθαι διακονίαις ἀτόποις, καὶ ἔρωτι μιαρῶ καὶ ἀρπαγαῖς καὶ πλεονεξίαις καὶ βίαις.

⁵¹⁸ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.157.32-37: Μὴ νομίσης, φησὶν, ὅτι τὰ εἰς τὸν δοῦλον, ὡς εἰς δοῦλον γινόμενα, οὕτως ἀφήσει. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἔξωθεν νόμοι διαφορὰν ἴσασι τούτων τῶν γενῶν, ἅτε ἀνθρώπων ὄντες νόμοι· ὁ δὲ νόμος ὁ τοῦ κοινοῦ Δεσπότητος οὐδεμίαν οἶδε διαφορὰν, ἅτε κοινῇ πάντας εὖ ποιῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τῶν αὐτῶν μεταδιδούς.

social status. Although such a statement is certainly admirable, it does not do much good for the treatment of institutional slaves while they are on earth. Like Stoic notions of indifference, the concept of eschatological punishment and rewards of all the slaves of God, regardless of earthly social status, draws attention away from the pressing inequalities and injustices of institutional slavery.⁵¹⁹ As a logical inference to the theologico-juridical argument, the issue of hamartiology obviously comes to the fore, since sin is understood as disobedience from the slaves of God, and hence, the reason for the eschatological punishment. Chrysostom explains the origins of sin to his audience (*Hom. Eph. 22.1*):

But if anyone should ask, ‘Where does slavery come from? And, ‘Why it has it come into humanity?’ (And I know that many are asking these questions, and desire to have them answered.) I will tell you. Slavery is the result of greed, of degradation, of brutality, since Noah, we know, had no slave, nor Abel, nor Seth, nor those who came after them. The institution was the fruit of sin, of rebellion against parents. Let children listen carefully to this, that whenever they are disobedient to their parents, they deserve to be slaves. A child such as this discards his nobility of birth; for he who rebels against his father is no longer a son; and if he who rebels against his father is not a son, how will he be a son who rebels against our true Father? He has turned his back on his nobility of birth, he has gone against nature. It is also the result of people taken as prisoners of wars, and battles. Fine, but Abraham, you will say, had slaves. True, but he did not use them as slaves.⁵²⁰

⁵¹⁹Gregory of Nyssa utilized his eschatology in a slightly different manner, which led to his outspoken rejection of institutional slavery. The same cannot be said of Chrysostom since he never rejects slavery as an institution itself; cf. David B. Hart, “The ‘Whole Humanity’: Gregory of Nyssa’s Critique of Slavery in the Light of His Eschatology,” *SJTh* 54, no. 1 (2001): 51-69.

⁵²⁰ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.157.38-54: Εἰ δὲ τις ἔροίτο πόθεν ἡ δουλεία, καὶ διὰ τί εἰς τὸν βίον εἰσῆλθε τὸν ἀνθρώπινον (καὶ γὰρ οἶδα πολλοὺς καὶ ἐρωτῶντας τὰ τοιαῦτα ἡδέως καὶ μαθεῖν βουλομένους), ἐγὼ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐρῶ· Ἡ πλεονεξία τὴν δουλείαν ἔτεκεν, ἡ βαναυσία, ἡ ἀπληστία· ἐπεὶ

Here we have a similar argument to that of Gregory of Nyssa in his homily on Ecclesiastes. The subordination between slave and slaveholder is not natural, or prelapsarian, in Chrysostom's view. We have seen that most of the Christian authors of late antiquity held this view. Even shortly after the fall with reference to Noah, Abel and Seth, Chrysostom intimates that slaveholding was not present. In a different homily he would also state that Adam did not have slaves (*Hom. I Cor.* 40.6). Slavery is therefore not natural, that is, natural in the patristic sense of the word, as being part of God's original order. Slavery is the result of greed, covetousness and savagery, as Chrysostom states, as well as a consequence of war. The conceptual linkages between slavery, eschatology and hamartiology are very important in this instance, and we see what important place slavery occupies also in Chrysostom's development of Christian theology. The concept of slavery is, again, inseparable from Christian theology, and late ancient Christian theological formations had very real, direct consequences for slaves - it did not improve their situation at all.

Finally, one of the most important sections in the homily deserves to be cited and explained, since it represents Chrysostom's clearest statements regarding *oikonomia* and slave-management (*Hom. Eph.* 22.2):

But if, before we examine the following verses, you have a mind to listen, I will make the same remarks concerning slaves as I have also made earlier concerning children. Teach them to be religious, and everything else will follow from necessity. But now, when any one is going to the theatre, or going off to the bath, he drags all his slaves behind him; but when he goes to church, not for a moment; nor does he admonish them to attend and listen. Now how will

Νῶε δούλον οὐκ εἶχεν, οὐδὲ Ἄβελ, οὐδὲ Σήθ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα. Ἄμαρτία τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶγμα ἔτεκεν, ἢ εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ὑβρις. Ἀκουέτωσαν οἱ παῖδες, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσι δούλοι εἶναι, ὅταν εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἀγνώμονες ᾖσιν. Ἀφείλετο ἑαυτοῦ ὁ τοιοῦτος τὴν εὐγένειαν· ὁ γὰρ ὑβρίζων τὸν πατέρα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι υἱός. Εἰ δὲ ὁ πατέρα ὑβρίζων, οὐκ ἔστιν υἱός, ὁ τὸν ὄντως ἡμῶν Πατέρα ὑβρίζων, πῶς ἔσται υἱός; Ἐξῆλθεν ἀπὸ τῆς εὐγενείας, ἐξύβρισεν εἰς τὴν φύσιν. Εἶτα καὶ πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι αἰχμαλώτους ἔλαβον. Ἄλλ' ὁ Ἀβραὰμ εἶχεν οἰκέτας, φησὶν. Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὡς οἰκέταις ἐκέχρητο.

your slave listen, when you, his master, are busy with other things? You have purchased and acquired your slave? First of all make it clear what God wants him to do, to be kind towards his fellow-slaves, and to take virtue very seriously. Everyone's house is a city, and every man is a prince in his own house. It is clear that this is the character of the wealthy house, where there are both lands, and overseers, and rulers over rulers. I also say that the house of the poor is like a city. Since there are also offices of authority here; for instance, the husband has authority over the wife, the wife over the slaves, the slaves again over their own wives; again the wives and the husbands over the children. Does he not appear to you to be, as it were, a type of king, having so many authorities under his own authority? And that it is crucial that he should be more skilled both in domestic and civic government than all the rest? For the one who knows how to manage these in their various relations, will also know how to select the fittest people for offices, truly, and will choose excellent ones. And in this way the wife will be a second king in the house, lacking only the crown; and he who knows how to choose this king, will excellently regulate all the others.⁵²¹

⁵²¹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.157.60-158.25: Εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε ἀκοῦσαι, τὰ αὐτὰ ἐροῦμεν περὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν, ἃ καὶ πρότερον περὶ τῶν παιδῶν· διδάσκετε αὐτοὺς εἶναι εὐλαβεῖς, καὶ πάντως πάντα ἔπεται. Νῦν δὲ εἰς μὲν θέατρον ἀνίων, καὶ εἰς βαλανεῖον ἀπιών τις, πάντας ἐπισύρεται τοὺς παῖδας· εἰς δὲ ἐκκλησίαν, οὐκέτι, οὐδὲ ἀναγκάζει παρῆναι καὶ ἀκούειν. Πῶς δὲ ὁ οἰκέτης ἀκούσεται, σοῦ τοῦ δεσπότου ἑτέροις προσέχοντος; Ἠγόρασας, ἐπρίω τὸν δοῦλον; ἐπίταττε πρότερον αὐτῷ τὰ κατὰ Θεὸν, ὥστε πρὸς τοὺς συνδούλους εἶναι ἥπιον, ἀρετῆς πολὺν ποιεῖσθαι λόγον. Πόλις ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκάστου οἰκία, ἄρχων ἐστὶν ἕκαστος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ οἰκίας. Καὶ ὅτι μὲν τοιαύτη ἡ τῶν πλουτούντων, εὐδηλον, ἔνθα καὶ ἀγροὶ καὶ ἐπίτροποι καὶ ἄρχοντες ἐπὶ ἄρχουσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν πενήτων οἰκίαν φημὶ πόλιν εἶναι. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐνταῦθά εἰσιν ἀρχαί· οἶον, κρατεῖ τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἡ γυνὴ τῶν οἰκετῶν, οἱ οἰκέται τῶν ἰδίων γυναικῶν· πάλιν αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες τῶν παιδῶν. Ἔρα οὐ δοκεῖ σοι, καθάπερ τις βασιλεὺς εἶναι, τοσούτους ἔχων ἄρχοντας ὑποτεταγμένους ἑαυτῷ, καὶ

From this section we see that Chrysostom, like Xenophon and Plato, subscribes to holistic *oikonomia*. The previous discussions on *oikonomia* and slave-management make it possible to understand the relevance of this statement in the ancient Mediterranean context. For Chrysostom, the household slave must now, like children, be educated in ‘religion’ and ‘virtue’. It is also interesting that when raising children virtuously, Chrysostom advises that the *pater familias* use the slaves as a type of training ground for the virtue of the child (*Inan. glor.* 67-68). This is a very subtle form of discipline directed toward slaves. Although Chrysostom reiterates by noting that this is also applicable to children, the form and impetus of adult education (assuming the slaves are adults) is reformation. The slaves are now not simply taught household or even agricultural tasks, but the householder or even the *vilicus* (he uses the example of overseers in the text) becomes directly responsible for the education of slaves in virtue. The example of Paul and Onesimus, the slave of Philemon, is important in this regard as it serves as a model and a justification for this practice. Since Paul took it upon himself to teach Onesimus, so too should the *pater familias* teach the slave virtue. A virtuous slave becomes a marker of honour according to Chrysostom (*Hom. Phlm.* Preface): ‘He [Paul] teaches us not to be ashamed of our slaves, if they are virtuous.’⁵²² This pedagogy has several aspects to it that need to be delineated.

Firstly, this move toward the Christian pedagogy of slaves is the logical inference of the development of the pastorate. Teaching, according to Chrysostom’s *De sacerdotio*, is a crucial duty of the office of the clergy.⁵²³ While the pastors are responsible for teaching the heads of households, the heads of households now need to teach the slaves who, Chrysostom admits, are not always brought to church by their masters. The education of slaves is also hierarchical. He later states that slave-husbands are the rulers of their wives, showing the prevalence of slave-families in late antiquity, and this would imply that the slave men need to teach their wives and

πάντων προσήκειν αὐτὸν οἰκονομικώτερον εἶναι καὶ πολιτικώτερον; Ὁ γὰρ εἰδὼς διαφόρως κεχρησθαι τούτοις, οἶδε τοὺς ἐπιτηδείους ἄρχοντας αἰρεῖσθαι, καὶ αἰρήσεται γε λαμπρούς. Οὐκοῦν ἔσται βασιλεὺς ἕτερος ἢ γυνὴ ἐν οἰκίᾳ χωρὶς τοῦ διαδήματος, καὶ ὁ εἰδὼς τὸν βασιλέα τούτων αἰρεῖσθαι, πάντα τὰ ἄλλα καλῶς διαθήσει.

⁵²² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.704.23-24: Διδάσκει ἡμᾶς μὴ ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τοὺς οἰκέτας, εἰ ἐνάρετοι εἶεν.

⁵²³ De Wet, “Priestly Body.”

children. This type of dynamic is also seen in his entire homily *De inani gloria*, specifically on the proper way to raise children. The comments herein also function in this system. The *haustafeln* are now transformed into something more than codes of conduct or, as argued earlier, social contracts. There is now a shift in emphasis from governance to education and pedagogy. The eccentricity of Cato's insistence on teaching his own children would not seem too strange to Chrysostom in this instance. The impetus on the formation and maintenance of masculinity is now amended, and the 'man of the house' should now also become a teacher of Christian religion and virtue; if I may, a *doctor familias*. The *pater familias* becomes responsible for the salvation of the slave and so becomes the pastor of his household. This is a very effective strategy from the side of the pastorate. Since its influence may have been limited due to physical space restrictions, the strategy of Christianizing the household would broaden their sphere of influence. Chrysostom, after all, considers the household a microcosm for the church, as he states in the same selection of homilies (*Hom. Eph. 20.2*): 'If we manage our households in this way, we will be also qualified for the management of the church. For surely a house is a little church. So it is possible for us by becoming good husbands and wives, to surpass all others.'⁵²⁴ The art of *oikonomia* is also teaching and preparation for the management of the church. The husband then becomes the medium and catalyst through which pastoral power is mediated, especially by means of education and psychagogy, as also seen in the discussions of the *haustafeln*. We mentioned earlier that the soul of an individual was also a strategy in Stoicism and Christianity to promote the care of the self and the mastery of oneself and others. The pastoral mastery of slaves now becomes curative - the husband should also care for the slaves by educating and disciplining them. It obviously assumes that slaves are in need of such discipline. The educational discipline of other souls becomes crucial to the formation of Christian masculinity. Again, in a different homily on Ephesians, while elaborating on the story of the jailor who had his whole family baptised (cf. Acts 16:29-31), Chrysostom complains (*Hom. Eph. 8.2*): 'Yes, not like most men these days, who allow both slaves and wives and children to go unbaptized!'⁵²⁵ He implies that

⁵²⁴ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.143.6-10: Ἄν οὕτω τὰς οἰκίας διοικῶμεν τὰς ἑαυτῶν, καὶ πρὸς Ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστάσιαν ἐσόμεθα ἐπιτήδειοι· καὶ ἡ οἰκία γὰρ Ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ μικρά. Οὕτως ἐνὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν γενομένους ἀγαθοῦς, πάντα ὑπερβαλέσθαι.

