

'IF A STORY CAN SO MASTER THE CHILDREN'S SOUL': CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURAL PEDAGOGY, ORALITY AND POWER IN THE WRITINGS OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

'If a story can so master the children's soul'

Chris L. de Wet
University of South Africa
chrisldw@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to give account of the dynamics between Christian scriptural pedagogy, orality and power in the writings of John Chrysostom. The study firstly examines Chrysostom's views on the discourse of reading scripture, with reference to his *In Acta apostolorum homilia* 19. Thereafter, the study investigates the practical application of this discourse in the household ritual of reading scripture, here with reference to Chrysostom's *In Genesim sermo* 6. Finally, on an even higher level of abstraction, the study looks at scriptural pedagogy in the education of children as seen in Chrysostom's *De inani gloria*.

Keywords:

CHRYSOSTOM, ORALITY AND THE CORPOREAL EXHIBITIONISM OF SCRIPTURE

In the year 399 C.E., John Chrysostom, the bishop of Constantinople, found himself in a difficult political predicament when Eutropius, the disgraced ex-chamberlain of the emperor Arcadius, sought asylum in his church. Eutropius was eventually captured and exiled after Chrysostom pleaded for his life, although Eutropius was executed a few months later (Kelly 1998: 145–151). After this event, Chrysostom preached a homily starting with the following words (*Hom. Capt. Eutrop.* 1 [NPNF]):1

Delectable indeed are the meadow, and the garden, but far more delectable the study of the divine writings. For there indeed are flowers which fade, but here are thoughts which abide in full bloom; there is the breeze of the zephyr, but here the breath of the Spirit: there is the hedge of thorns, but here is the guarding providence of God; there is the song of cicadae, but here the melody of the prophets: there is the pleasure which comes from sight, but here the profit

which comes from study. The garden is confined to one place, but the Scriptures are in all parts of the world; the garden is subject to the necessities of the seasons, but the Scriptures are rich in foliage, and laden with fruit alike in winter and in summer. Let us then give diligent heed to the study of the Scriptures: for if you do this the Scripture will expel your despondency, and engender pleasure, extirpate vice, and make virtue take root, and in the tumult of life it will save you from suffering like those who are tossed by troubled waves. The sea rages but you sail on with calm weather; for you have the study of the Scriptures for your pilot; for this is the cable which the trials of life do not break asunder.²

This impressive prologue to the homily, with its seamless parallelisms, demonstrates the centrality of scripture in Chrysostom's thinking. After this introduction, he continues to argue that the reason for the success in sparing the life of Eutropius is directly related to the potency of scripture as the 'law of the church'. In Chrysostom's mind, scripture does not only have the ability to contribute to spiritual growth, but it also has the ability, as a socio-judicial apparatus of power, to solve critical social and political issues. The citation above illustrates the potential of scripture as an evergreen garden, a metaphor that stresses the spiritual fertility of scripture – its capacity and potential for social reproduction. The second nautical metaphor above shows the disciplinary nature of scripture as a captain or helmsman of virtue and emotion – here its capacity for the regulation and modification of behaviour. The study and utilization of scripture in everyday life is central to Christian discipline in late antiquity. The study of the written word, including the Bible but also other texts, especially hagiographical texts, was considered a prime religious activity. Derek Krueger, in his *Writing and holiness: The practice of authorship in the Early Christian East* (2004), has illustrated how central the act of text production and literacy was in the making of socio-theological discourse in the East, and in almost all instances the hagiographical prose and poetry was based on biblical narratives and biblical *vitae* (cf. Rapp 2007: 194–224). We therefore find a society that was shaped to a large extent by textual data found in scripture (cf. Cameron 1994; Young 2002). Krueger's study, however, is simply focused on writers in the late ancient East, in other words, the literate. But we know that levels of literacy, the ability to read *and* write, were in fact rather low in antiquity (Harris 1991). While literacy in itself is a very complex concept, Botha (Botha 2012: xiii) has shown that even written forms of communication, texts, were very 'oral': 'Cultural-anthropological characteristics of speech (oral, non-written communication) and the social effects of illiteracy permeate their written communication.' Ancient literates were themselves 'illiterate' in the sense noted by Botha. Moreover, some scholars of the Roman world prefer to speak of 'literacies' in Greece (Thomas 1992; Thomas 2009: 13–45) and Rome (Woolf 2009: 46–68), showing the immense complexity of the issue. Even when examining the early Christian book with its highly illustrative nature we see the prominence of visual (and I would also argue, oral) argument framing the texts. Since we are dealing with late ancient society as an oral society, how did the study of scripture, what could be termed a literacy practice (Botha 2012: 11), as a dynamic of power, operate in such a society?³

In other words, how was the study of scripture as a power strategy orally practised, and what were the implications for the body politic, the social and individual body? For the purpose of this paper, I will focus on the issue of scriptural pedagogy, orality and power only in some writings of Chrysostom. Whereas moderns in our print and media culture are quite accustomed to opening and reading the Bible if we wish to study it, the practice in antiquity was quite different. I will therefore examine instances in Chrysostom's writings in which the orality of scriptural pedagogy and its consequent power dynamics become clear.

I am especially interested in how the orality of scriptural pedagogy was practised in everyday life in the community Chrysostom serves, and how the dynamics of power operate in this practice. Thus, rather than simply speaking of scripture, it is perhaps more appropriate to use the term coined by Michel de Certeau, namely 'scriptural economy'. I will utilize De Certeau's understanding of the dynamics of orality and the scriptural economy in this study since it relates orality to the practices of everyday life, what we could term the ephemerality of oral practices. Here I will highlight two important discursivities delineated by De Certeau that may prove helpful in approaching this issue in the writings of Chrysostom. Firstly, in the interplay between orality and textuality, there is a disciplinary process of reproduction and diffusion present (De Certeau 1984: 132). In modern print and media culture voices are 'recorded' and 'edited' in studios by professionals, but the biblical texts went through their own process of reproduction and diffusion in late antiquity. Unlike the case of modern instances of preaching, biblical texts are not simply quoted in these ancient homilies, but they are 'voiced'. For instance, Mitchell (2002: 35–37) has shown that Chrysostom does not merely quote Paul, but in well-devised ekphrases, he in fact makes Paul 'speak'. It implies that the words of Paul are filtered through the hermeneutico-disciplinary lens of Chrysostom. In this manner the re-voicing of scripture is assimilated into 'the network – an endless tapestry – of a scriptural economy' (De Certeau 1984: 132). The myriad scriptural voices are re-recorded and re-voiced into a new, political and orthodox scriptural symphony. Dissonant voices, scriptural contradictions, are cleaned up, filtered and assimilated into this scriptural economy. These voices of old become politically re-embodied. In the very act that is preaching, these biblical bodies receive new voices and new sounds, they receive cries, tears and laughter. Thus, I am arguing that when an author such as Chrysostom cites scripture in a homiletic context especially, he in fact cites not words, not even voices, but bodies. I therefore understand orality (and its relation to scriptural pedagogy), generally in late antiquity and specifically in Chrysostom, as a reproductive corporeal exhibitionism. Is it not ironic that we speak of a body or 'corpus' of texts? Both Nancy and MacKendrick stress the discursive capability of body and language/text in the formation and reproduction of subjectivities, and Nancy (1994: 195; cf. MacKendrick 2004: 162) muses thus on 'corpus':

Body is the total signifier, for everything has a body, or everything is a body ... and *body* is the last signifier, the limit of the signifier, if what it says or would like to say – what it would like

to have said – is nothing other than the interlacing, the mixing of bodies with bodies, mixing everywhere, and everywhere manifesting this other absence of name, named ‘God,’ everywhere producing and reproducing and everywhere absorbing the sense of sense and of all the senses, infinitely mixing the impenetrable with the impenetrable.

