

MARGARET A. SCHATKIN

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE CHRISTOLOGY
OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

INTRODUCTION

While Chrysostom's greatness is acknowledged in the eastern and western church, his Christological thought has been less well understood or even misunderstood in the West¹. Such may be the case with an article by Camillus Hay (1959), entitled « St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ »². An analysis of Hay's article, examining its theses and influence on subsequent scholars, forms the subject of this essay, whose purpose is to clear the path towards a better understanding of Chrysostom's Christology.

In his article, Hay has in mind Joseph Hermenegild Juzek, whose Dissertation on the Christology of St. John Chrysostom was published in 1912³. It is worthy of note that in the forty-seven years between Juzek and Hay, no other western scholarship seems to have been done on the Christology of St. John Chrysostom. The intent of the present article is to show that Juzek, relying on his nineteenth-century predecessors like

1. For example, J. TURMEL, *Histoire des Dogmes 2 : La Trinité, l'incarnation, la vierge Marie*, Paris, 1932, p. 318, writes that John was a disciple of Diodore and followed him in teaching two persons in Christ.

2. C. HAY, « St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ », *Franciscan Studies* NS 19, 1959, pp. 298-317. Cf. C. HAY, « Antiochene Exegesis and Christology », *Australian Biblical Review* 12, 1964, pp. 10-23.

3. J. H. JUZEK, *Die Christologie des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus : Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Dogmatik der Antiochener*, Breslau, 1912, as cited by C. HAY, « St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ », p. 298 n. 1. The printed dissertation is only partial, but the complete dissertation was presented to the faculty and may have

Dorner, Förster, and Kihn⁴, remains the basic study, to which, in order to avoid the errors introduced by Hay and scholars relying upon him, we must return.

In response to Juzek, Hay put forth five theses, which are given below in his own words :

i. « Nowhere in his writings does Chrysostom give any indication that Christ possessed a distinct human knowledge » (Hay, p. 305).

ii. « Chrysostom does not affirm the existence of two wills in Christ in this passage... » (p. 307). « Chrysostom nowhere affirms the presence of a human will in Christ » (p. 309).

iii. « St. John Chrysostom nowhere attributes a human intellectual or volitional activity to Christ » (p. 309).

iv. « Chrysostom never speaks of the human activity of Christ as that of a distinct human nature acting simply because it is human » (p. 311).

v. John « nowhere affirms that Christ's *human* will played a meritorious part in the accomplishment of the Passion » (p. 307).

These striking theses, which Hays directed against Juzek but stand in their own right, must be scrutinized to see whether they do justice to Chrysostom's doctrine of Christ.

JOSEPH HERMENEGILD JUZEK AND LEO CAMILLUS HAY

Joseph Hermenegild Juzek was born April 13, 1895 in Belschnitz, Kreis Ratibor, son of a landowner, Jakob Juzek and his now deceased wife Marianne, née Wyslucha. He attended the elementary school in his native village and in Groß Gorschütz until 1887, then the Gymnasia in Ratibor and Mysłowitz. He studied Theology in Breslau and after completion of his course work and attending the seminary, he was ordained in October 1910, appointed as curate of St. Barbara in Königshütte, Upper Silesia, to assume administration of the independent castle church in Costau (a sinecure ?). This enabled him to continue his studies,

survived somewhere in the Breslau archives, but it would have had to survive two wars, including the notorious and highly destructive Siege of Breslau in 1945 and the floods of 1997. He dedicated the printed dissertation to his uncle, an Archpriest Juzek, no Christian name given.

4. J. A. DORNER, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2 Bde, Berlin 1845-53²; Th. FÖRSTER, *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Schule*, Gotha, 1869; H. KIHN, *Die Bedeutung der antiochenischen Schule*, Weissenburg, 1866.