Iluk begins with a brief historical introduction, discussing the riot of the Antiochene populace in 387. Thoroughly based on the fundamental scholarly literature dealing with this topic, written by researchers in Polish and in other languages alike, it provides the reader with an outline of the well-known historical facts connected with the riot along with a discussion of its chronology, which is followed by a short presentation of Chrysostom’s orations from the series On the Statues. Iluk duly emphasises that the primary intention of these homilies, aside from their numerous and detailed references to the revolt, was to offer the listeners catechetical instruction for Lent. In keeping with the results of modern-day commentators, he also contends that in his homilies John Chrysostom supported the bishop Flavian, to whom he unequivocally gave credit for having saved the city from the emperor’s ire. The introduction also includes an extraordinarily useful tool: a chronological chart indicating the precise dates when the individual homilies were delivered together with an outline of the key questions discussed in these sermons.

The Polish translation provides the reader with the twenty-one homilies as originally printed in the Patrologia Graeca (PG, vol. XLIX, col. 15–222) in the order established by F. van de Paverd3. Iluk believes that the collection of the homilies in status – as sermons for Lent – should also include the two baptismal catecheses (Catecheses II ad Illuminandos, PG, vol. XLIX, col. 231–240) which he nevertheless decided to leave out as they had been previously translated into Polish and published by Wojciech Kania4. Moreover, Iluk would expand the

---


collection in statuis even further and include into it two more sermons (De decem milium talentorum debito, PG, vol. LI, col. 17–30 and In Psalmum 145, PG, vol. LV, col. 519–528)5, as A. Valievicius has fairly recently proposed, but nor do these appear in his volume as they contain no references whatsoever to the riot of 387.

This Polish translation is not a bilingual edition and does not offer the Greek original on facing pages, but it has to be noted that Greek terms and passages are profusely quoted in the footnotes. A lion’s share of the footnotes (946 in total) offers descriptions of rhetorical figures (over thirty types used throughout the text), which are also given in the original Greek. Numerous footnotes contain references to biblical motives and passages employed by Chrysostom in the homilies. It is worth mentioning that fragments of the homilies from the De statuis series are preserved in the eleventh-century compilation by the Byzantine rhetor and hagiographer Theodore Daphnopates. In the footnotes to his translation, Iluk makes references to the specific passages of Theodoret’s text. Last but not least, the footnotes also include the first Polish translation of the passages from the orations of Libanius which, like the homilies in statuis, directly refer to the Antiochene rebellion of 387. This is a remarkably useful feature, especially from the point of view of historians, as it allows them to compare with ease the descriptions of the events seen by these two authors.

Translating rhetorical texts from Greek is always a daunting task for any translator. The Polish translation is truly as beautifully written as it is precise. There are only a few debatable points, all of them of a fairly minor character. For instance, it is questionable whether the archon referred to by Chrysostom in the title and opening passages of Oration 16 was the Prefect of the East (i.e. praefectus pretorio per Orientem), as Iluk has it, or the governor of the Oriens diocese (comes Orientis), or perhaps the governor of the Syria Coele province (consularis Syriae)6. It seems to me that Chrysostom referred to one of the last two of those magistrates. However, given that the nomenclature of Roman officialdom appearing in ancient rhetorical texts was never, to put it mildly, precise or consistent, these references give us much leeway with regard to their interpretation7.

---

6 Given that the term archon (or hegemon) was used to denote a state official – most probably, however, with reference to governors of provinces or dioceses as opposed to the prefect, commonly referred to as eparchos (e.g. H.J. Mason, Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis, Toronto 1974 [= ASPa, 13], passim, e.g. p. X, 40, 52, 136, 138–139) – it seems more plausible that the magistrate implied in this particular instance was either the governor of the diocese or of the province. It is possible that one of these two started the crackdown on the rebellion by deploying a unit of archers under his command and that for this reason he must have been present in the city (cf. P. Pett, Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IVe siècle après J.-C., Paris 1955 [= IFAB.BAH, 62], p. 241, an. 3: the governor [of the province?]; G. Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest, Princeton 1961, p. 429 [the comes of the East]; contra – R. Browning, The Riot of AD 387 in Antioch: The Role of the Theatre Clauses in the Later Empire, JRS 42, 1952, p. 15, an. 42 [local police force]; J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, Antioch. City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire, Oxford 1972, p. 124 [nýkteparchoi]).
7 The office of provincial governor in 387 was held by Celsus (cf. PLRE I, p. 194, s.v. Celsus 5; P. Pett, Les fonctionnaires dans l’œuvre de Libanius. Analyse prosopographique, introd. A. Chastagnol, Paris 1994 [= CRHA, 134], p. 66) believed it was Celsus who quelled the riot; he also contends that Celsus was a paga
8 The office of provincial governor in 387 was held by Celsus (cf. PLRE I, p. 194, s.v. Celsus 5; P. Pett, Les fonctionnaires dans l’œuvre de Libanius. Analyse prosopographique, introd. A. Chastagnol, Paris 1994 [= CRHA, 134], p. 66) believed it was Celsus who quelled the riot; he also contends that Celsus was a pagan and that it was to him that Chrysostom referred in Oration 16. This is certainly debatable; earlier studies indicated that the rebellion had been suppressed by the governor of the diocese (cf. O. Seck, Die Briefe des Libanius. Zeitlich geordnet, Leipzig 1906 [= TUGAL, 30.1–2], p. 107; G. Sievers, Das Leben des Libanius, Berlin–Leipzig 1868, p. 175). In any case, the presence of the Prefect of the East himself is the least probable option; that office was held from 384 to 388 by Maternus Cyngnus (cf. e.g. PLRE I, p. 235–236, s.v. Maternus Cyngnus 3).
9 For instance: John Chrysostom, Homilies on the Statues..., p. 445: the Prefect entering the Church, I commend the Prefect’s consideration, with the suggestion that this may have implied the praefectus pretorio per Orientem; Saint Jean Chrysostome, Homélies sur les Statues..., p. 80: Je loue la prudence du gouverneur, with the suggestion that le gouverneur de la ville is implied; ИОАНН ЗЛАТОУСТ, Беседы...,
To conclude, this volume by Jan Iluk containing his excellent Polish translation of this collection of Chrysostom’s homilies is immensely important for the study of the history of Antioch in Syria in its multifarious aspects: aside from those of political and social nature, it is highly informative not only with regard to Chrysostom’s social, theological and political thought (or, more broadly, to that of other patristic writers), but also to the history of the Antiochene Church at large and, most notably, the Antiochene patriarchate.
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