This elaboration on corpus by Nancy brings me to the following point. Secondly, De Certeau’s emphasis on the body as a site of inscription is particularly important. The body becomes part of the panoply of instruments for writing, apparatuses for literacy practices, especially when there is an element of scripture and writing as *law* (De Certeau 1984: 139):

What is at stake is the relation between the law and the body [political, social and/or individual] – a body is itself defined, delimited, and articulated by what writes it. There is no law that is not inscribed on the body. Every law has a hold on the body From birth to mourning after death, law “takes hold of” bodies in order to make them its texts.

The investigation of the orality of scriptural pedagogy in late ancient everyday life is therefore also the study of a subtle yet complex somatography. Authors such as Foucault⁴ and De Certeau were cognisant of these bodily practices, especially institutions such as hospitals, schools, courtrooms and prisons, but I will focus in this paper on such somatographies related to scriptural pedagogy evident in household rituals and also in the education of children (in the household).

We therefore see two discursively linked processes within the dynamics of orality and scriptural pedagogy. First, we have the reproduction and re-assimilation of dissonant and often strange scriptural voices into a new complex network that is the scriptural economy. The ancient biblical voices seem to receive new revamped bodies, orthodox bodies with orthodox voices, an exhibitionism of bodily citations. Second, we see that this new scriptural economy writes itself on bodies within their everyday lives.

In the next part of this paper I will look at the nature of scriptural pedagogy and orality in Chrysostomic thinking, and thereafter delineate two practical examples of oral scriptural pedagogy in the everyday domestic lives of Christians in Chrysostom’s context. Thus, the agenda for this investigation entails the following: firstly, I will examine Chrysostom’s own view of the dynamics and capabilities of scriptural pedagogy by specifically looking at his interpretation of the encounter between the apostle Philip and Ethiopian eunuch (*Hom. Ac.* 19; cf. Acts 8:26–40); secondly, I will investigate the role and practice of scriptural pedagogy in the household rituals of Chrysostom’s audience, focusing on his *In Genesim sermo* 6; thirdly, I will give special attention to the role of scriptural pedagogy in the education of children with an emphasis on Chrysostom’s homily, *De inani gloria*. It is important to note here that just because Chrysostom admonishes Christians to do what he advises them to do, it does not mean that they did it. It does, however, imply the possibility of his admonitions and how oral scriptural pedagogy *could* have taken place. In the course of the discussions we will

also look at how the operation of this authoritative scriptural economy may have been negotiated and resisted by the very bodies it aims to write itself upon.

CHRYSOSTOM ON SCRIPTURAL PEDAGOGY: THE CASE OF THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH (IN ACTA APOSTOLORUM HOMILIA 19)

The issue of scriptural pedagogy is very common in most of Chrysostom's homilies since the homilies themselves, especially the exegetical homilies, are instances, or literacy practices and products, of scriptural pedagogy. Often when reflecting on Chrysostom's bibliology scholars tend to focus on Chrysostom as an exegete of the Antiochene School, a network of Christian leaders mostly situated in Asia Minor who approach scripture with a unique emphasis on the history, social context and rhetoric of the text (Schor 2007: 517–562). They are described often in contrast to the older Alexandrine School of exegetes who were more concerned with the allegorical interpretation of scripture. Antiochenes, like Chrysostom, did have their own level of allegory on which they interpreted scripture – this was called *θεωρία* (as opposed to *ἀλληγορία*; cf. Froehlich 1984: 19–23).

Much has been said on the exegetical approach of Chrysostom. In this section I am neither interested in how Chrysostom reads scripture, nor how he wants his audience to read scripture. I am interested in the discursive effect of reading itself, that is, the discourse of reading scripture in Chrysostom. I will focus here on his interpretation of the narrative of the Ethiopian eunuch (cf. Acts 8: 26–40). It is the perfect example, since we have the act of reading and the act of scriptural pedagogy wrapped in a compact yet strange narrative. What does Chrysostom have to say about this narrative, and what does it say about the Chrysostomic discourse of reading and scriptural pedagogy? My focus will remain on the corporeality and somatography of oral scriptural pedagogy.

Chrysostom admires the Ethiopian eunuch, and mentions an important psychic technology that must be present in the act of reading and studying scripture, the combination of earnestness (*σπουδή*) and yearning (*πόθος*) (cf. *Hom. Ac.* 19.2 [MPG 60.151.31–32]) – these function as injections of excess psychic power into the highly somatic art of reading. Reading must therefore spring from psychic desire and psychic drive, both technologies of somatic empowerment. Above I called the act of reading a highly somatic art, a statement that requires some clarification. Reading in antiquity was a physical event, especially when one read a scroll, which was heavy and one required two hands to handle it. In the time of Chrysostom the codex, an artefact less strenuous on the body itself, by and large replaced the scroll. Botha (2009: 19) makes a crucial observation in this regard: 'I consider this shift to the codex among Christians as indicative of a distinct attitude towards writing and books: a different way of reading, studying and invoking tradition. The codex facilitates proof-texting, and is well-suited to eclectic and selective consultation of writing.' Moreover, reading was in most instances a public and oral act – one read books aloud in public or at least in

groups of people. Here we see again the corporeal exhibitionism in scriptural pedagogy – it not only displays the newly reproduced bodies of the characters in the text, but also puts the reader himself or herself on display. In the act of reading, one puts one's body on display and therefore one also puts one's body on the line and opens it to risk. Hence the Chrysostomic requirement of this scriptural zealotic, the psychic power excesses of seriousness and desire that fuel and energize reading bodies. Despite lacking understanding, the Ethiopian eunuch possessed this prerequisite for successful spiritual pedagogy. Moreover, while earnestness and desire are prerequisites for scriptural pedagogy, the outward bodily appearance (σχῆμα, Latin: *habitus*) is of no consequence (*Hom. Act.* 19.2). In the context of the narrative, it probably relates to the ethnicity and status of the Ethiopian eunuch. But it also serves as a strategy in Chrysostom to democratize scriptural pedagogy. Some scholars, such as Cavallo (1999: 64–89), assert that the rise of the Christian codex 'displace[d] the aristocracy and its bookrolls in favour of the middle classes and their codices' (Botha 2009: 19). This seems to be the case for Chrysostom's audience, one that was comprised mostly of the middle classes. The question of Chrysostom's audience has been widely debated. Some like MacMullen (1989: 503–511) have argued that Chrysostom's audience only comprised individuals from the upper echelons of society. MacMullen bases this view mainly on the literacy of Chrysostom's audience and their ability to understand his sophisticated rhetoric, as well as the constant mentioning of the rich in the homilies. Mayer (2000: 73–87) has challenged this view convincingly in my opinion. She argues that Chrysostom's audience was probably representative of the wider Christian community. The constant mention of the wealthy should not be seen as a pointer to their numerical dominance but rather to their social influence and prominence. If Cavallo is correct in his statement about codices among the middle classes, it would support the view of Chrysostom's audience as one in which many would have at least had access to codices, both for their educational and possibly apotropaic value. This brings me to the next point.