⁵²⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.62.19-21: ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς νῦν οἱ πλείους περιορῶσι καὶ δούλους καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ παῖδας ἀμυήτους τυγχάνοντας.

the husband of the house is responsible for the governance of the souls of the house, including having them baptised and taking them to church. Slaves were present sometimes in the services along with their owners.⁵²⁶ The Christian redomestication of masculinities relied especially on transforming the husband not only into someone who could master his own bodily passions and dominate subordinates, but, perhaps more importantly, someone who could be a teacher of virtue and a teacher of religion. This notion of the care of others should be seen as being not only curative in nature, which would especially be the case for children, but, in the case of slaves, it may also be understood as corrective and thus a strategy, in Foucault's terms, of creating docile bodies through discipline.⁵²⁷

The assumption is that most slaves are delinquents and degenerates, as mentioned above - abnormals in the true sense of the word. Social status and the position within the household hierarchy becomes an indicator of where remedial action is necessary. On the one hand, it assumes that the *pater familias*, the pastor, maintains strict surveillance in order to identify degeneracy and treat it psychagogically. The pastoral model of government found with the rise of Christianity, along with the strong focus on the household as catalytic space for distributing pastoral power, had some radical effects on the very nature of the *domus*. The household, in the first instance, becomes something of an 'observatory.' Kate Cooper has convincingly argued for the nature of households as being 'closely-watched.'⁵²⁸ The household was not, strictly speaking, a private space for individuals. It was a point of observation, in the first instance, for the husband of the house over his subordinates. Of course, it does not necessarily have to be the husband. Women also played a role in the government of households, and as mentioned earlier, Saller has shown that, technically speaking, a female could also, ironically, be a *pater familias*.⁵²⁹ The point

⁵²⁶ Cf. Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience," in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (A New History of the Sermon 1; Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen (eds); Leiden: Brill, 1998), 123–26; Sandwell, *Religious Identity*, 54, 192; Hartney, *Transformation of the City*, 43.

⁵²⁷ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Alan Sheridan (trans.); New York: Vintage, 1977), 135–55.

⁵²⁸ Kate Cooper, "Closely-Watched Households: Visibility, Exposure and Private Power in the Roman *Domus*," *P&P* 197 (2007): 3–33.

⁵²⁹ Richard Saller, "*Pater Familias, Mater Familias*, and the Gendered Semantics of the Roman Household," *CP* 94 (1999): 184–99.

is then that the head of the household, the *pater familias*, had to closely monitor the behaviour of the slaves, who are prone to degeneracy according to ancient stereotypes, to ensure they behave virtuously and, if they do not, administer the appropriate corrective and disciplinary action. But it also implies that the *pater familias* was strictly observed by the pastor, who, in turn, is highly scrutinized by his superiors as well as society. Education and discipline presuppose technologies of observation, since this makes the effects of power, pastoral power in this instance, visible and the means of discipline also becomes visible. Most importantly, as we have mentioned, this is hierarchized surveillance. This measure of controlled and hierarchized observation was also present in the church architecture in late antiquity, with the rise of a simple yet effective spatial technology: the βῆμα. The typical theatre-like spatiality, where it is the speaker who is under observation, now becomes inverted and reversed: in the basilicas it is the members who are under surveillance, and the gaze of the pastor is the gaze that determines normalcy and degeneracy. This word was also common in the juridical language of ancient courtrooms. The strong spatial politics within the basilicas, including the churches of Chrysostom, support the rise of a Christian culture of surveillance within its physical and socio-symbolic spaces and places.⁵³⁰ Not only is the gaze of the bishop, with the βῆμα-spatiality, almost a social microscope of conduct in terms of its function, it was also the point of representation - and becomes something of a panopticon. The bishop functions as someone who interprets the observation of everyday life. For instance, the way in which Chrysostom depicts the rich and the poor in the city is not simply descriptive; he especially emphasizes the two extremes poles of the rich and poor in the city, without focussing on the rest. This is of course a strategy for manipulating the thoughts and emotions of the audience, especially since it is done via preaching. The point is that observation also implies a control of the scopic politics of those being observed. They are told what to ‘see’ when looking. In terms of slavery, the strict mentality of observation was already present in the Roman agricultural writers, but for a different purpose - they needed to monitor work progress to ensure high profitability. In those writings especially, surveillance is an economic operator. Here,

⁵³⁰ Whether inside the basilica, or outside in the city-processions, interesting interplays of space and power-discourse are present here; for more on this, cf. Christine C. Shepardson, “Controlling Contested Spaces: John Chrysostom’s *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy,” *JECS* 15 (2007): 483-516; Nathanael Andrade, “The Processions of John Chrysostom and the Contested Spaces of Constantinople,” *JECS* 18, no. 2 (2010): 161–89.

the surveillance is based on and directed towards psychosocial reform. This strategy of observation was highly effective in maintaining the pastoral power of late ancient Christianity. The fact that the surveillance is strictly hierarchized and functional means that the flow of power and corrective discipline forms a large and complex network with very potent religious markers of authority. This is what the pastorate would become: a complex and hierarchized network of power-flows and knowledge-operations whose agents are duplicated in macro- and microcosmic contexts. What does this mean? Although the priest is pastor in a macrocosmic context, the larger church (which is in effect, a grouping of households); the husband becomes a duplicate or surrogate of the pastor within his own household; one could also consider both Christic duplications. The slave-husband, as Chrysostom states, then also becomes a duplication of the pastor and husband in that the slave-husband should teach his wife, children and slaves. Foucault's remark on hierarchized surveillance becomes important in this instance:

The power in hierarchized surveillance of the disciplines is not possessed as a thing, or transferred as a property; it functions like a piece of machinery. And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a 'head', it is the apparatus as a whole that produces 'power' and distributes individuals in this permanent, continuous field...Discipline makes possible the operation of a relational power that sustains itself by its own mechanism and which, for the spectacle of public events, substitutes the uninterrupted play of calculated gazes. Thanks to techniques of surveillance, the 'physics' of power, the hold over the body, operate according to the laws of optics and mechanics, according to a whole play of spaces, lines, screens, beams, degrees and without recourse, in principle at least, to excess, force or violence. It is a power that seems all the less 'corporal' in that it is more subtly 'physical'.⁵³¹

⁵³¹ Foucault, *Birth of the Prison*, 177.

Chrysostom's comments on the teaching of slaves are thus part of a much larger network or machinery of power we call pastoral governance. Like Plato's weaver, this network directs numerous actions and distributes bodies accordingly. The teaching of the slave by the *pater familias*, and the teaching of slave-wives, slave-children and slaves of slaves by the slave-husband are simply distributions of this complex network of pastoral power. Foucault's final remark above is important. We see that this form of observing and correcting behaviour, these 'calculated gazes,' in the curative and pastoral sense makes claims that it is not physically violent. In truth that may not have been the case, but Chrysostom himself, and as seen above, several other Christian and non-Christian authors of antiquity, state that slaves should not be beaten or threatened. One of the most important technologies in this machine of observance-based pastoral governance is fact that even when no one is looking, God, the eternal and *all-seeing* slaveholder is watching. This was already present in the *haustafeln*. Hence the agreement in the Ephesian and Colossian *haustafeln* that slaves (institutional and metaphorical, in my opinion) should not base their conduct simply on the surveillance of humans (the notion of ὀφθαλμοδουλεία - being enslaved to human eyes), but must remember that they are constantly observed by the divine slaveholder. The aim of all this is to normalize and correct the underlings in the hierarchized system of surveillance. Chrysostom remarks (*Hom. I Cor. 34*):

Furthermore, in order that the one may be subjected, and the other rule; (for equality often results in quarrels) he did not allow it to be a democracy, but a monarchy; and as in an army, this hierarchy one may see in every family. In the rank of king, for instance, there is the husband; and the wife in the rank of lieutenant and general; and the children too are given a third position in command. Then after these a fourth order, namely that of the slave. For slaves also rule over their inferiors, and some one of them is often set over the whole household, guarding the position of the master, but still as a slave. And along with this again another command, and among the children themselves again another, according to their age and gender, since among the children the girl does not possess equal influence. And God has made governments within a small area and

densely grouped together everywhere, that all might be in agreement and good order.⁵³²

Hierarchy and order become, in Chrysostom's terms, natural, that is, by order of God. He is very aware of the complex and strict hierarchical codes in the household, even among children, and here too he applies it in a holistic sense. The notion of slaves governing other slaves, like the *vilicus*, is also affirmed here in the urban context. In Chrysostom's eyes, *oikonomia* is not democratic but monarchic. This brings me to the second point on how the rise of Christian pastoral governmentality changed the household and, essentially, slave-management. Since the aim of surveillance and discipline is corrective and aimed at producing docile and obedient bodies, the household also becomes a reformatory. This is especially the point behind Chrysostom's notion that they should be educated in *virtue*. In the earlier work of Philodemus, we also saw this new focus on virtue and ethics (even though it has been argued that the agricultural treatises are highly ethical documents laden with virtue-discourse). Philodemus wanted to provide a type of *oikonomia* that was centred on Epicurean wealth ethics, and this was also exhibited with the Stoics like Seneca and Dio Chrysostom. Unlike Philodemus, however, and more in the line of Xenophon and Plato, the notion of providing universal principles of governmentality is also implied by Chrysostom. By stating that 'every man's house is a city,' the implication is that he also subscribes to a holistic view of oeconomical governmentality, earlier he stated that the household is a little church. The continuity and universality between civic/political and ecclesiastical and domestic governance becomes apparent. The purpose,

⁵³² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 61.289.64-290.16: Εἶτα ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὑποτάττηται, τὸ δὲ ἀρχῆ τὸ γὰρ ὁμότιμον οἶδε πολλάκις μάχην εἰσάγειν· οὐκ ἀφῆκε δημοκρατίαν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ βασιλείαν, καὶ καθάπερ ἐν στρατοπέδῳ, ταύτην ἂν τις ἴδοι τὴν διάταξιν καθ' ἐκάστην οἰκίαν. Ἔστι γοῦν ἐν τάξει μὲν βασιλέως ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐν τάξει δὲ ὑπάρχου ἢ γυνῆ καὶ στρατηγοῦ· καὶ οἱ παῖδες δὲ ἀρχὴν κεκλήρονται τρίτην· εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ τετάρτη ἢ τῶν οἰκετῶν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι κρατοῦσι τῶν ἐλαττόνων, καὶ εἷς τις πολλάκις τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐφέστηκε, τὴν τοῦ δεσπότης τάξιν διατηρῶν, πλὴν ὡς οἰκέτης. Καὶ μετὰ ταύτης ἕτερα πάλιν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν γυναικῶν, ἢ τῶν παιδῶν, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς παισὶ πάλιν ἕτερα κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς παιδίοις ὁμοίως τὸ θῆλυ κρατεῖ. Καὶ πανταχοῦ δι' ὀλίγου καὶ πυκνὰς ἐποίησε τὰς ἀρχὰς ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα πάντα ἐν ὁμοιοῖα μένη καὶ εὐταξία πολλῇ.

however, is developed to include the correction and reformation of delinquent bodies, whether in the city, church or household. He also intertwines civic spaces, like the theatre and the baths, with the space of the church and the household. Since there are universal governing principles, according to Chrysostom, it makes the flow of power within the network of the pastoral model of government more accessible and easy. As with the magistrate of the city (we think again of Plato's comments on the magistrate as the shepherd), who was in charge of order, discipline and punishment, so too the bishop and the *pater familias*, perhaps in a more limited role, receive the same responsibilities. Close to the conclusion of a homily on Romans, Chrysostom advises his audience to be shepherds over their families (*Hom. Rom. 29.2*): 'For the one who is ruled may be in the place of a shepherd to his family, to his friends, to his slaves, to his wife, to his children'.⁵³³ The bishops were, by implication, also magistrates in many respects; this new manifestation of power was especially evident in the phenomena of the *episcopalis audientia* and, more implicitly, evident in the procedures of *manumissio in ecclesia*. Bishops could also grant asylum to fugitives in certain instances.⁵³⁴ The magistrate, bishop and *pater familias* were responsible for corrective discipline. When Chrysostom refers to slaves who should be taught virtue and religion by their owners, it implies discipline and also new modes of punishment. Chrysostom intimates that both children and slaves should be educated, and the principle provided in the *haustafeln* on disciplining children with the words 'to bring them up in the chastening and admonition of the Lord' also becomes applicable to slaves. He states exactly this in the homily that was cited above (*Hom. Eph. 22.2*): 'I shall make the same recommendations concerning slaves, as I have also made previously concerning children.' Chrysostom assumes a measure of chastisement and punishment with both slaves and children. We will discuss Chrysostom's comments on the punishment at the end of this section. What should be remembered, however, in this instance is that teaching slaves to be virtuous and religious also implies that the *pater familias* makes it clear what type of behaviour is expected from them. Here the aspect of the social contractuality of the *haustafeln* becomes apparent again. By being slaves of a Christian *pater familias*, slaves are also 'expected' to become Christians and give up their

⁵³³ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 60.661.59-661.1: ἔξεστι γὰρ καὶ ἀρχομένῳ ἐν μέρει εἶναι ποιμένος, τῆς οἰκίας, τῶν φίλων, τῶν οἰκετῶν, τῆς γυναικὸς, τῶν παίδων.

