

Household, Family

The sociological unit in the Hellenistic world, as in the OT, was not the individual, the city or the state but the family or household. Early Christianity, including the NT itself, to a large degree addressed people not as separate individual entities but as connected to the household (see *DPL*, Households and Household Codes).

1. Households in the Ancient Mediterranean World
2. Evidence of Households in the New Testament
3. Households and the Social Structure of Early Christianity

1. Households in the Ancient Mediterranean World.

In the OT the term *house* is frequently used figuratively as a reference to one's family (e.g., Gen 7:1). A house or household included not only an immediate nuclear family but usually a somewhat extended family and those who were dependent on and connected to that family in some way, all under the authority of the householder. Thus when Joshua promises that "I and my house will serve the Lord" (Josh 24:15), he means his family and other people living with his family under his authority will serve the Lord. Similarly, in Genesis (41:40; 45:8, etc.), as Acts 7:10 recounts, when Joseph was made governor over Egypt and over Pharaoh's household, it means he had stewardship both of the nation and of Pharaoh's family and attendants. (The NIV's "my palace" in Gen 41:40 probably misses the point.) These references also demonstrate that "house" did not include everyone under a person's authority but only those with some kind of familial or domestic attachment. Pharaoh's household (Gen 45) is distinguished from "all Egypt," which was also under his authority.

In the Hellenistic world the household was a social unit with familial or domestic connections whose members lived in a particular house and were subject to the householder's authority. They shared a common identity as members of that unit. Its cohesiveness lay not only in its members' connection to the head of the house but also in various economic, psychological and religious factors. Prosperity (or want) came not to individuals in isolation but to their household (see Herm. Sim. 7.3). The very word *economy* comes from the Greek (*oikonomia*) for "house law," because financial and other administration pertained to the household, not the individual. Such administration was often the responsibility of the householder's wife. In our literature Clement of Rome refers to women who have been taught "to manage the affairs of the household with dignity" (1 Clem. 1.3). Psychologically, a person's identity, from that of the householder to that of the slave, resided in his or her connection to, responsibilities toward and function within a household. Ordinarily a

household was held together by a common religion, the family generally following the religious proclivities of the head of the household.

2. Evidence of Households in the New Testament.

It is therefore not surprising that the household, a social unit found both in the OT and in Hellenistic culture, is common in our literature. Since households were such strongly religiously-linked social units, they are often the target of evangelistic effort. Several extended families whose heads believe the gospel are said to be included in the salvation that comes to that "house." Thus in Acts 10:2 Cornelius "with all his household" feared God and is later (Acts 11:14) told that Peter will bring a message "by which you will be saved, you and all your household." Similarly Lydia, a Thyatiran businesswoman in Philippi, is baptized "with her household" (Acts 16:15). This last reference demonstrates that a woman could be head of a household and was accepted as such in the church (see also 1 Cor 1:11; Ign. *Pol.* 8.2; Rom 16 in Paul's tribute to women colleagues). The prison warden of Philippi and his whole household are saved and rejoice with him (Acts 16:31, 34), and in Acts 18:18 Crispus, the synagogue ruler in Corinth, believed, along with his whole household. Clearly the author of Acts regards the coming of the gospel as affecting whole families and household authority structures as well as individuals. The baptisms of these entire households suggests an early Christian adoption of the OT covenantal idea that included families and households, not just individuals, in the covenant and thus also the covenant signs (see Gen 17:23).

Likewise in the General Epistles the family is a social unit to which salvation often comes. Hebrews 11:7 makes reference to Noah building an ark for the salvation of his "house." Although this was in the first instance a physical salvation rather than a spiritual one, Hebrews is clearly applying it in a spiritual direction (see 1 Pet 3:20–21), since his emphasis is on Noah's faith. The rest of Hebrews 11 emphasizes how the OT family of God exercised faith.

3. Households and the Social Structure of Early Christianity.

Since entire households of prominent people were converted, it is not surprising that the household remained the basis for early Christian meetings. In general the early Christians, having been expelled from the synagogues, appear to have gathered in the homes of prominent converts for instruction and prayer (Acts 12:12, 16:40; Rom 16). Several recent sociological studies on these house churches have argued that much of the social structure of early Christianity stemmed from its being patterned after a household unit, with attendant responsibilities and claims to loyalty. In particular, as the household of God, the church was not a democratic institution but a patriarchal family consisting of people who are familially related to, dependent on, obedient to and loyal to the head of that house, Jesus Christ, and thus also to his subordinate officers (1 Pet 5:5; Heb 13:17).