Since scriptural pedagogy requires an installation of excessive power in the form of the zealotic, and is not concerned with outward bodily appearance, most likely relating to aspects of ethnicity, gender and status, it becomes a very useful apparatus for self-fashioning, a very important practice in antiquity. Scriptural pedagogy, and reading in particular, serves the purpose of subject-formation in a very corporeal sense. This is already evident in the narrative of the Ethiopian eunuch. After reading, he requests to be baptized (*Acts* 8: 36–39), a highly corporeal ritual – a direct example of how the scriptural economy writes itself on the body and thus on the subject. This stems from the interaction between the reader(s)/listeners and the text and, in some cases, the activity of a mediator (in this case, Philip). Chrysostom understands scriptural pedagogy to be an oral dialectic. We have said that reading was done aloud and often in groups, and in his discussion of the actions of the Ethiopian eunuch he constantly speaks of the eunuch as someone in conversation with the prophet Isaiah, and then eventually with Philip (*Hom. Act.* 19.2). For Chrysostom, reading should lead to baptism, a milestone in Christian self-

fashioning. Scriptural pedagogy and baptism are almost synonymous to Chrysostom. He uses the character of the Ethiopian eunuch to shame his audience, specifically those who are not baptized. The Greek text reads: Ἀισχύνθητε ὅσοι ἀφώτιστοι τυγχάνετε, that is, 'Be ashamed, all of you who are unbaptized' (or literally, '... you who have not reached enlightenment/instructedness') (*Hom. Act.* 19.2 [MPG 60.151]). Catechumens are called ἀφώτιστοι or *illuminandi*, those who are in the process of being enlightened and near baptism. The words signify bodies in darkness, bodies not yet enlightened by scriptural pedagogy. Scriptural pedagogy and baptism are correlates in this instance. The issue of baptism as a somatography is quite overt, but there are also more subtle nuances of self-fashioning related to scriptural pedagogy for Chrysostom. Simply possessing a book in itself can be described as a practice of self-fashioning. Lowden's (2007: 13–47) study on the visual argument of books is quite important here. A book, especially in the context of late antiquity, makes a statement by means of its codicological iconography, especially when books were lined with gold and silver or beautiful leather bindings. The book itself had an aura. Kotsifou (2007: 48–68) also shows how bookmaking by monks was considered a spiritual endeavour. It was both a sign of spiritual and in some cases financial status. The illustrations were discourses in themselves, and as we will read soon in this homily of Chrysostom, books *speak*. Owning and reading a book may have been seen as a high spiritual exercise within Christian communities. Furthermore, the matter is complicated by the fact that an ancient codex almost never contained the entire corpus of scripture. The different books of the canon were divided, and within these books chapter divisions and headings were rare, making the written word somewhat inaccessible and not very user-friendly, hence I repeat my statement that reading was a highly corporeal practice, a type of *askesis*.⁵ So when Chrysostom urges his audience to read more, there are several factors at play. Obviously there is the matter of studying and learning the principles within scripture from words and illustrations, which was important. But reading was part of the set of Christian disciplines in controlling the body and the passions, not unlike fasting, it had a toll on the body. It was also a type of tattoo on the Christian body, a marker of a certain status, like baptism. Chrysostom is upset with his audience because they do not make use of the books (βιβλία) (*Hom. Act.* 19.4–5).

Chrysostom is not so much bothered by people not understanding what they read, but more by people not wanting to understand, people who lack the necessary zealous installation of power, who lack desire and a serious disposition towards scriptural pedagogy. These are people who are not willing to listen when scripture *speaks* to them. He assumes that people have adequate access to books, which seems to have been the case. For Chrysostom scripture speaks on its own but also via sacerdotal mediators, yet he believes his audience ignores scriptural voices (*Hom. Act.* 19.5 [NPNF]):

Say, what are the Scriptures for? For as much as in you lies, it is all undone. What is the Church for? Tie up the Bibles [literally, 'books']: perhaps the judgment would not be such, not such the punishment: if one were to bury them in dung, that he might not hear them, he would not so

insult them as you do now. For say, what is the insult there? That the man has buried them. And what here? That we do not hear them. Say, when is a person most insulted – when he is silent, and one makes no answer, or, when he does speak (and is unheeded)? So that the insult is greater in the present case, when He does speak and you will not hear: greater the contempt. “Speak not to us” [Isaiah 30:10], we read, they said of old to the prophets: but you do worse, saying, Speak: we will not do. For there they turned them away that they should not even speak, as feeling that from the voice itself they got some sort of awe and obligation; whereas you, in the excess of your contempt, do not even this. Believe me, if you stopped our mouths by putting your hands over them, the insult would not be so great as it is now.⁶

We see in this section the very oral nature of Chrysostom’s scriptural pedagogical dialectic. Lack of reading becomes lack of discipline, and as with all matters of discipline, it is because those psychic technologies meant to govern the body are absent. We see in this text how scriptural authority is problematized. Chrysostom assumes the inerrancy of scripture, and therefore the scriptural voice is also an authoritative voice. But the authority of this voice is not recognized among his congregants. Chrysostom contrasts them with the ancient Israelites, who did not want to listen to the prophetic voice, but still acknowledged the awe of the voice. His congregants have heard, but still they are defiant. The very orality of the text also stands as the damnation of those who hear but do not heed. It is not enough to simply read, one requires the transformative knowledge. This is especially the point raised by Chrysostom in a different homily where he also discusses the Ethiopian eunuch (cf. *Contr. Marc.* 1). The eunuch required an apostolic mediator to explain the text. The dialectic between the scriptural voice and the reader needs to be catalyzed by an authorized mediator so that understanding may be reached (Clark 1999: 61).

In this section I aimed to delineate those elements that make up the discourse of reading in Chrysostomic thought. Of course, the universality of these discursive elements would need to be tested by means of comparison with other authors and contexts. I have extrapolated three such elements: firstly, I asserted that reading (and thus, scriptural pedagogy) was a highly somatic art especially because of its oral character. Reading takes hold of the body, and it mixes the body of the reader with those scriptural bodies that aim to replicate and reproduce themselves onto the reading body – this all being part of the dynamics of an authoritative scriptural economy. Because reading is a somatic art, it requires discipline and thus various psychic technologies of control and corporeal energization – the zealotic – must be present. For Chrysostom, these were earnestness and a desire to learn. Secondly, reading and scriptural pedagogy were part of the practice of self-fashioning and formation of Christian identity. The site for this is of course also the body and, as mentioned above, reading acts like a type of spiritual discipline that shapes the Christian body, an informal yet relational *askesis*. Finally, there is an oral dialectic present in the act of reading. Scripture *speaks*, and the reader must listen and act. It speaks by means of scriptural voices, but these scriptural voices, as we mentioned earlier, are part of the re-recorded and diffused matter of the scriptural economy. They

always speak through mediatory filters, the exegetes, scribes, preachers and teachers.

I will now proceed to look at how these acts of reading are replicated and resisted in the everyday life of Christians in Chrysostom's time. I will limit my discussions to the reading of scripture as a household ritual and to the use of scriptural pedagogy in the education of children with special reference to Chrysostom's *De inani gloria*.

SCRIPTURAL PEDAGOGY AND HOUSEHOLD RITUAL (IN GENESIM SERMO 6)

Chrysostom famously urges his congregants to turn their houses into churches (*Hom. Eph.* 20.2). He therefore aimed at establishing certain household rituals that will resemble the ecclesiastical life (Leyerle 2012). Among the many rituals, Chrysostom, and other Christian leaders of antiquity would prescribe,⁷ the reading of scripture stood out as one of the fundamental practices of a Christian house and church. While it is noted that scripture plays a role in most Christian rituals, especially the singing of spiritual songs (notably the psalms), prayers and the poor-box, this section will specifically look at scriptural pedagogy as the *reading* (or at least, narrative retelling) of scripture.