⁵³⁴ Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 239–59.

own freedom of social and religious identity. The slaves and children are therefore provided with an image of what a Christian *should* look like. Chrysostom seems to indicate that the *pater familias* should lead by example, and not only drag his or her slaves to civic spaces like the theatres and the baths, but also bring them to church. This statement in itself gives us an interesting bit of data, which should be read carefully, but still taken into consideration. Since slaves were status-markers, it seems that taking them to church was not very popular. The first level of education and correction, in fact, starts with the slaveholders, by having them bring their slaves to church and compel them to listen. These technologies then construct the levels of observances a slave should adhere to, and it also then provides a technology of measurement as to when a slave is not compliant. These were most certainly the issues raised, inter alios, by Peter of Alexandria and Basil the Great. Owners had to know something about the sexual history of their slaves, control and regulate their conjugal and sexual relationships, and also guide them in religious matters. Peter of Alexandria canonized the punishment for slaves who sacrificed to non-Christian deities on behalf of their owners. Thus, by means of psychagogy, the specifics of non-observances and transgressions (all labelled as ‘sin’) are also spelled out, and this creates a space and dynamic for disciplinary penalty. The previous outlines of transgression found in the Graeco-Roman household codes were both replaced in some instances, and/or supplemented in others, by the new Christianized guidelines for acceptable slave behaviour, which would be based on ethical principles interpreted from biblical texts. The biblical texts serve as scriptural apparatuses for authorizing the new codes of conduct, and also provide a rationale for punishment and reward, as we have seen above. If the slave therefore does not conform to the principles by which a slave should act according to Roman standards, as well as the new Christian domain of ethical behaviour for slaves (found in the *haustafeln*), it is equal to non-conformance and thus punishable. These could be minor infractions, but in most instances, in the context of slavery in antiquity, it would probably be related to the inability of the slave to carry out his or her task. When it comes to the punishment of slaves it seems that Chrysostom prefers disciplinary and corrective exercises rather than violent and corporeal signs. As with all the authors discussed above, both Christian and non-Christian, the *pater familias*, whether he is the manager of an agricultural estate or a Christian psychagogue, should preferably avoid violent punishment and rather use psychological manipulation to regulate the behaviour of the slave-bodies. In the case of the Christian psychagogue/*pater familias*, Chrysostom advises the

avoidance of harsh punishments in the homily, since the owners should remember that they too are slaves of God. This view is very common in disciplinary dynamics. Foucault cites the eighteenth-century author and teacher Charles Demia, saying:

The teacher must avoid as far as possible, the use of punishment; on the contrary, he must endeavour to make rewards more frequent than penalties, the lazy being more encouraged by the desire to be rewarded in the same way as the diligent than by the fear of punishment; that is why it will be very beneficial, when the teacher is obliged to use punishment, to win the heart of the child if he can before doing so.⁵³⁵

This statement coming from the context of eighteenth-century French didactics, almost replicates the statements made by Xenophon, Cato, Varro and Columella on the punishment of slaves. Therefore, there cannot be punishment if there are no rewards - this is why Chrysostom especially focuses on eschatological punishments and rewards. Ranks, of course, can also serve as technologies of penalty. As a reward, we have seen that slaves may be manumitted if they conform to Christian codes of virtuous behaviour; Chrysostom himself states (*Hom. 1 Cor. 40.6*) ‘...[W]hen you have purchased them [slaves] and have taught them trades whereby to support themselves, let them go free. But when you whip them, when you put them in chains, it is no more an act of philanthropy.’⁵³⁶ If a slave therefore measures up to what is expected of him or her, they may be set free as a form of reward. In the same homily, in a wider sense, Chrysostom also reminds his audience that the institution of slavery itself is a punishment due to sin (*Hom. 1 Cor. 40.6*): ‘Since the class of slaves did not at all originate out of necessity, otherwise a slave would have been formed along with Adam; but it is the penalty of sin and the punishment of

⁵³⁵ Foucault, *Birth of the Prison*, 180.

⁵³⁶ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 61.354.16-18: ἀγοράσας, καὶ τέχνας διδάξας ὥστε ἀρκεῖν ἑαυτοῖς, ἄφες ἐλευθέρους. Ὅταν δὲ μαστίζης, ὅταν δεσμεύης, οὐκέτι φιλανθρωπίας τὸ ἔργον.

disobedience.⁵³⁷ The fact that institutional slavery exists is because God, the great slaveholder, is punishing his slaves for their sin or disobedience. Discipline therefore functions especially on the basis of its ability to give awards, or to reserve them. The scholar should be attentive to this development with Chrysostom, and in late ancient Christianity in general. The disciplining of slaves by means of psychagogy with punishment and reward serves again as new yet subtle differentiators of normality and abnormality. The very essence of this disciplinary process is that it forms a field of comparison. The ideal figure is postulated in the process of teaching, and the individual is then evaluated and compared on these grounds. In my opinion, the danger of this is that this ideal figure of Christian virtue is often, especially in late antiquity, still based on Roman standards of free masculinity, despite the proliferation of passive and feminine virtues. The bar is set high for slaves, women and children, since the standards that they are measured against are the standards of what made Roman men - namely the control and domination of the bodily passions. These women and slaves had to become ‘men’. In Chrysostom’s homilies on the Maccabean martyrs, when discussing the figure of the martyr-mother, who willingly sacrificed her children, he stated that she became the epitome of masculine virtue, leaving her weaker, maternal nature behind her. Normalizing judgement is now based on their level of the emulation of free masculinity. The martyr-mother of the Maccabees is judged positively because, according to Chrysostom, she surpassed her naturally weak feminine and maternal instincts, and became like a man.⁵³⁸ In Gillian Cloke’s convincing and aptly named study *This Female Man of God* (1995), she has shown that the feminine had to be escaped via the masculine; this is how virtue for women was constructed.⁵³⁹ The slave would now have to escape the stereotypes of slavery by embodying the virtues of free, Christian/Roman masculinity. In this manner, the household functions as a reformatory - its aim is not simply to dominate and master, but to correct and to reshape.

⁵³⁷ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 61.354.1-4: Οὐδὲ γὰρ χρείας ἔνεκεν τὸ τῶν δούλων ἐπεισῆχθη γένος, ἐπεὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἐπλάσθη ἄν και δούλος· ἀλλ’ ἀμαρτίας ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπιτίμιον, και τῆς παρακοῆς ἡ κόλασις.

⁵³⁸ Chris L. de Wet, “Claiming Corporeal Capital: John Chrysostom’s Homilies on the Maccabean Martyrs,” *JECH* 2, no. 1 (2012): 3-21.

⁵³⁹ Gillian Cloke, *This Female Man of God: Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, 350–450 AD* (London: Routledge, 1995), 214–16.

Furthermore, all of these technologies of the Christian pastoral household serve in providing the *pater familias*, and indirectly, the ecclesiastical authorities, with knowledge about individuals, in service of making it a docile body. As virtue and aptitude is increased, so too is domination increased. The somatosocial coagulation, defragmentation and refragmentation that occur when the act of discipline produces a docile body, is masterfully described by Foucault:

The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, not at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely. What was then being formed was a policy of coercions that act upon the body, a calculated manipulation of its elements, its gestures, its behaviour. The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it. A ‘political anatomy’, which was also a ‘mechanics of power’, was being born; it defined how one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile’ bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes the same forces (in political terms of obedience)...If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination.⁵⁴⁰

I have provided the entire citation, quite lengthy, yet so extremely important for the chapters of this dissertation that lie ahead, and for the rest of the current chapter. Foucault’s notion of the production of docile and ‘practised’ bodies could be well compared to Bourdieu’s

⁵⁴⁰ Foucault, *Birth of the Prison*, 137–38.

fields of cultural and social reproduction and the dynamics of the habitus.⁵⁴¹ Foucault makes this statement in the light of the rise of disciplinary institutions during the eighteenth century, especially in France. Shortly before providing this discussion, Foucault also states that ascetic and monastic discipline differ from what is stated above since it is based on renunciation rather than the increase of utility. Here I tend to differ with Foucault. The discipline of monasticism was also based on utility, and renunciation itself becomes a utility or technology of monasticism. Although renunciation, as Elizabeth Clark⁵⁴² and Peter Brown⁵⁴³ have both convincingly shown, was a crucial discourse in the making of late ancient Christianity, from what has been seen above with regards to slave-management and the *oikonomia* of the late ancient Christian household, I think Foucault's remarks in the citation above are also applicable, since slave-bodies, more than any other, are also economic or, as I will argue in a later chapter, commodified bodies – economic and symbolic capital in the Bourdieuan sense. The mechanistic functioning of power in the pastoral model of governance I have already illustrated, along with its very distinct nature as a 'political anatomy', highly hierarchized and based on surveillance, with the curative and corrective impetus producing docile slave-bodies that need to measure up according to the standards of Roman-Christian masculinities in late antiquity. The hold of pastoral power over slave-bodies cannot be underestimated: on the one hand, these slaves are measured against the high standards of free Roman-Christian masculinity, while on the other hand, motivated to remain in their difficult state of institutional slavery via the strategy of proliferating passive, feminine virtues, especially those of suffering and endurance. Moreover, the close corporeal resemblance between the slave life and the ascetic life also increased the pastoral hold over slavery. Finally, as the *pièce de résistance*, the Stoic-Philonic metaphor of moral slavery and being slaves of God not only promoted attitudes of indifference to institutional slavery, but the very conceptual and symbolic dependence of Christian theology on the very concept of slavery ensured the survival and perpetuation of institutional slavery, and, even more importantly and dangerously, the discourses and discursivities that function behind slavery that are present even today.

⁵⁴¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

⁵⁴² Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

⁵⁴³ Brown, *Body and Society*.

Chrysostom's homilies on the *haustafeln*, in my opinion, fit squarely into this 'political anatomy' that function for the production of docile slave-bodies. We now proceed to his homiletic commentary on the Colossian *haustafeln*.

4 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON COLOSSIANS 3:22-41 (*HOM. COL. 10*)

Chrysostom's series of homilies on Colossians was most certainly delivered in Constantinople. In the third homily Chrysostom refers to his position in the episcopate (*Hom. Col. 3.4*) with the allusions to the fall of Eutropius and the foolishness of earthly power supporting this point. He also mentions recent earthquakes that hit the capital in the second homily, which took place at the end of 398 and the Eutropius affair happening in August of the following year. It would then point to the possibility of the series being preached in the beginning of 399, possibly in the autumn season.⁵⁴⁴

The comments in homily 22 regarding slave-management was certainly more detailed than those in this homily and in this homily Chrysostom refrains from elaborating on slave-management principles for Christians. The similarities between this homily and the previous one is that in both Chrysostom makes the regular Stoic references to metaphorical slavery, with the accompanying focus on not aiming to please people but to please God. The major difference between this homily and the previous is Chrysostom's lack of comments directly related to the governance of slaves in the household; in fact, the homily seems to be quite rushed. The reasons for this will forever elude us. Surprisingly, the codes given to husbands and wives are very brief, unlike the previous series of homilies.