Since the church as a whole, as well as in its manifestations in local houses, was regarded as a family, the mutual obligations of its members are thought of in terms of family responsibilities. Christians have an obligation to familial love (1 Pet 1:22; 2 Pet 1:7; 1 Jn 3:11; 4:7; etc.), and failure to show proper hospitality in welcoming family members is grievous (3 Jn 10; *Did.* 12.1-5). The family must be protected

OT Old Testament

NT New Testament

DPL *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. R. P. Martin and G. F. Hawthorne

e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example

Herm. Sim. *Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude(s)*

1 1 *Clement*

against false teachers, to whom hospitality must not be given (2 Jn 10). 1 Peter 5:1–5 (see also 1 Jn 2:12–14) addresses the church as a household. Elders are to be shepherds, eager to serve but not lording it over their charges, themselves in service to the chief Shepherd (1 Pet 5:4). The “young men” are to be submissive and a model to all members, who are to be clothed with humility toward one another (1 Pet 5:5).

However, the early church’s stress on believers as members of the household of faith did not obscure the significance of individual belief. The particular character of the household code in 1 Peter is partly the result of the fact that certain slaves and women, contrary to their household heads, have believed in Christ and are thus religiously at odds with their households. Much of the suffering that 1 Peter envisages is due to the fact that, by adopting Christianity, individuals are disrupting one of the glues that held a household together. No doubt many non-Christian heads of households felt obligated for the sake of maintaining the household to discourage its members from departing from the accepted religion of the house, and this may at times have led to attempts at physical coercion. Thus slaves, specifically identified in 1 Peter 2:18 as *oiketai* or household slaves, could be beaten for their faith (1 Pet 2:20). Both slaves and wives (1 Pet 3:1–6) are put in the difficult position of being required to do all they can to maintain the stability of the household while at the same time holding fast to their religious convictions and commitments to Christ. Suffering for so doing was commendable (1 Pet 2:20) because it brought glory to God (1 Pet 2:12; 4:16).

The fact that individuals may be saved in distinction from their household does not obviate the reality of their household connections. 1 Peter 3:1–2 even entertains the possibility of the household connectedness working in reverse of the usual pattern, suggesting that unbelieving heads of households might be won by the godly behavior of their believing wives.

The postapostolic period continued in this vein. Although the corporate idea of salvation continues, the necessity of personal belief and action is also stressed. Hermas retains the corporate expectation when he exhorts people to “pray to God, and he will heal your transgressions, and those of your whole house and those of all the saints” (Herm. Vis. 1.1.9), but at the same time he struggles with the fact that his own family has not repented (Herm. Vis. 1.3.1–2), at least partly because Hermas did not care for the spiritual well-being of his house until rebuked (Herm. Vis. 2.3.1). Thus the early church to a large degree maintained the balance between corporate connectedness, even in respect to salvation, and individual responsibility.

See also Hospitality; House, Spiritual House; Household Codes; Social Setting of Early Non-Pauline Christianity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. R. Banks, *Paul’s Idea of Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale, 1960); A. J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 1977); A. Strobel, “Der Begriff des ‘Hauses’ im griechischen und römischen Privatrecht,” *ZNW* 56 (1965)

Herm. Vis. *Shepherd of Hermas, Vision(s)*

91–100; D. Tidball, *An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1983).

D. G. McCartney

Household Codes

NT writers adopted a number of conventional literary devices to aid them in the teaching of ethics. One significant device of this sort is referred to by scholars as a household code. This term is a translation of the German term *Haustafel* (“house table”), which Martin Luther originally coined and which was taken up by scholars to describe the extended passages in the NT that address various members of a household. A number of sections in the NT letters have been classified in this way (Col 3:18–4:1; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15; 5:1–2; 6:1–2; Tit 2:1–3:8; 1 Pet 2:13–3:7), and related teaching occurs in the writings of the late first- and second-century apostolic fathers. The focus of the present article is on the non-Pauline NT and later usage of this form of instruction, but the lines of research have developed in such a way that some discussion of the Pauline usage must fall within our purview (see *DPL*, Households and Household Codes).

1. Definitions: The Parameters and Permutations of the Household Code
2. The Household Code Tradition in Recent Scholarship
3. Household and Church Codes in the Later New Testament and Apostolic Fathers
4. Conclusions

1. Definitions: The Parameters and Permutations of the Household Code.

1.1. The Form. The ideal household code is characterized by teaching addressed to the two members in a household relationship (wives and husbands; slaves and masters; children and parents); use of an imperative verb expressing subordination (Gk *hypotassō*) or obedience (Gk *hypakouō*); grounds or motivation for the behavior enjoined; and reciprocal address. But close inspection of the various passages generally categorized as household codes reveals a number of differences that complicate the issues of the genesis and form of the NT device.