It would be erroneous to assume that scriptural pedagogy dominated the lives of people calling themselves Christians in late ancient society. This was already evident in Chrysostom's complaint that people do not read or understand scripture (cf. *Hom. Act.* 19.4–5). Sandwell (2007: 63–90) has shown that Chrysostom views religious identity, and thereby religious practice, in a very rigorist way, more than the average person in ancient society. We must understand that Chrysostom is the business of religion. On a grass-roots level the matter was somewhat more pervasive. Scriptural pedagogy was rather embedded in the encompassing habitus of religious identity (Sandwell 2007: 1–33). The household was especially the space where religious identity and worship could be expressed, and Chrysostom knew that effective social identity change takes place first and foremost in the household. Leyerle (2012)⁸ has convincingly illustrated that the metaphor and spatiality of the household becomes a mirror for the church-space, and Chrysostom especially draws parallels between the table, the bed and the chest (cf. *Hom. Matt.* 32.5–7). For Chrysostom, the household should be a duplication and extension of the church (*Serm. Gen.* 6; Hill 2004: 105–106):

Let us take all this to heart, then, dearly beloved, and on returning home let us serve a double meal, one of food and the other of sacred reading; while the husband reads what has been said, let the wife learn and the children listen, and let not even the servants be deprived of the chance to listen. Turn your house into a church; you are, in fact, even responsible for the salvation both of the children and of the servants. Just as we are accountable for you, so too each of you is accountable for your servant, your wife, your child. In the wake of such stories sweet dreams will befall you, rid of every nightmare; all that the soul is in the habit of pondering on during the day becomes the stuff of our dreams in sleep. If we keep hold of what is said each day, we shall not need effort: the sermon afterwards will be clearer and the teaching on our part more enthusiastic.⁹

This curious passage merits some comment. We see here the event of pastoral governmentality duplicating itself onto the household. I am of the opinion that this has a disciplinary impetus – pastoralism duplicates itself from its inherent excess of power, and while the house becomes a church, the husband becomes the priest and the family his audience. It becomes a very subtle and pervasive ecclesiastical strategy to extend its control over bodies in the household and everyday life. From Chrysostom's constant complaining in the sermons, it does seem that there was some resistance to this and that what we have here above is more of an ideal than a norm. But the practice should not be disregarded either. It should be remembered, as Bowes (2008) has shown, that household religious ritual was a very important aspect of late ancient daily life. Furthermore, there was a formal and even juridical dimension to household ritual. In 392 C.E. we have some legislation from the emperors Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius that concerns household religious ritual (*Cod. Th.* 16.10.2; Comby 1985: 73):

But if any person should venerate, by placing incense before them, images made by the work of mortals ... or should bind a tree with fillets, or should erect an altar of turf that he has dug up ... this is a complete outrage against religion. Such person, as one guilty of the violation of religion, shall be punished by forfeiture of that house or landholding in which it is proved that he served a pagan superstition.

We see here the concern from the authorities on what happens in one's house, and also the juridical risk involved in performing illicit rituals. While it is uncertain to what extent these types of laws were enforced, it is clear that this sort of juridical rhetoric caused some anxiety among non-Christians. Libanius, for instance, refers to a friend of his, Modestus, who could only in secret confess the gods he admired during the reign of Constantius (*Ep.* B 74.5 (F 804); cf. Sandwell 2007: 3). There seems then to be not only a duplication of ecclesiastical power in the household rituals, but also a substitution of the oral power of confession to non-Christian deities.

To return to the Chrysostomic citation above, we also see that scriptural pedagogy is performed by the male head of the household, another inference of the duplication of ecclesiastical power. This was not a uniform practice in antiquity. Bowes (2008: 189–190) notes that more often than not women ran their own Bible study groups. This, however, is not the case with Chrysostom, who prefers a more androcentric scriptural pedagogy. Of course, when there were no men in the house, women had to take the lead. Women could, after all, also be a *pater familias* (Saller 1999: 182–197). For Chrysostom, however, it is still the male voice that dominates and mediates the scriptural voice in this new transferred and duplicated scriptural economy. It is clear that Chrysostom is referring here to a middle to upper class household, one that has a traditional family structure, and one that contains slaves. The father becomes responsible for the bodies of the other members of the household. Slaves are included in this ritual of reading after church. Slaves are to be taught virtue through scriptural pedagogy (De Wet 2013: 281–318). The inclusion of slaves here should not necessarily be seen as ameliorative. It

is rather symbolic of a power of discipline and normalization that sprouts from pastoral governmentality, is mediated via the father or husband, and applied to the bodies of women, children and slaves. The duplicative dynamic also seems to extend to the family of the slave, where the slave-husband now also assumes responsibility for his wife and children (*Hom. Eph. 22.2*). In this manner the power of oral scriptural pedagogy permeates every level of ecclesiastical and domestic activity, and it becomes embedded in the daily life of the Christian household. While it did not exactly operate in the way Chrysostom may have desired in all households, this oral scriptural pedagogy serves as a regulatory technology in a duplicated scriptural economy. It also illustrates the extent of influence the network of the scriptural economy reaches.

Finally, he also fully acknowledges the psychological power of reading. He states that scriptural pedagogy has a positive effect on the emotions, especially relating to dreams. This has been affirmed by cognitive psychological studies (Rayner and Pollatsek 1989). Reading scripture is therefore not only important in the control of knowledge and emotion, but also, as a correlate of self-fashioning, the source of good dreams. Dreams were important in the construction of Christian culture – dreams, after all, are also *read* in the ancient world. Miller (1997: 140) highlights an instance in the *Shepherd of Hermas* where Hermas dreams about an old woman reading to him from a little book; he then needs to go and copy it, and does so with some difficulty. Miller (1997: 140) is correct in noting that literacy becomes Hermas's therapy and salvation. In a similar vein, Chrysostom seems to insinuate that the event of reading, as salvific therapy, fashions the Christian psyche on all levels, including the world and culture of dreams. By Christianizing dreams, one also Christianizes culture.

We have seen here that oral scriptural pedagogy in household rituals served as a power strategy in the encompassing duplication of pastoral governmentality within the household. Households were not always very receptive to adopting such practices, but the prominence of household worship in both the social and juridical rhetoric of late antiquity does indicate that household religious practice did need to express itself as religious and pious organisms, especially for the sake of social honour and safety. Christian rituals such as the reading of scripture serve as both duplicative and substitutive practices. In Chrysostom's view, the practice should be androcentric, although we also know that this was not the norm. All members of the household, including slaves, needed to be part of the scriptural pedagogical ritual, especially the one surrounding the table. There existed then a subtle exchange and negotiation in ritual practice in late ancient households in Chrysostom's time and place. But flowing through and from all these negotiations, exchanges and resistances is the power of ecclesiastical governmentality that aims to control, regulate and fashion Christian bodies in society.

I will now look at this process more closely in the practice of scriptural pedagogy in the education of children in John Chrysostom's *De inani gloria*.

