

**MEN AND WOMEN IN THE HOUSE(HOLD) OF GOD.  
CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES ON 1 TIM 2,8-15**

**KORINNA ZAMFIR**

**Abstract.** Chrysostom dedicates two homilies to the discussion of male and female deportment at worship and to gender roles, as described in 1 Tim 2,8-15. The author shares many of the ancient views on social roles, on the hierarchy of marital relations, as well as preconceptions regarding women's alleged weakness, deceiving and gullible nature. Yet, his view is nuanced insofar as he also admits women's major role in the moral education of their children. Education becomes a major focus in the second homily, where men are also demanded to become more engaged in this task. Common ancient double standards on sexual morality are also challenged. The analysis focuses on Chrysostom's exegesis, his patterns of thought, on some difficult textual matters, as well as on the social context of these homilies.

**Keywords:** John Chrysostom, Pastoral Epistles, gender roles, creation and fall, worship, education.

**An undecided provenance**

The homilies on 1 Timothy are among the most difficult to locate and date, with scholars advocating both for the Antiochean and the Constantinopolitan provenance.<sup>1</sup> The arguments for an Antiochean origin, introduced by Monfaucon and Bonsdorff, such as the references to monks in Hom. 14, the impersonal tone apparent in the way he describes the expectations concerning the bishop in Hom. 10, the absence of specific reference to the emperor, have been criticised by A. Nägele. Thus he argues that allusions to monastic life may be found in the Antiochean and

<sup>1</sup> On the *status quaestionis* regarding the provenance of the homilies, including some references to those on the Pastoral Epistles, see W. MAYER, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom: Provenance. Reshaping the foundations* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 273), Rome: Institutum Patristicum Orientalium Studiorum, 2005, 36–273; as well as her abridged discussion of the criteria, “Les Homélie de Jean Chrysostome. Problèmes concernant la provenance, l’ordre et la datation”, *Revue d’Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, 52.2 (2006) 329–353. For the Antiochean origin of the homilies on 1 Tim plead B. de Monfaucon (admitting the utmost difficulty he had establishing the provenance), J. Stilling, H. Lietzmann, M. von Bonsdorff, Ch. Baur, J. Quasten (cf. MAYER, 100, 123, 169, 171, 183–185, 200–201, 204, 206, 208, 225, 229); as well as C. MARRIOT, following Monfaucon, in the introduction to the Oxford-edition (SCHAFF, *NPNF* 13, 401). These homilies are assigned to Constantinople by H. Saville, L.S.L. de Tillemont (though with some hesitation, also suggesting a Syrian origin for Hom. 17), A. Nägele (MAYER, 40, 64, 67, 216–217; A. NÄGELE, “Des Johannes Chrysostomus Homilien zu den Timotheusbriefen des hl. Apostels Paulus und die Zeit ihrer Abfassung”, *ThQ* 116 [1935] 117–142). Although Mayer agrees with Nägele’s criticism of the Antiochean origin, she does not decide upon the provenance of these epistles, leaving the question for a future assessment (*Homilies*, 472, cf. 469).