While the homilies on the Ephesian *haustafeln* were built around the theme of the household, this one short homily devoted to the entire Colossian *haustafeln* is not built around that theme. Here the central theme and structure of the homily are based on authority. This is perhaps fitting considering the Constantinopolitan context in which Chrysostom was quite active in civic politics. He does provide the same arguments as in the previous homily on the character of the authorities in the *haustafeln*. The authority functioning between husband and wife is natural, while that between slave and owner is not natural. The theme of love is perhaps more prevalent in this homily. Chrysostom makes a strong link between nature and love; this would be

⁵⁴⁴ Mayer, *Homilies of St. John Chrysostom*, 191–92.

the affection rising from biological kinship. The authority existing between slave and slaveholder is somewhat different from what Chrysostom envisages since he states (*Hom. Col. 10.1*):

Next he comes to the third kind of authority, saying that slaves must obey their masters according to the flesh. Here there is also a certain love, but no more resulting from nature, as in the one above, but from social custom, and from the authority itself, and the works done. Since the range of love is more limited here, obedience is increased, and he elaborates on this, desiring to give to these from their obedience, what the first have from nature. Thus, that which he discusses solely with the slaves is not for the sake of their masters, but also for their own sake, so that they may become desirable on their own for their masters.⁵⁴⁵

Whereas the relationships between the *pater familias* and his wife and children put an emphasis on love, here the emphasis is on obedience and labour. The love/authority between husband and wife is natural, but that between slave and master is based on social custom (*συνηθεία*). The theme of loving slaves is also quite Stoic, as we have seen it in Seneca's epistle. Unlike Seneca, however, Chrysostom does not use an argument of mutual origin to encourage love between slaves and masters. Rather, it is by means of good work that a slave should win the love of his or her master. Fear remains an important factor of manipulation here, and the obvious discrepancy between fear and love, surprisingly, does not feature here as it did in the previous homily and in the commentaries of Origen and Jerome. Along with the technology

⁵⁴⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.367.11-23: Εἶτα ἐπὶ τρίτην ἦλθεν ἀρχὴν, Οἱ δοῦλοι, λέγων, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις. Ἐνταῦθα ἔστι μὲν τι καὶ φίλτρον, ἀλλ' οὐκέτι φυσικὸν, καθάπερ ἄνω, ἀλλὰ συνηθείας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐνταῦθα τὸ μὲν τοῦ φίλτρον ὑποτέτμηται, τὸ δὲ τῆς ὑπακοῆς ἐπιτέταται, τούτῳ ἐνδιατρίβει, βουλόμενος, ὅπερ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔχουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως, τοῦτο δοῦναι τούτοις ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπακοῆς. Ὡστε οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν δεσποτῶν τοῖς οἰκέταις μόνους διαλέγεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ἵνα ποθεινοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ἐργάζωνται τοῖς δεσπόταις.

of fear comes the usual emphasis on surveillance. Here, however, the ever-present panopticism of the divine slaveholder is more elaborately and explicitly stated. Slaves should fear Christ in the first instance despite the earthly socio-juridical regulations (*Hom. Col. 10.1*): ‘Make, he says, your service which is required by the law, to come from the fear of Christ. Since, when your master does not see you, and if you perform your duty and what is necessary for his honor, it is clear that you do it because of the sleepless Eye.’⁵⁴⁶ God’s surveillance is called the ‘sleepless eye’ (ὁ ἀκοίμητος ὀφθαλμός). Fear of God means that one does not do evil when no one is looking. The love that owners ought to show to slaves, and the strong emphasis on teaching them virtue, points to the fact that slaves should no longer be considered merely as possessions and, more importantly, status indicators.

In this homily Chrysostom brings out a different emphasis on Stoic moral slavery. Although he does state that slavery is only temporal, ‘Your better part, the soul, is free, he says; your enslavement is temporary’ (*Hom. Col. 10.1*).⁵⁴⁷ Chrysostom stresses the freedom of the soul in this instance, and he now explains moral freedom (rather than moral slavery). The moral freedom metaphor, however, has some very practical implications for slaves according to Chrysostom (*Hom. Col. 10.1*): ‘He wants to have them freed not only from hypocrisy, but also from laziness. He has made them free instead of being slaves, when they do not need the dominion of their master; for the expression ‘from the heart’ means, with good intentions, not with a slavish necessity, but with freedom and choice.’⁵⁴⁸ Freedom from hypocrisy and laziness would certainly have direct advantages to the slaveholder regarding the labour of the slave. The dominion (ἐπιστασίας) of the master is now downplayed since a higher economy of

⁵⁴⁶ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.367.31-35: Ποίησον, φησί, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου δουλείαν ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου γίνεσθαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Κἂν γὰρ μὴ ὀρῶντος ἐκείνου πράττης τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ δεσπότη, δηλονότι διὰ τὸν ἀκοίμητον ὀφθαλμὸν ποιεῖς.

⁵⁴⁷ Translation: *NPNF*; Greek text: PG 62.367.28-29: Τὸ κρεῖττον σου ἢ ψυχὴ ἐλευθέρωται, φησί· πρόσκαιρος ἢ δουλεία.

⁵⁴⁸ Translation: *NPNF*; Greek text: PG 62.367.50-56: Οὐ μόνον ὑποκρίσεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀργίας αὐτοὺς ἀπτηλλάχθαι βούλεται. Ἐλευθέρους αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν ἀντὶ δούλων, ὅταν μὴ δέωνται τῆς τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐπιστασίας· τὸ γὰρ, Ἐκ ψυχῆς, τοῦτό ἐστι, τὸ μετ’ εὐνοίας, μὴ μετὰ δουλικῆς ἀνάγκης, ἀλλὰ μετ’ ἐλευθερίας καὶ προαιρέσεως.

surveillance is at work and the slave is now a docile body. We have seen above that many late ancient Christian authors believed that Christian slaves were better workers than non-Christian slaves; or at least, they ought to be better. The argument here is related to this, and implies that a Christian slave, having renounced laziness and hypocrisy (two very stereotypical vices for slaves), is obviously a more productive slave. We see again here how Chrysostom utilizes the Pauline psychic expression ‘Ἐκ ψυχῆς’ as a strategy to produce a docile body. As mentioned, the soul is a corporeal strategy, used to manipulate corporeal behaviour.

He then discusses the rewards for good Christian slaves and, as expected, makes reference to eschatological reward and punishment. In the Colossian *haustafeln* however, Chrysostom seems to read a more ethnocentric argument from Paul than in the other (*Hom. Col. 10.1*):

Here he confirms his former guidelines. In order that his words may not seem to be flattery, he will receive, he says, the wrong he has done, that is, he will also be punished, for there is no partiality here. So what if you are a slave? It is not a shame. And truly he might have said this to the masters, as he did in the Epistle to the Ephesians. But here he appears to me to be hinting at the Greek masters. So what if he is a Greek and you are a Christian? The actions are scrutinized, not the persons, so that even in this case you ought to render service with good intentions and from the heart.⁵⁴⁹

Chrysostom addresses the problem of Christian slaves under non-Christian, specifically Greek, slaveholders. In this passage Chrysostom seems to understand that Greek (and thereby we

⁵⁴⁹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.368.2-13: Ἐνταῦθα βεβαιοῖ τὸν πρότερον λόγον. Ἴνα γὰρ μὴ δόξη κολακείας εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα, λήψεται, φησὶν, ὁ ἡδίκησε· τουτέστι, καὶ τιμωρίαν δίδωσιν· Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Τί γὰρ, εἰ δοῦλος εἶ; οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ. Καὶ μὴν τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς δεσπότας ἔδει εἰπεῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους. Ἄλλ’ ἐνταῦθά μοι δοκεῖ τοὺς Ἕλληνας αἰνίττεσθαι δεσπότας. Τί γὰρ, εἰ ἐκεῖνος μὲν Ἕλληνας, σὺ δὲ Χριστιανός; Οὐ τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλὰ τὰ πράγματα ἐξετάζεται. Ὡστε καὶ οὕτω μετ’ εὐνοίας, καὶ ἐκ ψυχῆς δεῖ δουλεύειν.

can add, I would say, Roman) principles of *oikonomia* and slave-management differ from Christian methods. I have said before that such a statement seems to be rather propagandistic and conjectural; although the contents of Christian slave-management principles differed from Greek and Roman principles and manifestations of slaveholding, their practical manifestations were more or less the same. We would find similar reasoning in his commentary on the *haustafeln* in Titus. Christian slaves, according to Chrysostom, should obey their owners despite their religion and socio-cultural practices. This is related to the notion of God not showing any favouritism of persons. Not much advice is given to slaveholders in this homily and, in fact, in the entire homily the most detail is devoted to slave behaviour, even more than to the behaviour between husband and wife.

The dynamics of authority in this homily become quite evident then, and it is also here based on the pastoral model of governance. Authority is effective because of surveillance, the divine shepherd and slaveholder is always watching, his eye is ‘sleepless.’ There is also love, that is, curativity, at work here, but the emphasis now is on the production of the practised, disciplined and docile body of the slave. It should also be noted here, with Chrysostom’s emphasis on the freedom of the soul, that the punishment and reward are also directed against the body as well as the soul; hence the strict disciplinary impetus between body and soul. Furthermore, the scopic economy proposed by Chrysostom here has two sides: since God shows no favouritism of persons, the slave and/or the master should do the same. Thus Christian slaves, who *ought* to work harder and better, should also show no favouritism in their behaviour if their owner is not a Christian. The control of the passion of hypocrisy, as stated in this homily, relates not only to correct behaviour before God, but also to proper behaviour before those who are not Christians. In his commentary on Titus Chrysostom would state that this type of behaviour has a kerygmatic function, and promotes Christianity. Good slave behaviour now becomes an informal policy of Christianity: ‘our slaves work better.’ This statement is of course built on the common and degrading stereotypes of slaves being hypocritical and lazy: two passions Chrysostom urges them to control in this homily. In the next homilies on the Timothean and Titan *haustafeln*, we will see this negative stereotype from Chrysostom more clearly.

5 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON 1 TIMOTHY 6:1-2 (*HOM. I TIM. 16*)

The provenance of this series of homilies is a bit more problematic. The majority of homilies in the series seems to point to them being preached in Antioch, but the evidence is not entirely conclusive. The homily does provide much discussion on the topic of slaveholding. In this homily Chrysostom emphasizes the mutual fictive kinship between slaves and slaveholders. This is also a typically Stoic concept. These are the reasons for good relations between the slave and the slaveholder. It is a theme that is also very prevalent in Chrysostom's series of homilies on the Epistle to Philemon. He re-articulates Paul's words in Philemon 16 thus (*Hom. Phlm. 2*): 'You have lost a slave for a short time, but you will find a brother for ever, not only your brother, but also mine. There is much virtue here. But if he is my brother, you also will not be ashamed of him.'⁵⁵⁰

Chrysostom especially focuses on the relations between slaves of God and God as slaveholder in the homily on the Timothean *haustafeln*. Chrysostom uses the image of the hard-working, busy slave as metaphor for what the attitude of Christians should be towards God. Like slaves, who spend most of their time doing the work of the slaveholder, so too the work of the divine slaveholder should take precedence (*Hom. I Tim. 16.2*):

But if he admonishes slaves to show such obedience, think of what ought to be our attitude towards our master, who brought us into existence out of nothing, and who feeds and clothes us. If in no other way then, let us at least serve him as our slaves serve us. Do they not structure their whole lives to ease the life of their masters, and is it not their duty and their life to take care of the masters' concerns? Are they not busy with their masters' work all day long, and only a small part of the evening busy with their own? But we, on the contrary, are always tending to our own affairs, in our master's hardly at all, and that too, although he does not need our services, as masters need those of their slaves, but those very

⁵⁵⁰ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.711.27-32: Δοῦλον ἀπόλεσας πρὸς ὀλίγον, καὶ ἀδελφὸν εὐρήσεις εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ἀδελφὸν οὐ σὸν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμόν. Ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἡ ἀρετὴ πολλή. Εἰ δὲ ἐμὸς ἀδελφός, οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθήσῃ καὶ σύ.

services are to our own benefit. In their case the ministry of the slave benefits the master, but in our case the ministry of the slave shows no profit to the master, but is rather to the benefit of the slave.⁵⁵¹