SCRIPTURAL PEDAGOGY AND THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN *DE INANI GLORIA*

Chrysostom's homily, *De inani gloria*, represents his views on how children, especially boys, should be raised. Having said this, the document favours male-directed pedagogy. Females are mentioned almost incidentally and in passing (cf. *Inan. glor.* 90). The homily is primarily concerned with the formation of adolescent masculinity by means of virtue-education (*Inan. glor.* 18; Laistner 1979: 102): 'In our own day every man takes the greatest pains to train his boy in the arts and in literature and speech. But to exercise this child's soul in virtue, to that no man any longer pays heed.'¹⁰ Again we see a comment probably applicable to the middle and upper classes, who have apparently neglected virtue-education but not the literacy of their children. The homily is very analogical, and is just as much a critique on deviant adult behaviour as it is a treatise on how to raise children (Leyerle 1997: 243–270). Chrysostom does not envision a monastic education for all children here (*Inan. glor.* 19), he rather prefers, among other things, the *askesis* of reading and story-telling to shape adolescent bodies. As we have seen in the previous sections, scriptural pedagogy was crucial for self-fashioning, and in the case of children, parents need to assume the responsibility of fashioning the identities of their children (*Inan. glor.* 22; Laistner 1979: 103): 'To each of you fathers and mothers I say, just as we see artists fashioning their paintings and statues with great precision, so we must care for these wondrous statues of ours.'¹¹ So how does this take place? How do the scriptural pedagogical and oral technologies operate to produce and reproduce these productive yet docile bodies? In a creative yet conventional way, Chrysostom compares the raising of a child to the building of a city (*Inan. glor.* 25).¹² As Laistner (1979: 104) points out, the theme of the soul or mind as a city is common among the early Christian fathers as well as in Hermetic literature. In this treatise, the child is compared with a city and the various senses to the city gates. The gate that is of importance here is the gate of hearing. Chrysostom is very concerned with the regulation of knowledge in terms of a child's hearing. Of course, once we have the regulation of knowledge, we see the dynamics of power laid bare. Chrysostom is fully aware of the intricacies between speaking and hearing, that is, orality, and discipline or virtue-formation. He explains that if one controls the gate of hearing, the gate of the tongue, speech, will also be controlled – since foul words heard lead to foul words spoken (*Inan. glor.* 13). Moreover, Chrysostom is aware that stories are crucial in this instance, and he starts by advising parents to select the narrators of their children's virtue very carefully. Parents need to screen the tutors of their children, be it slaves, teachers or nurses, with great care (*Inan. glor.* 37–38), and if no slave, that is, the *paedagogus*, is available, a free virtuous man should be hired. Old wives' tales and gossip from slaves should be avoided at all costs (*Inan. glor.* 38). Since slaves played a formative role in Graeco-Roman and Christian pedagogy (Edmondson 2011: 358–359), their presence and influence at this young age of a child's development should be strictly monitored. The regulation of personal influence, to Chrysostom, is the key to healthy development. Chrysostom advises the father, or approved teacher,

to tell a boy a story while the mother also sat nearby (*Inan. glor.* 39). She is to listen and participate in a secondary and supporting role. Females are not fully excluded from the process of scriptural pedagogy of boys, and if we consider the centrality of women in ancient Bible study, as pointed out by Bowes above, then it is probable that many women who did not have husbands around had to undertake this task themselves. Chrysostom himself was raised by his mother and he personally recounts the influential role she played in his own self-fashioning (*Sac.* 1.5–6).

How did this pedagogy take place practically? I will highlight three important points in this instance: firstly, while one could certainly not rule out the presence of reading exercises here, it does not seem that Chrysostom favours reading as such in this instance. We have already seen that children were present during the formal reading rituals in the house. This level of pedagogy here would probably flow from the reading events performed during the household rituals. There is also no reason to assume a strictly formal operation of scriptural pedagogy. In some instances children may have been read to directly, and perhaps asked to read (Chrysostom himself stresses parent's preoccupation with literacy teaching), and in other instances not, depending on the discretion of the teacher. The children we are dealing with in this treatise would probably age from late pre-adolescence to adolescence and puberty, especially considering the involvement of slaves. As children grew up, slaves became less involved in their pedagogy and the father's or mother's role became more central (Edmondson 2011: 359). I am convinced that the household ritual of scriptural pedagogy prescribed in, for instance, the sermon *In Genesim* 6, and these prescriptions on the education of children in *De inani gloria*, are directly linked and correlate with each other. The two may not even have been separate events. As I have said, it would be somewhat problematic to force a rigid and formal structure on these practices. They could have been separate or simultaneous. It also explains why slaves are required to attend the ritual of readings from scripture, so that they would be able to both teach the children and avoid speaking foul words to the children's ears. This affirms a view I proposed in a different study that the household, in Chrysostom's mind at least, functions as something of a reformatory, an informal school-space where observation, regulation and control are central, and where the duplicative strategies of pastoral power speak and perpetuate themselves (De Wet 2013: 219–224). Not only do we see this interchange between household ritual and the education of children, but Chrysostom also connects this operation to the formal reading of scripture in church (*Inan. glor.* 41; Laistner 1979: 109): 'This is not all [telling the story at home]. Go, leading him by the hand in church and pay heed particularly when this tale is read aloud.'¹³

Secondly, while reading is not central to this pedagogical operation, story-telling occupies a key role. The teacher, whether father, mother or slave, is to tell the story to the child in a very specific manner. Chrysostom spares no detail in the precise art of scriptural story-telling to children. The story-telling must be somewhat cryptic and dialectical, a dialogical narrative heuristic (*Inan. glor.* 39–42). The story is told in a rather general 'once upon a time' fashion, and should contain cues and clues related to

biblical narratives and the story should also be related to the practicalities of everyday life (*Inan. glor.* 14). Adolescent behaviour is therefore reproduced and modified from elements in the story. Stories are not supposed to be too elaborate – they must be simple, to the point and practical – most importantly, there must be repetition for the sake of memorization and imitation (*Inan. glor.* 40; Laistner 1979: 109):

So far is enough for the child [only the basic elements of the story]. Tell him this story one evening at supper. Let his mother repeat the same tale; then, when he has heard it often, ask him too, saying: ‘Tell me the story,’ so that he may be eager to imitate you. And when he has memorized it thou wilt also tell him how it profits him. The soul indeed, as it receives the story within itself before thou hast elaborated it, is aware that it will benefit.¹⁴

This section provides many insights. The setting for teaching here is at the supper table, again confirming the informal structure of scriptural pedagogy and the education of children in the household, and the fluidity of Christian household rituals. It helps us to understand ancient households not as formal and rigid institutions, but rather as vibrant organisms organized around their own personal and relation dynamic, with varying manifestations. It is something of a recycling of pastoral power to comply with the demands of ephemerality and family relation. I still see the household as a reformatory, but it is informal and relational, and thus I would speculate, highly effective. While I doubt the following and believe more investigation is needed, this change in organization could perhaps be a form of resistance against the duplication of pastoral power onto the household. Here we also see the role of both parents in story-telling and pedagogy. The child should also repeat the story, and special attention should be given when the child is in church and the story is repeated (*Inan. glor.* 41). Two power-knowledge strategies are served by this simple practice: first, memorization, in other words, internalizing the regulated and distributed knowledge for the sake of discipline and self-fashioning; second, the imitation of the story-telling virtuoso is served by this practice, which is in essence part of the pastoral-governmental task of creating docile and socially productive and pro-Christian bodies for society. Chrysostom himself, at the end of the citation, admits the potential for psychic discipline in this practice – the soul both knows and should be told that this knowledge is beneficial. I understand the soul here in the sense that Michel Foucault has proposed, as a set of highly somatic technologies to discipline and shape the body. Soul is not anti-corporeal, it is in fact part of the very operation of the individual body in corporeal care and formation (Foucault 1977: 29). The dynamics between these psycho-corporeal strategies and virtue-formation become quite evident (*Inan. glor.* 44; Laistner, 1979: 110):

[After narrating the tale of Jacob and Esau] If a story can so master the children’s soul that it is thought worthy of belief, the veritable truth, it will surely enthrall them and fill them with great awe. Again they must learn to despise the belly; for the story must also show them that he gained nothing by being the first-born and the elder. Because of the greed of his belly he belayed the advantage of his birthright.¹⁵

In this citation above, we see how the concept of mastery, central to virtue and self-fashioning, is attributed to the level of narration. Stories are in themselves psychic technologies with the capacity to master the passions of the adolescent and so create virtue and discipline. The story of Jacob and Esau, for instance, is used to explain the dangers of vice, the importance of self-control and even the limits of social status (for example, first-born birthright) when virtue is absent.

With the repetition of the story, the storyteller should also point out different practical lessons that may be learnt from the story (*Inan. glor.* 42). Thereafter, other stories should be told in the same manner (*Inan. glor.* 43–46). Fear also plays an important role as a strategy of control and regulation (*Inan. glor.* 20, 26, esp. 30).

Thirdly, we have seen that scrutiny of the medium (the story-teller) and the technique of narration received much attention in the treatise, but Chrysostom does not neglect to give guidelines on the material of the narration either. The stories need to be directly biblical or at least close mirrors, and classical tales from Greek and Roman mythology should be avoided. This is of course related to the issue mentioned above that children's ears should be shielded from the tales of slaves. It is part of the regulation of knowledge and its resulting implications for behaviour modification. Mythological tales should be avoided (*Inan. glor.* 39). Although they are awe-inspiring, there are, according to Chrysostom, many biblical narratives that can inspire equal and surpassing awe. Earlier in the treatise Chrysostom forbids parents to have their children attend the theatre (*Inan. glor.* 77–79), another educational and highly oral space in late antiquity (Leyerle 2001: 4–5). We see here a move by ecclesiastical power to monopolize the management and distribution of education and educational practices in late antiquity. This was a difficult endeavour since education was not yet formalized in the manner we see it in the modern era, hence the preoccupation, or obsession, of the church with the household and the phenomenon of bishops acting as domestic advisors and specialists in οἰκονομία (Sessa 2011: 1–34).

In this section it was asked how scriptural pedagogy was manifested in the everyday life of Christians in Chrysostom's context. It was asked how it was practically applied and also resisted. Three important points have been made: firstly, the person who should tell the story must be the best suited in virtue and skill, and children should avoid the talk of slaves and old wives' tales coming from unsavoury characters. Secondly, we have seen that the various sites where scriptural pedagogy would take place were not organized around a formal structure, especially in the household. The diffusion (or in some cases assimilation) of formal household reading into dialectical oral storytelling was clear. In some instances there may have been a formal household ritual of reading scripture outside the education of children, but it seems that these two practices more often converged into one. While the household still functions as a reformatory, the functioning and organization is not fixed and formal, but rather, as I proposed, fluid and organic. I mentioned with a measure of doubt that it could be an element of resistance, especially since Chrysostom still aims to connect the formal church rituals of reading scripture with the process of educating children. We therefore see this tri-

part organizational network in the scriptural pedagogy and the education of children: the formal ecclesiastical *lectio*, and the combined or connected household rituals of reading scripture and telling children educational stories. Thirdly, the material of the narratives are also controlled and limited to biblical knowledge and not stories from classical mythology. The purpose of the operation in all three of these aspects remains based on power, that is, the control of knowledge and the reproduction and regulation of acceptable behaviour. Instances of resistance are somewhat elusive and opaque. It was just mentioned that it cannot yet be proved conclusively that the fluidity of the household functioning constitutes an instance of resistance. More subtle and nuanced instances of resistance do slip in the treatise, for instance parents who probably did allow children to attend both theatre and church, and perhaps to study some stories from classical mythology (they may have encountered these in their later years when studying rhetoric and grammar). The presence of women and slaves in the educational process does not constitute a measure of resistance to the androcentric operation of scriptural pedagogy in Chrysostom. Even though women were key players in scriptural pedagogy, this would be expected of them as acting in the role of a *pater familias*. If anything, the presence of women in scriptural pedagogy simply perpetuates male power in the educational space, since the technologies of androcentrism and andromorphism would still be present (see, for example, Chrysostom's own case with his mother; *Sac.* 1.3–5). The role of slaves here is also not a form of resistance and certainly not an instance of the amelioration of the injustice of slavery. It again simply perpetuates the practice. The problem for both slaves and women here is that the duplication of pastoral power onto the household, whether directly or more diffused, is still a masculinizing process (De Wet 2013: 252–292). The little attention given to the education of girls (and other slaves) in the treatise testifies to this.

CONCLUSION

In this article I set out to delineate how the study of scripture as a power strategy was orally practised, and what the implications were for the body politic, the social and individual body. It therefore entailed a focus on the issue of scriptural pedagogy, orality and power only in some writings of John Chrysostom. I was especially interested in how these three interrelated phenomena express themselves in the daily life of Christians in Chrysostom's time and context. Methodologically, I understood the relation between scripture and orality in terms of De Certeau's notion of a scriptural economy; one that diffuses and reproduces scriptural voices and bodies in service of ecclesiastical powers and institutions. This reproduction of scriptural bodies was seen as a reproductive corporeal exhibitionism, with a very real effect on social and individual bodies, a socio-political somatography. In relation to the sources, I isolated three key primary sources for this endeavour, namely Chrysostom's *In Acta apostolorum homilia* 19, his *In Genesim sermo* 6 and finally, *De inani gloria*.

The study started by looking at Chrysostom's views on the discourse of reading scripture, with special emphasis on his reading of the narrative of the Ethiopian eunuch in his *In Acta apostolorum homilia* 19. Reading was characterized as a highly somatic art, one that takes hold of bodies and calls them to discipline. Chrysostom especially emphasizes the psychic technologies of earnestness and a desire to learn – a psychic zeal of reading and comprehension – that acts as technologies of control and also corporeal energization. This was all in service of self-fashioning and identity formation. In this way, reading becomes an informal type of *askesis*. It is achieved, in Chrysostom's mind, by means of a dialectic between hearing and responding to scripture with the aid of mediatory filters such as priests, scribes and teachers.

With this in mind, I aimed to examine how this discourse of reading scripture was practically applied in household rituals, especially as it was related in his *In Genesim sermo* 6. It was shown that the oral scriptural pedagogy in the household rituals served as a power strategy in the duplication of pastoral governmentality onto the household. For Chrysostom, the practice was supposed to be androcentric, but in reality this was probably not the case, and all members of the household participated. Nevertheless, scriptural pedagogy is still a masculinizing discourse. The ritual especially took place around the table where all members of the household could listen and participate.

Finally, in order to focus on scriptural pedagogy on an even higher level of abstraction than the previous two sections, it was asked how Chrysostom envisioned the role of scriptural pedagogy in the education of children, specifically as seen in *De inani gloria*. While Chrysostom is very systematic in his application of the scriptural economy onto early Christian households, the reality of its operation seems more fluid and organic. The household ritual of reading scripture, discussed in the second section of the article, seemed to convolute with the practices of the education of adolescents in the household. These two practices were probably assimilated and practised much more informally than Chrysostom may have wanted. Despite the organic and fluid nature of Christian household rituals and educational practices, the household still functioned as a type of reformatory to reproduce and regulate docile bodies in service of pastoral governmentality. Hence the importance of attending church services as part of the education of household members, especially children. The discourse of reading is supplemented here by the discourse of story-telling, and Chrysostom gives precise guidelines on who should tell, how they should tell and what they should tell. His guidelines, however, were not mechanistically followed, and the reality of everyday practice in households seemed somewhat different from what Chrysostom imagined and advised.

We have seen then in this paper how the dynamics of Christian scriptural pedagogy, orality and power function in the writings of Chrysostom. This complex operation within the oral history of late antiquity had effects on the body politic, the social body and the individual body. The body politic was influenced in the application of an authoritative scriptural economy, as a subset of pastoral governmentality, as a power strategy for duplicating and disseminating pastoral power outside of the formal institution that is the

church. This led to numerous effects on the social body, especially the domestic social body. Households accepted, resisted and negotiated this application of power in the form of scriptural pedagogy. Finally, on a micro-level within the household, individual bodies were shaped, regulated and disciplined in the fluid yet potent everyday practice of scriptural pedagogy; the site where stories mastered the souls and the bodies of not only children, but also women and slaves.