Chrysostom's teaching on the Christian lifestyle, here, is based on institutional slavery. It again demonstrates that if we were to totally remove the phenomenon of slavery from history, Christian theology and ethics would take on an entirely different shape. Here God becomes the epitome of the fair and virtuous slaveholder, who cares for slaves by supplying in their corporeal needs. Since God shows such providence, it is only fair that slaves of God serve him entirely. The difference between God and the earthly slaveholder is that unlike the earthly one, God is in no need of slaves. It is explained as a mutually beneficial relationship. God is also greater in that the rewards he gives to his slaves are far greater. A very interesting statement is here made by Chrysostom regarding manumission. The freedom of the soul, and salvation, is much greater than institutional manumission according to Chrysostom. He goes so far as to say (*Hom. I Tim. 16.2*): 'Freedom here is often worse than enslavement since it is often embittered by famine beyond slavery itself.'⁵⁵² Here we see how complex manumission is, and as seen above with

⁵⁵¹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.589.11-29: Εἰ δὲ τοῖς δούλοις οὕτως ἐπέταττε τοσαύτη κεχρηῆσθαι τῇ ὑπακοῇ, ἐννοήσατε πῶς ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὸν Δεσπότην διακεῖσθαι χρῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς παραγαγόντα, τὸν τρέφοντα, τὸν ἐνδιδύσκοντα. Εἰ καὶ μηδαμῶς οὖν ἑτέρως, κἂν ὡς οἱ οἰκέται οἱ ἡμέτεροι, δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ. Οὐχὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ζωὴν εἰς τοῦτο κατεστήσαντο ἐκεῖνοι εἰς τὸ ἀναπαύεσθαι τοὺς δεσπότας αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ, καὶ οὗτος ὁ βίος τὰ δεσποτικὰ μεριμνᾶν; οὐχὶ τὰ τοῦ δεσπότητος πᾶσαν τὴν ἡμέραν μεριμνῶσι, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν πολλάκις μικρὸν ἐσπέρας μέρος; Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦναντίον, τὰ μὲν ἡμέτερα διαπαντός, τὰ δὲ τοῦ Δεσπότητος οὐδὲ μικρὸν μέρος, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ δεομένου τῶν ἡμετέρων, καθάπερ οἱ δεσπότηται τῶν δούλων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων αὐτῶν πάλιν εἰς ἡμέτερον προχωρούντων κέρδος. Ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἡ διακονία τοῦ οἰκέτου τὸν δεσπότην ὠφελεῖ· ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ δούλου τὸν μὲν Δεσπότην οὐδὲν, πάλιν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν οἰκέτην ὀνίνησι.

⁵⁵² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.589.46-49: ἀλλὰ τί; ἐλευθερίαν τὴν ἐνταῦθα, τὴν πολλάκις τῆς δουλείας χαλεπωτέραν. Πολλάκις γὰρ κατέλαβε λιμὸς, καὶ πικροτέρα δουλείας αὕτη ἢ ἐλευθερία γέγονε·

many of the other authors, manumission was not necessarily something sought by all slaves. It also relates to the previous statements from Libanius, Chrysostom and Theodoret, stating that being institutionally free also implies great anxiety in providing for one's everyday needs and the needs of slaves.

Finally, Chrysostom admonishes the audience to imitate slaves in the metaphorical sense, with the main focus on fear. As earthly slaves fear their masters, so too the heavenly slaves must fear God. It becomes a blueprint for proper, Christian behaviour. Here, Chrysostom shows how effective the technology of fear is for controlling slave-bodies. Fear teaches slaves patience and endurance, those important passive virtues promulgated by ancient Christian authors (*Hom. I Tim.* 16.2):

But I especially encourage you to imitate slaves; only in that they work out of fear of their masters, let us do the same out of the fear of God. For I do not find that you even do this! They receive many insults from fear of us, and silently endure them with the patience of philosophers. They are subjected to our violence justly or unjustly, and they do not resist, but entreat us, even though they have often done nothing wrong. They are satisfied to receive no more than they need and often less; with straw for their bed, and only bread for their food, they do not complain or murmur at their hard life, but because of their fear of us they are restrained from impatience. When they are entrusted with money, they return all of it. For I am not speaking of the bad [slaves], but of those that are moderately good. If we threaten them, they are immediately humbled.⁵⁵³

⁵⁵³ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.589.65-590.16: Ἐγὼ δὲ κἂν τοὺς οἰκέτας μιμήσασθαι παραινῶ· ὅσα ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τὸν φόβον τὸν ἡμέτερον πράττουσι, κἂν τοσαῦτα διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβον ἡμεῖς πράττωμεν· οὐ γὰρ εὐρίσκομεν πράττοντας ὑμᾶς. Ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον φόβον ὑβρίζονται μυριάκις, καὶ παντὸς φιλοσόφου μᾶλλον ἐστήκασι σιγῶντες· ὑβρίζονται καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀδίκως, καὶ οὐκ ἀντιλέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦσιν, ἀδικοῦντες οὐδὲν πολλάκις. Οὐδὲν ἐκεῖνοι πλέον τῆς χρείας λαμβάνοντες, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἔλαττον στέργουσι· καὶ ἐπὶ στιβάδος καθεύδοντες, καὶ ἄρτου μόνον

The fear of slaves towards their masters also defines the fear Christians should have of God. It is because of the fear of eternal judgement and punishment that Christians rightly fear God; again, we see the interplays of eschatology and slavery. The problem Chrysostom also addresses quite briefly in the homily is that slaveholders tend to keep score of slave offenses, and punish accordingly. Yet they forget about God and their offences against him. Christians should have the mentality of good slaves when it comes to their relationship with God.

6 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON TITUS 2:9-10 (*HOM. TIT. 4*)

Regarding the provenance of the series of homilies on Titus, Mayer remarks: ‘The provenance of the series on Titus (CPG 4438) has never been disputed. The references in *In Titum hom. 3* to those who fast with the Jews and to Daphne, the cave of Matrona and a location dedicated to Kronos in Cilicia, all provide incontrovertible proof that it was delivered at Antioch.’⁵⁵⁴ It is then also the fourth homily in this series that serves as our source for Chrysostom’s comments on slave-management. This homily is very developed in terms of the discussion on slave-management, and it shows some important resemblances with *Homilia in epistulam ad Ephesios 22*.

As with the other two homilies discussed above, also in this homily Chrysostom starts immediately with the reference to Stoic moral slavery, and as in the homily on the Colossian *haustafeln*, he makes a distinction between the behaviour of Christian and non-Christian slaves and slaveholders. Again, Christian slaves, out of their fear for Christ, should not only be better workers, but exempla of virtue (*Hom. Tit. 4*):

For if you serve your master with good intentions, yet the cause of this service commences from your fear, so the one who serves with such great fear, will receive the greater reward. For if he does not control his hand, or his undisciplined tongue, how will the gentile

πληρούμενοι, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν διαίταν ἔχοντες εὐτελεῖ, οὐκ ἐγκαλοῦσιν, οὐδὲ δυσχεραίνουσιν ἐκεῖνοι διὰ τὸν παρ’ ἡμῶν φόβον· ἐμπιστευόμενοι χρήματα, πάντα ἀποδιδόασιν (μὴ γὰρ μοι τοὺς μοχθηροὺς εἵπησ τῶν οἰκετῶν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὴ λίαν κακοὺς)· ἂν ἀπειλήσωμεν, εὐθέως συστέλλονται.

⁵⁵⁴ Mayer, *Homilies of St. John Chrysostom*, 186.

admire the doctrine that is among us? But if they see their slave, who has been taught the philosophy of Christ, showing more self-mastery than their own philosophers, and serving with all meekness and good intentions, he will admire the power of the gospel in every way. For the Greeks do not judge doctrines by the doctrine itself, but they make the practice and lifestyle the test of the doctrines.⁵⁵⁵

He again refers to Greek slaveholders in this section. He utilizes another stereotype that the Greeks place a high regard on practical philosophy. We have seen this issue also in the works of Philodemus on the issue of *oikonomia*. He therefore refers to Christian theology as the philosophy of Christ, which in this instance, aims to highlight Christian principles of self-mastery and virtuosity. Now the Christian slave is not merely someone who works better, but someone who lives a virtuous life. We have seen above in the discussion on the homily to the Ephesians that the disciplinary standards of virtue that slaves and women were measured with were in essence, standards of free masculinity. Here, this discourse becomes explicit. He states above that Christian slaves should exhibit more ‘self-mastery’ (ἐγκράτεια) than the philosophers, and just after saying this, he states (*Hom. Tit. 4.1*): ‘Therefore, let women and slaves be their teachers by [their] domestic lifestyle.’⁵⁵⁶ Chrysostom’s construction of the Christian slave becomes much more apparent. It is via this type of masculine domestic conduct (‘διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἀνατροφῆς’) that women and slaves can serve a pedagogical function in

⁵⁵⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.685.11-23: Καὶν γὰρ τῷ δεσπότη διακονῆς μετ’ εὐνοίας, ἀλλ’ ἢ πρόφασις ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχει. Ὡστε ὁ μετὰ τοσοῦτου φόβου ἐκείνῳ διακονῶν, μεγίστων ἐπιτεύξεται τῶν μισθῶν. Εἰ γὰρ χειρὸς μὴ κρατεῖ, μηδὲ γλώττης ἀκολάστου, πόθεν θαυμάσεται ὁ Ἕλληνας τὸ δόγμα τὸ παρ’ ἡμῖν; Εἰ δὲ τὸν δοῦλον θεάσονται τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ φιλοσοφούντα, τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς φιλοσοφησάντων μείζονα τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἐπιδεικνύμενον, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐπιεικείας καὶ τῆς εὐνοίας διακονούμενον, παντὶ τρόπῳ θαυμάσεται τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ κηρύγματος. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δόγματος δόγματα, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ πραγμάτων καὶ βίου τὰ δόγματα κρίνουσιν Ἕλληνας.

⁵⁵⁶ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.685.23-25: Ἔστωσαν οὖν αὐτοῖς καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ δοῦλοι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἀνατροφῆς.

the eyes of outsiders. In order to facilitate this construction, Chrysostom has to also adopt the traditional, negative stereotype of the ancient slave-body (*Hom. Tit. 4.1*):

For both among themselves, and everywhere, it is admitted that the race of slaves is inordinate, not open to impression, stubborn, and does not show much aptitude for being taught virtue, not from their nature, it cannot be, but from their [bad] upbringing, and the neglect of their masters. For those who rule over them care about nothing but their own service, and if they do give attention to their morals, they do it only to avoid the distress that would be their part when they fornicate, rob, or become drunk; and since they are so neglected and having no one to care about about them, they obviously descend to the depths of wickedness. For if they were under the tutelage of a father and mother, a guardian, a master, and teacher, with suitable companions, with the honor of a free condition, and many other advantages, it is difficult to depart from doing evil things, what can we expect from those who are bereft of all these, and are mixed up with wicked people, and associate fearlessly with whomever they want to, with no one concerned about their friendships? What type of people do we expect them to be? Because of this it is difficult for any slave to be good, especially when they do not have the advantage of being taught either from those outside or from ourselves. They do not engage in conversation with free persons who behave appropriately, who have a great regard for their reputation. For all these reasons it is a difficult and surprising thing that there should ever be a good slave.⁵⁵⁷

⁵⁵⁷ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.685.25-52: Καὶ γὰρ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ πανταχοῦ τοῦτο διωμολόγηται, ὅτι τὸ τῶν δούλων γένος ἰταμόν πῶς ἐστὶ, δυσδιατύπωτον, δυστράπελον, οὐ σφόδρα ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς διδασκαλίαν, οὐ διὰ τὴν φύσιν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀνατροφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀμέλειαν τὴν παρὰ τῶν δεσποτῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πανταχοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐτέρου, ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτῶν

Chrysostom here concedes to the negative stereotypes of ancient slaves in much detail. What makes slaves prone to vice, not able to control their passions, according to Chrysostom? He states that it is certainly not due to nature (as Aristotle has it), but from bad upbringing (ἀνατροφή) and neglect (ἀμέλεια) on the part of their owners. This tends to point to a link in Chrysostom's mind to bad behaviour and the way slaves are raised, not by nature he explicitly states; and also because of their masters who do not teach them virtue. We again see the emphasis on the curative and didactic role of the slaveholder. He then starts to criticize the slaveholders interestingly enough. The problem Chrysostom has, which bears resemblance to the problems forwarded by Philodemus, is that slaveholders are simply concerned about the labour of slaves and the quality of the work they do. The value of the slave-body, for Chrysostom then, does not simply lie in the quality of its service and labour, but in its conforming to the norms of virtuosity - this is now what defines good bodily practice. He continues to intimate that when slaveholders are concerned about the good behaviour of slaves, it is in order to spare them the embarrassment of bad slave behaviour. This is fully in line with Greek and Roman constructions of masculinity again. A man that cannot control and master his slave is a shameful sight. The only value of good slave behaviour in this instance is that it adds to the honour of the slaveholder. In another homily, Chrysostom states (*Hom. Heb. 24.6*): 'For if we refuse to be called the masters of our bad slaves, and give up on them; and if any one comes to us and says, 'so-and-so

διακονίας οἱ κρατοῦντες αὐτῶν φροντίζουσιν· εἰ δέ που καὶ τῶν τρόπων ἐπιμεληθεῖεν, καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀνάπαισιν πράττουσιν, ὥστε μὴ πράγματα αὐτοῖς παρέχειν ἢ πορνεύοντας, ἢ κλέπτοντας, ἢ μεθύοντας· εἰκότως ἡμελημένοι, καὶ οὐδένα τῶν πολυπραγμονούντων ἔχοντες, εἰς αὐτὰ τῆς κακίας τὰ βάραθρα καταποντίζονται. Εἰ γὰρ, ἔνθα πατήρ ἐφέστηκε καὶ μήτηρ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς καὶ τροφεὺς καὶ διδάσκαλος καὶ ἡλικιωταί, καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ τῆς ἐλευθερίας δόξα περικειμένη, καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα, μόλις ἂν τις διαφύγοι τὰς τῶν πονηρῶν συνουσίας· τί οἶει τοὺς πάντων τούτων ἐρήμους ὄντας, καὶ μισροῖς ἀναμιγνυμένους, καὶ μετὰ ἀδείας οἷς ἂν ἐθέλωσι συγγινομένους, οὐδενὸς ὄντος τοῦ τὰς φιλίας αὐτῶν πολυπραγμονούντος; τί οἶει τοὺς τοιούτους ἔσεσθαι; Διὰ τοῦτο δύσκολον δοῦλον γενέσθαι ἀγαθόν. Ἄλλως δὲ οὐδὲ διδασκαλίας ἀπολαύουσιν, οὔτε τῶν ἔξωθεν οὔτε τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν· οὐ συναναστρέφονται ἀνδράσιν ἐλευθέροις, κοσμίοις, πολλὴν τῆς αὐτῶν δόξης ποιούμενοις φροντίδα. Διὰ ταῦτα πάντα δύσκολον καὶ θαυμαστὸν, χρῆσιμον οἰκέτην γενέσθαι ποτέ.

does countless evils, he is your slave, is he not?’⁵⁵⁸ We immediately say, ‘certainly not!’ In order to spare us the shame, for a slave has a close relationship with his master, and the disgrace passes from the one to the other.’ Honour and shame become contagious and transferable in this instance. Chrysostom states that people in general are prone to generate bad behaviour and the enslaved all the more. He makes an important statement here. He admits that degenerate slave behaviour in antiquity is due to social inequalities and discrepancies; he identifies the root of the problem as being socio-psychological developmental issues. Upbringing, education and mentoring are not available to the slave, and even having these present, it is still difficult to live a virtuous life. These are the typical features used to classify abnormality and degeneracy in societies, even today. The slave as an abnormal is so because of several reasons then, according to Chrysostom, as well as many other ancient authors. The issue of bad upbringing is raised twice in the citation above. We have seen in the previous discussion on the homily on the Ephesian *haustafeln*, that in terms of discipline, in Chrysostom’s view, slaves are grouped in the same category as children. Puerile terms were often used to designate slaves, like *puer/παῖς*. In his *Homily on Hebrews* 28.9, for instance, Chrysostom uses this same Greek term above and calls slaves ‘serving boys’.⁵⁵⁹ This is not simply a term of offense and disrespect, but it exhibits something more pervasive when it comes to the identity of the slave. Using this type of language and applying the same rules of discipline on slaves as on children, we see the notion of puerility being transferred onto the image of the slave as an abnormal. The slave is not only regarded as a child in knowledge and experience (in fact, in the previous homily, Chrysostom used this as a distinction between slaves and children), but the slave is regarded as morally and socially underdeveloped in terms of behaviour. It also had sexual connotations; slave-traders are infamously known for using all kinds of techniques to make slaves look younger in order to boost their value.⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁸ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 63.169.60-170.5: Εἰ γὰρ ἡμεῖς παραιτούμεθα καλεῖσθαι δεσπότην πονηρῶν ἡμῶν δούλων, καὶ ἀφίεμεν αὐτούς· κὰν εἶπη τις προσελθὼν, Ὁ δεῖνα μυρία ἐργάζεται κακὰ, ἄρα σὸς δούλος ἐστίν; εὐθέως φαμέν, ὅτι οὐδαμῶς, ἀποτριβόμενοι τὸ ὄνειδος· σχέσις γὰρ ἐστι τῷ δούλῳ πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην, καὶ διαβαίνει ἡ ἀδοξία καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἀπ’ ἐκείνου·

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. PG 63.197.56.

⁵⁶⁰ Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament*, 129-133.

For Chrysostom, discipline and virtue-teaching become technologies of normalization; we must remember that free Christian masculinity is seen as the norm here. This is well before the rise of psychiatry and psychopharmacology, where normalization was mechanized by means of medical and juridicial power - the hospital/asylum and the courtroom. The dynamics are slightly different in the model of pastoralism. The technologies here, especially with Chrysostom, are now psychotheological, with the juridicial dimension remaining. Normalization (equal to masculinization) is done by means of the teaching of virtue and also practical skills, as Chrysostom states (cf. *Hom. Eph. 22.1-2*; *Hom. I Cor. 40.6*). In this way, slaves are now ready to be ‘released’ into society - this is the ideal manumission in Chrysostom’s thinking. Not only should slaves be virtuous citizens, but they should also have a trade so that they would not be a burden on society. There is now a shift from domination to reformation and rehabilitation. When I say rehabilitation, I do not mean it in the strictly technical sense that it received with the rise of the prison system. For the slave it implies that, after being isolated in the realm of slave-carcerality and under constant surveillance and supervision, the Christian household and *pater familias* now rehabilitates the slave as a free, social individual, training the slave to act according to virtue (that is, against the stereotypical slave-vices) and also making the slave an economic contributor to society. Instead of the courtroom, the institution of *manumissio in ecclesia* now becomes the authorizing body confirming that normalization has taken place. In Christian pastoral governmentality, and in Chrysostom’s ideal society, the essential function of slave-carcerality is now the rehabilitation of the slave, and not merely to perform labour (which can and should still be done under the status of being freed). The limitations still applied to the status of freed persons make the supervision and prevention of non-rehabilitation easy to facilitate and maintain.

Another strategy Chrysostom applies to facilitate discipline and rehabilitation within slave-management and *oikonomia* is his radical reduction of the number of slaves a Christian slaveholder is supposed to have. These statements fit in squarely with Chrysostom’s ascetic views on the renunciation of wealth. Slaves are here seen as commodified and disposable bodies. This will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter. The important point here is that reducing the number of slaves also makes it easier for the *pater familias* to discipline, instruct and punish them. One of the most popular instances where Chrysostom speaks of slaves and slaveholding, one that will surface many more times in this dissertation, is found in his *Homilia*

in epistulam I ad Corinthios 40. Here, regarding the number of slaves, Chrysostom famously states (*Hom. I Cor.* 40.6):

...[O]ne master only needs to employ one slave; or rather two or three masters one slave...We will allow you to keep a second slave. But if you collect many, you no longer do it for the sake of philanthropy, but to indulge yourself...when you have purchased them [slaves] and have taught them trades whereby to support themselves, let them go free.⁵⁶¹

In another, very important source mentioned above, Chrysostom states (*Hom. Heb.* 28.10): ‘Let there also be, if you do not mind, two serving boys.’⁵⁶² We will get back to this argument several times during the course of this study, since it bears so many important dimensions regarding slaveholding in the late Roman world. For our present discussion we need to ask: what relevance does this argument have for Chrysostom’s views on slave-management and slave-rehabilitation? We have seen above in the homily on the Ephesian *haustafeln* that even the poor households in Antioch would have had some slaves. The admonition to only have two slaves is not simply a rule based on the ascetic renunciation of property; by reducing the number of slaves, it becomes easier to educate and discipline slaves in the household. As we have mentioned above, Chrysostom’s remarks are almost always applied to smaller-scale, domestic slavery (even though the numbers of slaves in a wealthy, large domestic household would have been quite high). At this point I want to propose that the type of slaveholding Chrysostom wants his audience to adopt could be termed ‘tactical slaveholding.’ Michel de Certeau has utilized the military theorist Carl von Clausewitz⁵⁶³ to show how strategic power is transformed into tactical

⁵⁶¹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 61.353-354: Καὶ γὰρ ἐνὶ τὸν ἕνα χρῆσθαι δεσπότην οἰκέτη μόνον ἐχρήν· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ δύο καὶ τρεῖς δεσπότας ἐνὶ οἰκέτη...εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον, ἕνα που μόνον, ἢ τὸ πολὺ δεύτερον...εἰ δὲ πολλοὺς συνάγεις, οὐ φιλανθρωπίας ἔνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖς, ἀλλὰ θρυπτόμενος·

⁵⁶² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 63.197.56: Ἔστωσαν δὲ, εἰ βούλει, καὶ παῖδες δύο.

⁵⁶³ Carl P. G. von Clausewitz, *De la Guerre* (Pierre Naville (trans.); Paris: Minuit, 1955).

power: ‘Power is bound by its very visibility,’ thus, its representation.⁵⁶⁴ The reduction of the number of slaves reduces and limits the channels of mastery and the exhibition of wealth and status; thus it reduces the visibility of power. In military terms, when one’s forces or resources are visibly reduced, the more strategy is transformed into tactics. De Certeau states: ‘[A] tactic is determined by the *absence of power* [his italics] just as a strategy is organized by the postulation of power.’⁵⁶⁵ In antiquity, we can consider slaves as nodes of power; that is, modulations through which the slaveholder can make his or her power visible. Strategic power, in the thinking of De Certeau, is based on the utilization of space, since resources are abundant. Tactics, due to the lack of visible resources, must cleverly utilize time. Strategy is then the utilization of spatial requirements while tactics involve the utilization of temporal requirements. Once the numbers-based view of slaveholding is negated, that is, strategic slaveholding, tactical slaveholding is born. It must be remembered that Chrysostom still allows for a slaveholder to have ‘one or two’ slaves. Now, the small amount of slaves should be utilized to the most efficient extent, and according to Chrysostom’s ascetic thinking, only for necessity (ἀνάγκη) and need (χρεία). The terms here would imply those shameful servile duties specifically related to sewerage and other hygienic services, and according to another homily, cooking (*Inan. glor. 70*). Chrysostom, for instance, believes that a priest is allowed to have at least one slave so that he does not have to perform ‘shameful’ duties. This is stated as a contra-argument to shame those wealthy individuals who employ slaves for every possible type of material and social spatiality, whether it is aiding the owner at the baths, at the market or at the theatre, even at the foot of the bed or in the kitchen. It is interesting that in the case of cohabitation, Chrysostom advises the man who is sharing the house to also acquire those ‘feminine’ skills needed for certain domestic chores despite having slaves to perform them.⁵⁶⁶ While he advises slaveholders to perform their own duties, slaves are still implied. This is a direct assault on strategic slaveholding. While it is easier to discipline and teach a small number of slaves, their duties would, by implication, become

⁵⁶⁴ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Steven F. Rendall (trans.); Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 37.