NOTES

- 1 *Homilia de capto Eutropio* was originally labeled dubious in the Chrysostomic corpus, although several scholars now attest to its authenticity (cf. Mayer 2005: 88, 170, 228). Translations marked *NPNF* refer to Schaff's (1994) *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, the first series, accessed online. Greek texts marked *MPG* refer to Migne's (1857) *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca*, also accessed online. The Greek text for *De inani gloria* comes from the Malingrey's (1972) edition in the *Sources chrétiennes*, abbreviated *SC*. I will use Laistner's (1979) translation of *De inani gloria*.
- 2 Greek text (*MPG* 52.395.55–397.15): Ἡδὺς μὲν λειμῶν καὶ παράδεισος, πολὺ δὲ ἡδύτερον τῶν θεῶν Γραφῶν ἢ ἀνάγνωσις. Ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄνθη μαραϊνόμενα, ἐνταῦθα δὲ νοήματα ἀκμάζοντα• ἐκεῖ ζέφυρος πνέων, ἐνταῦθα δὲ Πνεύματος αὐρα• ἐκεῖ ἄκανθα αἰ τειχίζουσαι, ἐνταῦθα δὲ πρόνοια Θεοῦ ἢ ἀσφαλιζομένη• ἐκεῖ τέττιγες ἄδοντες, ἐνταῦθα δὲ προφηταὶ κελαδοῦντες• ἐκεῖ τέρψις ἀπὸ τῆς ὄψεως, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὠφέλεια ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως. Ὁ παράδεισος ἐν ἐνὶ χωρίῳ, αἱ δὲ Γραφαὶ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης• ὁ παράδεισος δουλεύει καιρῶν ἀνάγκαις, αἱ δὲ Γραφαὶ καὶ ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ἐν θέρει κομῶσι τοῖς φύλλοις, βρίθουσι τοῖς καρποῖς. Προσέχωμεν τοίνυν τῇ τῶν Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει• ἐάν γὰρ τῇ Γραφῇ προσέχης, ἐκβάλλει σου τὴν ἀθυμίαν, φυτεύει σου τὴν ἡδονὴν, ἀναιρεῖ τὴν κακίαν, ριζοῖ τὴν ἀρετὴν, οὐκ ἀφήσιν ἐν θορύβῳ πραγμάτων τὰ τῶν κλυδωνιζομένων πάσχειν. Ἡ θάλασσα μαίνεται, σὺ δὲ μετὰ γαλήνης πλέεις• ἔχεις γὰρ κυβερνήτην τῶν Γραφῶν τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν• τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ σχοινίον οὐ διαρρήγνυσι τῶν πραγμάτων ὁ πειρασμός.
- 3 The connection between literacy and pedagogy has already received much attention (cf. esp. Robb 1994).
- 4 In this paper I use much of the language and concepts found in Foucault's writings, particularly relating to power and the rhetoric of the body – I especially focus on his works on discipline (Foucault 1977), government (Foucault 2011) and power (Foucault 1980).
- 5 For a more detailed discussion on the relationship between scripture and asceticism, see Clark (1999: 104–176).
- 6 Greek text (*MPG* 60.155.48–156.6): Τίνος ἔνεκεν, εἰπέ μοι, αἱ Γραφαί; Τὸ γὰρ ὑμέτερον μέρος, πάντα ἀνήρηται. Τίνος ἔνεκεν ἐκκλησία; Κατάχωσον τὰ βιβλία• τάχα οὐ τοιοῦτον κρῖμα, οὐ τοιαύτη κόλασις. Εἴ τις καταχώσειεν αὐτὰ ἐν κόπρῳ, καὶ μὴ ἀκούοι αὐτῶν, οὐχ οὕτως αὐτὰ ὑβρίζει, ὡς νῦν. Τί γὰρ, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ ὑβριστικὸν ἐκεῖ; Ὅτι αὐτὰ κατέχωσε. Τί δαί ἐνταῦθα; Ὅτι οὐκ ἀκούομεν αὐτῶν. Εἰπέ μοι, τίς ποτε μάλιστα ὑβρίζεται; ὅταν σιωπῶντος μὴ ἀποκρίνηται, ἢ ὅταν λέγοντος; Πάντως ὅταν λέγοντος. Ὡστε μείζων ἢ ὕβρις νῦν, ὅταν καὶ φθεγγομένου μὴ ἀκούσης, μείζων ἢ καταφρόνησις. Μὴ λαλεῖτε ἡμῖν, φησὶ, πάλαι Ἰουδαῖοι τοῖς

προφήταις ἔλεγον• ὑμεῖς δὲ χεῖρον ποιεῖτε, λέγοντες• Μὴ λαλεῖτε, οὐ ποιοῦμεν. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἀπέστρεφον αὐτοὺς μὴδὲ φθέγγεσθαι, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς δεχόμενοι τινα εὐλαβείας ἀφορμῆν• ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐκ πολλῆς καταφρονήσεως οὐδὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε. Πιστεύσατε, εἰ τὰ στόματα ἡμῖν ἐνεφράξατε, τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθέντες, οὐκ ἦν τοσαύτη ἡ ὕβρις ὅση νῦν.