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 99–101; John H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics Between Desert and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 157.

more intense since the practice of everyday life is now tactical, based on optimum utilization of time rather than space. This creates the impression of weakness and poverty, one that is preferential for asceticism. Owning only two slaves would be a representation of extreme poverty.⁵⁶⁷ In the homily on Ephesians above Chrysostom stated that even poor households sometimes owned entire slave families (cf. *Hom. Eph.* 22.2).⁵⁶⁸ It is in line with the strong emphasis on the renunciation of material wealth, and more importantly, in line with the move to promote passive, feminine (in this case, almost Cynic) values of weakness. Both Von Clausewitz and De Certeau note tactics as an ‘art of the weak’; that is, as a tactical polemology of the weak.⁵⁶⁹ What are the effects of this shift from strategic to tactical slaveholding? Initially, it would seem to be ameliorative to institutional slaveholding, since fewer people are enslaved. While it is true that fewer people would be slaves in this system, one should not regard tactical slaveholding as being ameliorative. In fact, I would argue that it makes institutional slavery, firstly, more pervasive than before and, secondly, that tactical slaveholding would dramatically worsen the conditions of institutional slaves. Why does it make institutional slavery more pervasive? Because it bears the deception of being ameliorative. Just in terms of numbers, institutional slavery ‘appears’ to no longer be such a big problem, and the power-dynamics of slaveholding become less visible. It removes the critical eye from slavery possibly to other issues. Why would it worsen conditions for the slaves themselves? Because labour, surveillance and discipline become much more intense. Fewer slaves now need to do the same amount of work. Chrysostom, in this case, does advise slaveholders to tend to their tasks and duties themselves, but this would not always be practically applicable.⁵⁷⁰ In his homily *De inani gloria* he advises fathers to teach their children to take care of their own needs. Slaves should not hand them their cloaks, wash their feet or serve them at the baths – cooking, however, should be done by the slave since there are more important things to do with the time (*Inan. glor.* 70). The character of

⁵⁶⁷ Ramsay MacMullen, “Late Roman Slavery,” *Historia* 36, no. 3 (1987): 363–64.

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. also: Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 49–50.

⁵⁶⁹ De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, 37.

⁵⁷⁰ Chrysostom refers to the example of Sarah, who had hundreds of servants, but still ‘this woman kneaded the flour, and did all the other slaves’ duties, and stood by them as they feasted also in the rank of a slave’ (*Hom. Rom.* 30.2). Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 60.666.40-42: ...αὐτὴ ἔφουρε τὰ ἄλευρα, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα διηκονεῖτο, καὶ ἐστιωμένοις παρειστῆκει πάλιν ἐν τάξει θεραπεινίδος.

slave-labour also becomes much worse, with more slaves doing the terrible tasks usually reserved for the lowliest of slaves. Tactical slaveholding makes slaves work harder, due to the emphasis on temporal utility (of both slave and slaveholder), and the work they do would be so much more unpleasant. Fewer slaves to monitor means that those who are present can also be more strictly monitored, in terms of labour, and observed, in terms of correct, non-degenerate behaviour. Discipline can also become more focussed, and it creates a more intense, enclosed space where discipline happens. Discipline and punishment shift from the public spectacle to the domestic observatory/reformatory. Signs are replaced by exercises in this new mode of slaveholding; discipline is no longer enforced (i.e. punishment) by means of violent, external signs on the body (whippings or tattooing), but by means of exercises such as the study of scripture, the singing of hymns and, very importantly, service to the slaveholder. This is also one of the conclusions Chrysostom reaches in his *Homilia in epistulam ad Philemonem* 2. Since God also forgives his slaves, so too should earthly slaveholders practice forgiveness rather than resort to punitive violence (*Hom. Phlm.* 2): ‘...[So] that we masters may not give up on our slaves, nor press them too hard, but may learn to forgive the errors of such slaves, so that we may not always be severe, that we may not, due to their enslavement, be ashamed to make them share in all things with us when they are good.’⁵⁷¹ Chrysostom does not rule out punishment however. In the very next homily on the series on Philemon he states (*Hom. Phlm.* 3):

But why do I speak of slaves, who easily fall into these sins? But let a man have sons, and let him allow them to do everything they want, and let him not punish them; will they not be worse than anything? Tell me, in the case of men then, it is a sign of goodness to punish, and of cruelty not to punish, and is it not so in the case of God? Since he is good, he has therefore prepared a hell.⁵⁷²

⁵⁷¹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.711.36-42: ...ἵνα μὴ ἀπογινώσκωμεν τῶν οἰκετῶν οἱ δεσπότες, μηδὲ σφόδρα αὐτοῖς ἐπιτιθώμεθα, ἀλλὰ μάθωμεν συγχωρεῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τοῖς οἰκέταις τοῖς τοιούτοις, ἵνα μὴ ἀεὶ τραχεῖς ὦμεν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας ἐπαισχυνώμεθα καὶ κοινωνοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν πᾶσι λαμβάνειν, ὅταν ὦσιν ἀγαθοί.

⁵⁷² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.718.27-34: Καὶ τί λέγω οἰκέτας τοὺς προχειρότερον ἐπὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ταῦτα ἐρχομένους; Ἄλλ’ ἐχέτω τις υἱοὺς, καὶ πάντα ἐπιτρεπέτω τοῖς ἐκείνοις, καὶ

The development of late ancient Christian pedagogy and eschatology went hand in hand. Punishment is still very necessary, and here hell is seen as the most extreme, and violent form of punishment. Not punishing is therefore in fact a cruelty, as Chrysostom states. We find here a divine justification of violence and punishment, which now serves as a technology that not only enforces the masculinity of the *pater familias*, but also appears to be an act of ‘kindness,’ since God also punishes his slaves (cf. *Hom. Eph.* 16). There is no shame in the punishment of slaves. This is an aspect Foucault notes very early in his *Discipline and Punish*, where he states that the punishment of criminals in the modern period has moved into a hidden sphere since the brutal, public spectacles of punishment also shamed those who dealt out the punishment.⁵⁷³ For Chrysostom, however, there is no shame in punishing a slave, since God also punishes. Chrysostom does opt for controlled domesticated violence against slaves. In a discussion of domestic violence in general, he refers to men losing their tempers, removing their slave-girl’s head covering, dragging her by the hair and beating her. Chrysostom is bothered equally by the concept of a slave-girl with her head uncovered and the inability of the owner to control his temper (cf. *Hom. Eph.* 15.4).⁵⁷⁴ Discipline, he affirms, should be gentle and fair, yet a physical beating with a rod is permissible, but at the same time, the slaveholder should be conscious of his own sins before God. He also gives guidance to the *mater familias* (*Hom. Eph.* 15.4): ‘If you will learn this lesson in your household in dealing with your slave-girl, and not be severe but gentle and patient, with this behaviour you will be in the goodwill of your husband.’⁵⁷⁵ Again, in another homily he states (*Hab. eun. spir.* 3.7): ‘To teach or punish foolish slaves is a great honour, and not a simple praise, when one is able to expel wickedness using private violence

μη̄ κολαζέτω, τίνος οὖν οὐκ ἔσονται χείρους, εἰπέ μοι; Εἶτα ἐπὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων τὸ κολάζειν ἀγαθότητος, τὸ δὲ μὴ κολάζειν ὠμότητος, ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοῦ οὐκέτι; Ὡστε ἐπειδὴ ἀγαθός ἐστι, διὰ τοῦτο γέενναν προητοίμασε.

⁵⁷³ Foucault, *Birth of the Prison*, 3–31.

⁵⁷⁴ Just prior to this discussion Chrysostom states that women are prone to losing their tempers, shouting and publicly harassing their slave-girls, which is very shameful conduct; cf. *Hom. Eph.* 15.3–4.

⁵⁷⁵ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.110.41–43: Ἐὰν ἐν οἰκίᾳ ταῦτα παιδευθῆς ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαινίδος, καὶ προσηγῆς ἧς καὶ μὴ χαλεπῆ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἔση τοιαύτη.

against those who are the most evil.⁵⁷⁶ The point here is that slaveholders should not apply punitive violence hastily, such as putting their slaves in chains or beating them excessively; this is after all a loss of self-control and is considered shameful.⁵⁷⁷ The mastering of the passions of the slaveholder is just as important as the mastering of the slave. Punitive violence, therefore, should also contribute to the self-fashioning of the slaveholder, and always be directed to installing virtue to the slave. As then stated above, the preference of punitivity shifts from violent, public displays to domestic, spiritual exercises.

Hence, the move to tactical slaveholding is the logical step in favour of a better mechanism of rehabilitation. The process of rehabilitating the slave is, for Chrysostom, essentially a psychotheological process. The ‘soul’ of the slave is now manipulated by means of new strategies and new mechanisms of fear: doctrinal precepts. Chrysostom states (*Hom. Tit. 4.1*):

When it is therefore seen that the power of religion, imposing a restraint upon a class naturally so self-willed, has rendered them singularly well behaved and gentle, their masters, however unreasonable they may be, will form a high opinion of our doctrines. For it is manifest, that having previously instilled in their souls a fear of the resurrection, of the judgment, and of all those things which we are taught by our philosophy to expect after death, they have been able to resist wickedness, having in their souls a settled principle to counterbalance the pleasures of sin. So that it is not by chance or without reason, that Paul shows so much consideration for this class of people: since the more wicked they are, the more admirable is the power of that preaching which

⁵⁷⁶ Translation: Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 331; Greek text: PG 51.287.4-8: ...καθάπερ οικήτας ἀγνώμονας παιδεύειν καὶ σωφρονίζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγκώμιον μέγιστον, καὶ οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν ἔπαινος, ὅτι τοὺς πρὸς τοσαύτην κατενεχθέντας κακίαν ἠδυνήθη διὰ τῆς οἰκείας σφοδρότητος ἀπαλλάξει τῆς πονηρίας...

⁵⁷⁷ Chrysostom states clearly that under no circumstances should a free man physically abuse or beat his wife or a slave-girl; cf. *Hom. 1 Cor. 26.8*.

reforms them. For we then most admire a physician, when he restores to a healthy and sane state one who was despaired of, whom nothing benefited, who was unable to command his unreasonable desires, and wallowed in them. And observe what he most requires of them; the qualities which contribute most to their masters' ease.⁵⁷⁸

It is the indoctrinization of the slave-body as a form of discipline that makes it a docile body. The formation of late ancient Christian eschatology, in particular, has bonds with the institution of slavery, and I would argue, that ancient Christian eschatology was directly related to slavery. Eschatology, as a technology of fear, becomes a very powerful social and rhetorical strategy. Chrysostom now plays one of his most important cards, and compels us to make a crucial and critical observation. When speaking about this process of disciplining and rehabilitating a slave, he uses a medical discourse. I have mentioned above that unlike the modern psychiatrization of normal and abnormal conduct, the process in Chrysostom's context is psychotheological and finally also juridical in terms of *manumissio in ecclesia*. But this does not rule out the discourse of medicality in this larger, discursive formation of the rehabilitated Christian slave. Despite their prepsychiatric context, medical metaphors are very common in Chrysostom's rhetoric. Slave-management, which now also becomes slave-rehabilitation, is like

⁵⁷⁸ Translation: *NPNF* (I prefer to keep the *NPNF* translation here due to its clarity); Greek text: PG 62.685.53-686.10: Ὅταν οὖν ἴδωσιν, ὅτι τὸ γένος τὸ οὕτως αὐθαδὲς ἢ τοῦ κηρύγματος δύναμις χαλινὸν περιθεῖσα πάντων εἰργάσατο κοσμιώτερον καὶ ἐπιεικέστερον, κἂν σφόδρα πάντων ὦσιν ἀλογώτεροι οἱ δεσπότες, λήψονται ἔννοιαν μεγάλην περὶ τῶν δογμάτων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν. Δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως φόβον καὶ τὸν τῆς κρίσεως καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων μετὰ τὸν θάνατον φιλοσοφουμένων παρ' ἡμῖν πρότερον ἐγκαταθέντες αὐτῶν τῇ ψυχῇ, οὕτως ἴσχυσαν ἀποκρούσασθαι τὴν κακίαν, ἀντίρροπὸν τινα φόβον τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν κακῶν ἡδονῆς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐνιδρυσαντες ψυχῇν. Ὡστε οὐκ εἰκὴ οὐδὲ ἀπλῶς πολὺν ὑπὲρ τούτων πανταχοῦ ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον· ὅσῳ γὰρ ἂν ὦσι κακοὶ, τοσούτῳ μάλιστα θαυμάζεται τοῦ κηρύγματος ἢ ἰσχύς. Καὶ γὰρ ἰατρὸν τότε θαυμάζομεν, ὅταν τὸν ἀπεγνωσμένον καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς βοήθειας ἀπολαύοντα οὐδὲ κρατῆσαι τῶν ἀκαίρων ἐπιθυμιῶν δυνάμενον, ἀλλ' ἐν ταύταις ἐγκαλινδούμενον, ἐναγάγη πρὸς υἰεῖαν καὶ διορθώσῃται. Καὶ ὄρα τίνα παρ' αὐτῶν ἀπαιτεῖ· ἂ μάλιστα πάντων ἀναπαύει τὸν δεσπότην·

a medical practice. Of course, a morally healthy slave has many benefits for the slaveholder and the household, as he states (*Hom. II Thess. 5.3*): ‘And virtue is so exceptional, that even a slave often benefits a whole family together with the master.’⁵⁷⁹

In concluding his discussions on slaves, Chrysostom summarizes the main point he has made again. Slave conduct should be directed to God and not the owner. Chrysostom uses the example of Joseph who served a non-Israelite king as a slave. It was the good and sound behaviour of Joseph, his accumulated knowledge of the king’s domestic affairs, and the trust he had won thereby, that saved him from being executed after Potiphar’s wife attempted to seduce him. He concludes again by referring to the holistic nature of oeconomic government, citing 1 Timothy 3:5, that a man who can govern his house can also govern the church.