- 7 Bowes (2008) has given a very thorough analysis of household worship in late ancient Christianity. Her focus is unfortunately not so much on Chrysostom, but it does provide a good overview of the development of Christian household worship.
- 8 At this point I need to express immense gratitude to Blake Leyerle for providing me with the paper she read at the Annual conference of the SBL in Chicago, 2012, and also for our fruitful discussions on this topic, and pointing out many important facets of household ritual in Chrysostom's thinking.
- 9 Greek text (MPG 54.607.22–39): Ταῦτα οὖν ἅπαντα, ἀγαπητοὶ, διακρατῶμεν, καὶ οἴκαδε ἀναχωρήσαντες διπλῆν παραθῶμεν τὴν τράπεζαν, τὴν τῶν σιτίων, καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀκροάσεως, καὶ λεγέτω μὲν ἀνὴρ τὰ εἰρημένα, μανθανέτω δὲ γυνή, ἀκουέτω δὲ καὶ παιδία, μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθωσαν δὲ μὴδὲ οἰκέται τῆς ἀκροάσεως ταύτης. Ἐκκλησίαν ποιήσόν σου τὴν οἰκίαν• καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὑπεύθυνος εἶ καὶ τῆς τῶν παιδίων καὶ τῆς τῶν οἰκετῶν σωτηρίας• καὶ καθάπερ ἡμεῖς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἀπαιτούμεθα λόγον. οὕτω καὶ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ οἰκέτου, καὶ ὑπὲρ γυναικὸς, καὶ ὑπὲρ παιδὸς ἀπαιτεῖται εὐθύνας. Ἀπὸ γοῦν τῶν τοιούτων διηγημάτων ἥδιστα διαδέξεται ἡμᾶς τὰ ὄνειρατα, καὶ φαντασίας ἀπηλλαγμένα ἀπάσης• οἷα γὰρ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἡ ψυχὴ μελετᾶν εἴωθε, τοιαῦτα καὶ καθ' ὕπνου φαντάζεται. Καὶ ἐὰν τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν φυλάττωμεν λεγόμενα, οὐ πολλοῦ δεηθῶμεθα πόνου• καὶ γὰρ σαφέστερος ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα λόγος ὑμῖν ἔσται, καὶ ἡμῖν προθυμότερα ἢ διδασκαλία.
- 10 Greek text (SC 188.271–274): Νῦν δὲ ὅπως μὲν τέχναι καὶ γράμματα καὶ λόγους τοὺς αὐτῶν παῖδας παιδεύσειεν, ἄπασαν ἕκαστος ποιεῖται σπουδὴν, ὅπως δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀσκηθεῖν, τούτου οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς λόγον ἔχει τινά.
- 11 Greek text (SC 188.306–309): Ἐκαστος τοίνυν ὑμῶν τῶν πατέρων καὶ τῶν μητέρων, καθάπερ τοὺς ζωγράφους ὀρώμεν τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκριβείας ἐξασκοῦντας, οὕτω τῶν θαυμαστῶν τούτων ἀγαλμάτων ἐπιμελώμεθα.
- 12 This is not the only pedagogical metaphor used in the homily. Education in virtue is also explained as the training of an athlete (*Inan. glor.* 19, 63), probably the more common metaphor for this practice in antiquity.
- 13 Greek text (SC 188.569–571): Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ χειραγωγῶν ἄγε• καὶ σπουδάσον αὐτὸν ἄγειν, ὅταν μάλιστα αὐτὴ ἡ διήγησις ἀναγινώσκηται.
- 14 Greek text (SC 188.555–562): Ἄρκει μέχρι τούτων αὐτῶ• καὶ τοῦτο ἐν μιᾷ ἑσπέρᾳ εἰπε δειπνῶν. Καὶ πάλιν ἡ μήτηρ τὰ αὐτὰ λεγέτω. Εἶτα ἐπειδὴν πολλάκις ἀκούσῃ, ἀπαίτησον καὶ αὐτόν• «Εἰπέ μοι τὸ διήγημα», ἵνα καὶ φιλοτιμηθῆται. Καὶ ὅταν κατάσῃ τὸ διήγημα, τότε αὐτῶ καὶ τὸ κέρδος ἐρεῖς. Οἶδεν μὲν γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν δεχομένη τὸ διήγημα πρὸ τῆς σῆς ἐπεξεργασίας καρποὺς ἐνεγκεῖν, πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ εἰπέ μετὰ ταῦτα•
- 15 Greek text (SC 188.615–621): Εἰ γὰρ μῦθος τινος οὕτως αὐτῶν κατέχει τὴν ψυχὴν ὥστε νομίζεσθαι ἀξιόπιστος εἶναι, τὰ ὄντως ἀληθῆ πῶς οὐκ ἂν κατάσῃ καὶ πολλοῦ φόβου ἐμπλήσῃ; Ὅτι χρὴ γαστρὸς καταφρονεῖν• δεῖ γὰρ κἀκεῖνο λέγειν τὸ διήγημα

ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτότοκον εἶναι καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐκέρδανεν• διὰ γὰρ τὴν τῆς γαστροῦ ἀκρασίαν προέδωκε τὸ προτέρημα τῆς πρωτοτοκίας.

REFERENCES

- Botha, P.J.J. 2012. *Orality and literacy in early Christianity*. Eugene, OR: Cascade.
- Botha, P.J.J. 2009. The Greco-Roman book: Contextualising early Christian documents. *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20: 2–27.
- Bowes, K. 2008. *Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, A. 1994. *Christianity and the rhetoric of empire: The development of Christian discourse*. California: University of California Press.
- Cavallo, G. 1999. Between *volumen* and codex: Reading in the Roman world. In G. Cavallo & R. Chartier (eds.), *A history of reading in the West*, 64–89. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Clark, E.A. 1999. *Reading renunciation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Comby, J. 1985. *How to read church history. Vol. 1: From the beginnings to the fifteenth century*. New York: Crossroad.
- De Certeau, M. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. California: University of California Press.
- De Wet, C. L. 2013. *Slavery in John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews: A cultural-historical analysis*. Unpublished D.Litt. Dissertation. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Edmondson, J. 2011. Slavery and the Roman family. In K. Bradley & P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge world history of slavery. Vol. 1: The ancient mediterranean world*, 337–361. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison*. Trans. Sheridan, A. London: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Gordon, C. (ed.). Trans. Gordon, C., Marshall, L., Mepham, J. & Soper, K. London: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. 2011. *The government of self and others: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1982–1983*. Davidson, A.I.I. (ed.). Trans. Burchell, G. New York: Picador.
- Froehlich, K. 1984. *Biblical interpretation in the early church*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Harris, W.V. 1991. *Ancient literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hill, R.C. 2004. *St. John Chrysostom: Eight Sermons on the Book of Genesis*. Boston: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1998. *Golden mouth: The story of John Chrysostom – Ascetic, preacher, bishop*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kotsifou, C. 2007. Books and book production in the monastic communities of Byzantine Egypt. In W.E. Klingshirn & L. Safran (eds.), *The early Christian book*, 48–68. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Krueger, D. 2004. *Writing and holiness: The practice of authorship in the early Christian East*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Laietner, M.L.W. 1979. *Christianity and pagan culture in the later Roman Empire*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Leyerle, B. 1997. Appealing to children. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5(2): 243–270.
- Leyerle, B. 2001. *Theatrical shows and ascetic lives: John Chrysostom's attack on spiritual marriage*. California: University of California Press.
- Leyerle, B. 2012. Turn your house into a church: Prescribed domestic rituals in the preaching of John Chrysostom. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November 2012, Chicago, I.L.
- Lowden, J. 2007. The word made visible: The exterior of the early Christian book as visual argument. In W.E. Klingshirn & L. Safran (eds.), *The Early Christian book*, 13–47. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- MacKendrick, K. 2004. *Word made skin: Figuring language at the surface of flesh*. Fordham: Fordham University Press.
- Macmullen, R. 1989. The preacher's audience (AD 350–400). *The Journal of Theological Studies* 40(2): 503–511.
- Malingrey, A.-M. (ed.). 1972. *Jean Chrysostome: Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants*. Paris: Cerf.
- Mayer, W. 2005. *The homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance: Reshaping the foundations*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.
- Mayer, W. 2000. Who came to hear John Chrysostom preach? *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 76(1): 73–87.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.). 1857–86. *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca*. Paris.
- Miller, P.C. 1997. *Dreams in late antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mitchell, M.M. 2002. *The heavenly trumpet: John Chrysostom and the art of Pauline interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster.
- Nancy, J.-L. 1994. *The birth to presence*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rapp, C. 2007. Holy texts, holy men, and holy scribes: Aspects of scriptural holiness in late antiquity. In W.E. Klingshirn & L. Safran (eds.), *The early Christian book*, 194–224. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Rayner, K. & Pollatsek, A.W. 1989. *The psychology of reading*. New York: Routledge.
- Robb, K. 1994. *Literacy and paideia in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saller, R.P. 1999. *Pater familias, mater familias, and the gendered semantics of the Roman household*. *Classical Philology* 94(2): 182–197.
- Sandwell, I. 2007. *Religious identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schaff, P. 1994. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Peabody: Hendrickson. Retrieved from www.newadvent.org/fathers (accessed 12 April 2013).
- Schor, A. M. 2007. Theodore on the 'school of Antioch': A network approach. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15(4): 517–562.
- Sessa, K. 2011. *The formation of papal authority in late antique Italy: Roman bishops and the domestic sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and orality in ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, R. 2009. Writing, reading, public and private 'literacies': Functional literacy and democratic

- literacy in Greece. In W.A. Johnson & H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient literacies: The culture of reading and writing in Greece and Rome*, 13–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolf, G. 2009. Literacy or literacies in Rome? In W.A. Johnson & H.N. Parker, (eds.), *Ancient literacies: The culture of reading and writing in Greece and Rome*, 46–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, F.M. 2002. *Biblical exegesis and the formation of Christian culture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.