Finally, it is also interesting to see that the discourse of domesticity was also related to life in the monastery. Chrysostom had a programme of social transformation in mind regarding his vision for the city in which he ministered.⁵⁸⁰ This transformation had at its core a type of popular asceticism that was viable in the households of urban Christians. The promulgation of popular asceticism was always explained in the light of its pinnacle, the monastery. The problem here is the fact that very little research has gone into the position, function and status of slaves in the late antique monastery.⁵⁸¹ Furthermore, there is no literary or archaeological evidence from monasteries in the East from late antiquity that described their position on slavery. The only witnesses are the official church canons. Much of this issue is thus left open to speculation. How can the principles of monasticism, especially as understood by Chrysostom, inform scholars on this issue?

One of the important principles in monasticism is that of necessity (*ἀνάγκη*). Monks were meant to care for themselves and only use what is necessary. In an interesting passage, Chrysostom describes the very nature of the monastery (*Hom. I Tim. 14.2*):

⁵⁷⁹ Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.498.54-58: καὶ τοσαύτη τῆς ἀρετῆς ἢ ὑπερβολῆ, ὥστε καὶ δοῦλος πολλακίς ὀλόκληρον ὠφέλησεν οἰκίαν μετὰ τοῦ δεσπότου.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Hartney, *Transformation of the City*, 90–94; Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*, 130–33; Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom*, 34–42.

⁵⁸¹ Glancy, “Slavery and the Rise of Christianity,” 462–63.

To go to the monastery of a holy man is to pass, as it were, from earth to heaven. You do not see there what is seen in a private house. That company is free from all impurity...No one calls for his slave, for each person serves himself...⁵⁸²

For Chrysostom, the monastery is a piece of heaven on earth. In this place there is no concept of private and personal property. These two principles, namely that of necessity and the lack of personal property, would seem to indicate that slave-status was not considered relevant in the monastery. There is also evidence that some poor monks were originally slaves,⁵⁸³ and it also seems that monasteries were used as asylum for runaway slaves.⁵⁸⁴ The legislation surviving from antiquity for the latter, however, is only evident from the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE.⁵⁸⁵ There is also an important shift during the mid-fifth-century, after Chalcedon, when the monastery became legally independent of lay ownership.⁵⁸⁶ It is therefore problematic to apply fifth century developments to monasteries earlier than this period. Moreover, the issue of providing asylum to slaves all but negates their status. It is exactly their status as being fugitive slaves that causes asylum in monasteries and churches to be a problem. The councils and canons before Chalcedon are notoriously difficult to interpret regarding the issue of slave-status and asylum. There is, in the first instance, the mid-fourth century Council of Gangra that condemned the Eustathians that seemed to have either promoted slaves to leave their masters or act insolently toward them.⁵⁸⁷ The silence of some other councils and canons are deafening, such as

⁵⁸² Translation: De Wet; Greek text: PG 62.575.30-33, 37-38: ὡσπερ ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, οὕτως ἐστὶν εἰς μοναστήριον ἀνδρὸς ἀγίου καταφυγεῖν. Οὐχ ὄραξ ἐκεῖ ταῦτα ἅπερ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ· πάντων καθαρὸς ὁ χορὸς ἐκεῖνος·... Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας, ῥέγχουσιν οἱ οἰκέται...

⁵⁸³ Cf. Gervase Corcoran, *St. Augustine on Slavery* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum; Rome: Patristic Institute Augustinianum, 1985); Pauline Allen and Edward Morgan, “Augustine on Poverty,” in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities* (Pauline Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer (eds); Leipzig: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 2009), 148.

⁵⁸⁴ Youval Rotman, *Byzantine Slavery and the Mediterranean World* (Jane M. Todd (trans.); London: Harvard University Press, 2009), 144–50.

⁵⁸⁵ Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, 90.

⁵⁸⁶ Kate Cooper, *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 236.

⁵⁸⁷ Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, 90–91.

canon 7 of the Council of Sardica (346-347 CE) that gave the bishop power to intervene in cases of widows, orphans, and those that are subject to deportation who were treated violently or unjustly. Nothing of slaves who have suffered the same is present here.⁵⁸⁸ The Council of Carthage (401 CE) is equally ambiguous, and only refers to *manumissio in ecclesia*. It must also be remembered that Chalcedon rejected the asylum offered to slaves, and stipulated that such slaves be returned to their masters. It is only in the late fifth century during the period of Justinian that a shift in policy becomes more or less evident. During this period, the church or monastery received permission to accept slaves who wanted to become clergymen or monks on the condition that they did not commit any crime prior to their flight. But masters still had a claim on these slaves. Their owners could still reclaim slaves who became clerics within a year of their service, and for slaves who became monks the owner had three years to reclaim the slave. What is more, the higooumenos of the monastery could not free slaves; this right was still reserved for the church and state authorities.⁵⁸⁹ Cases of slaves in monasteries and their manumission were therefore still rerouted to the channels of *manumissio in ecclesia*, which still assumed status boundaries between slave and master.⁵⁹⁰ None of these instances above shows a tendency towards a negation of status in the monastery, even when the slave has become part of its community. Finally, Chrysostom himself, in his commentary on the Epistle to Philemon, admonishes runaway slaves, or any slave for that matter, to return or remain with their legal owners (*Hom. Phlm.* Preface).⁵⁹¹

Furthermore, the passage quoted above from Chrysostom does not necessarily signify the absence of non-clerical slaves in the monastery; it simply means that the individual monks in the monastery did not use slaves for their own purposes. It is a fact that the churches and clergymen of late antiquity owned slaves, and there is no reason to doubt that the monastery, which was in itself a staunchly hierarchical entity, also collectively owned slaves. If one reads Chrysostom's discussions of slavery and necessity, especially the section in *Homilia in epistulam ad I Corinthios* 40.5, it is clear that the communal owning of a slave, that is, one slave for two or three masters, was not out of the question. Chrysostom also states that priests are allowed to own

⁵⁸⁸ Rotman, *Byzantine Slavery*, 144.

⁵⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 145.

⁵⁹⁰ Harper, *Slavery in the Late Roman World*, 465–85.

⁵⁹¹ Cf. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, 91; De Wet, "Honour Discourse".

a slave in order to perform those shameful duties, especially related to sewerage-management, cooking, etc (*Hom. Phil.* 9.4; *Inan. glor.* 70). If a priest could own a slave, one slave to a monk or two would not oppose the monastic concept of necessity in Chrysostom's eyes. The notion of the monastery as a household would also support rather than oppose the notion that slave-status was recognized in monasteries.⁵⁹²

The spatiality of the monastery is therefore not a socially neutral zone. The hierarchical dynamics of slave-domesticity were still present. The strong collectivism found in monastic communities allowed for slaves to be owned and used. The issue of slavery and monastic spatiality is not related to the principle of owning slaves, but rather the principle of self-sufficiency. An individual monk living in a monastery would have no need of a slave while he was at the monastery at least, but the community, like the church, would need slaves for their day-to-day operations.

There is then no reason, either from official ecclesiastical documents or from Chrysostom's homilies, to understand the monastery as a socially neutral zone. The principle of Christ not recognizing slave or free as found in Galatians 3:28 was not realized in the most sacred of ecclesiastical spaces - the monastery.

In this section we have examined Chrysostom's main arguments in terms of slave-management. We have used his homilies on the *haustafeln* as a framework, but evidence from other homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews were also considered. We will now summarize Chrysostom's main points on slave-management in a more systematized way while concluding this chapter.

7 CONCLUSION

At the commencement of this chapter the question was asked as to how Chrysostom negotiates and reconstructs the Roman habitus of domestic slaveholding. We have viewed the development of the discourse in order to understand the complex habitus itself. After this, we have examined Chrysostom's own guidelines on how slaves are to be managed as domestic bodies.

⁵⁹² Else M. W. Pedersen, "The Monastery as a Household Within the Universal Household," in *Household, Women, and Christianities in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Anneke B. Mulder-Bakker and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (eds); Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 167–90.

To conclude, we have seen three very important features in Chrysostom's discussions on slave-management. I will present these in this summary and conclusion of Chrysostom's thinking on slave-management as discursive shifts in the traditional Roman understanding of slaveholding. To articulate it differently, with reference to Jennifer Glancy's statement of habituation and slavery above, these discursivities would represent Chrysostom's somatic negotiations with the Roman/Christian habitus of slaveholding.⁵⁹³ He provides a rather complex framework in which the habit of slaveholding is adjusted; the medium by which he does this is preaching. Preaching, as Maxwell has illustrated, was a powerful tool in the Christianization of daily life.⁵⁹⁴

From strategic to tactical slaveholding: One of the most important discursive shifts we have seen with Chrysostom is that he promotes tactical rather than strategic slaveholding. The inference here is that by reducing the number of slaves Christians *ought* to have, as seen with several other late ancient Christian authors, slaveholding becomes reliant on the most clever and optimal utilization of time. Tactical slaveholding has temporality at its core; this was not good news for slaves, since it meant that their tasks would probably become both more intense and more shameful. The reason for this new prompt in Roman slaveholding was the notion that slaves could serve as adornment as well as representing high-status (symbolic capital) and thus, wealth (economic capital). In Chrysostom's potent ascetic theology and ethics, there would be no room for strategic slaveholding, which implies high numbers of slaves for all sorts of tasks, occupying them in many spatial contexts. This shift would have a substantial effect on the role and relational dynamics of the slave within the late ancient Christian household.

From domination to reformation: While the concept of domination occupied a central place in the Roman habitus of slaveholding, especially in formations of masculinity and master, we now find with Chrysostom a shift to a more reformatory impetus. The slave is not simply someone that should be dominated, but the slave also needs to be educated and disciplined in virtue and Christian religious observance. Domination still played an important role in this process. The stereotype of the suffering Christian slave (normally suffering under a non-Christian slaveholder) strategically utilizes the discourse of domination to promote and proliferate passive, feminine virtues - virtues that should also be embodied by some Christians

⁵⁹³ Glancy, "Christian Slavery in Late Antiquity," 70–75.

⁵⁹⁴ Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*, 144–68.

despite a counter-discourse of Christian androcentrism being present. The emphasis, however, is on reformation, and the *pater familias* must now become a *doctor familias* in the psychopedagogical sense. The context of this process of education and discipline is the household. But for Chrysostom the household is also the duplication of the church. The discourse therefore also has an element of pastoral governance in it. The most prominent continuity of pastoral governance between the church and the household is that of surveillance and observance. The household, like the church, therefore becomes in the first instance an observatory. Since the number of slaves has been (ideally) reduced, observation is easier and also becomes more intense. Slaves now need to partake in Christian pedagogy and spiritual exercises. The discipline of the soul, as a corporeal strategy, lies at the center of this discourse. In the second instance, in the light of the previous statement, the household also serves as a reformatory - an institution of technologies of discipline and reform to produce docile, normalized bodies fit for society. Since slaves are considered degenerate, abnormal and prone to violence, they need to be reformed. This reformation carries with it an element of masculinization, since the standards slaves (and women for that matter) are measured by are masculine virtues and modes of behaviour. The common, age-old stereotype of the unruly, degenerate slave is therefore assumed in this discourse. Punishment also plays an important role here. Although Chrysostom recommends punitive violence against slave-bodies under certain circumstances, there is a preferential option for exercises rather than signs; that is, spiritual disciplining rather than corporal punishment. The end of this process is envisioned in *manumissio in ecclesia*. It serves not only as a means by which slaves receive a different social status, namely that of freed persons, but it also serves to judge what is normal. Manumission was of course not the fate of all slaves even if they had been 'rehabilitated'.

Slavery and the making of Christian theology and ethics: We have also seen with Chrysostom, as well as all the other Christian authors of late antiquity, that slavery and its accompanying Stoic-Philonic metaphorical elaborations occupied a central role in the expression of Christian theology and ethics. It was also argued that if institutional slavery, by some miracle, might be removed from the history of late antiquity, Christianity would look dramatically different than it does today. Whether it is Christology or eschatology, the concept of slavery was used to express, explain and formulate these doctrines. Even the monastic developments and the rise of the monastery were not exempt from slaveholding discourses. From an ethical point of

view, slaveholding practices were interwoven with the ethics of marriage and parenting. With the development of the Christian tradition, new guidelines had to be formulated for old problems concerning slavery.