1.2. Variations Within the New Testament. The typical assumption is that the household codes of Colossians and Ephesians represent in some sense the basic form, with somewhat divergent later examples being understood as developments or expansions of an ideal form corresponding to developments in the church’s sense of self-identity in relation to the world as the house church became the institutional church (so esp. Herr).

Although this interpretation is open to question, it does seem clear from a comparison of the form and themes that the related passages belong to a common tradition(s) that in different settings and times proved to be capable of adaptation to new situations. Thus within the Pauline and Petrine writings we find passages that address believers specifically from the perspective of their place in the household

Gk Greek
esp. especially

(Eph; Col; cf. 1 Tim 6:1–2; 1 Pet 2:13–3:7). However, other passages related in form and tone address believers according to their positions in the broader context of the Christian congregation. Injunctions may be divided along gender lines, whether generally or in the marriage relationship (1 Cor 11:3–16; 14:33–35; 1 Tim 2:8–15), and along generational lines (1 Tim 5:1–2); Titus 2:1–10 combines these perspectives. Elsewhere the church as a whole is instructed to acknowledge the secular authorities (Rom 13:1–7; Tit 3:1–2; 1 Pet 2:13–17; *see* Civil Authority). And several passages encourage the church similarly to submit to its leaders and/or exhort leaders to lead well (1 Cor 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12–13; Heb 13:17; 1 Tim 3:1–13; Tit 1:6–9; 1 Pet 5:1–5).

In view of both the similarity of form, content and tone in these passages and the variety of groups and concerns addressed, the adequacy of the term “household code” to describe the tradition as a whole has been questioned. D. Schroeder (1976, 1959) chose the more general term “station code,” which identifies and links the passages on the basis of their common form and concern to teach believers how to behave in their various stations in life. Others (Balch, Weiser) prefer to think in terms of two subspecies of one tradition: the term “household code” applies to the form as it occurs in Colossians, Ephesians and 1 Peter, but the term “church code,” or “congregational code,” more accurately describes the tradition’s application or expansion in those passages that exceed the bounds of the household (e.g., 1 Tim 2:1–6:2; Tit 2:1–3:8).

Both of these approaches share the assumption that a basic form was altered or expanded as new situations warranted. The most recent work of H. von Lips suggests another explanation. He observed the relationship between the household code in 1 Peter and the code in Titus 2:1–3:7 and determined that these two examples share certain features that set them off from Colossians and Ephesians: the parent/child category is absent; instructions are addressed to slaves but not masters; subordination to the state, which Colossians and Ephesians do not mention, is enjoined; 1 Peter and Titus prefer the verb *subordinate* or *submit* (Gk *hypotassomai*; used throughout) to *obey* (Gk *hypakouō*; used in Col and Eph of slave and child) and the noun *despotai* of the masters (Col and Eph use *kyrioi*); and the codes in 1 Peter and Titus make extensive use of theological material to ground the instructions (Titus 2:11–14; 3:3–8; 1 Pet 2:21–24; 3:18–22). These points of contact, especially the addition of the instruction concerning the state, suggest the emergence of a new schema or a parallel tradition rather than one that has undergone transformation. Whether this explanation is an improvement remains to be seen. However, his attentiveness to the text and context, instead of primarily secular parallels, for clues about the meaning of the codes is noteworthy. This methodology has not always been followed.

2. The Household Code Tradition in Recent Scholarship.

Three crucial questions determine the direction that study of this teaching form has taken: Where did it come from? What circumstances in the Christian communities gave rise to its usage? What is the intention of the ethic it enjoins?

2.1. The Question of Source. For the most part scholars have concentrated on discovering the source of the code as it appears in the NT in the hope that this would provide the clue to its meaning. Initial investigations concluded that codes used in Stoicism had been modified only slightly for Christian use (Weidinger, Dibelius). Then some scholars noticed that the emphasis on subordination seemed closer to the teaching of Hellenistic Judaism as seen, for instance, in Philo (Schroeder 1959 and esp. Crouch). L. Goppelt (1973, 1993 [1978], 1982), building on the work of Schroeder, concluded that the NT household codes are genuinely Christian products; in some respects they compare with Stoic and Hellenistic Jewish relationship ethics but are more specifically the result of Christian reworking of Hellenistic ethics “on the basis of principles developed by Jesus and Paul” (Goppelt 1993 [1978], 173).

More recent scholarship emphasizes to a greater extent the influence of the Greco-Roman culture on the NT device (Lührmann, Thraede, Balch 1981, Müller, Lips). The structure of Aristotelian household ethics (addressing social relationships, reciprocity, placing one of the pair under the authority of the other) might explain the codes in Colossians and Ephesians. But the more likely immediate source of the NT tradition, which becomes more diverse in content, is to be found in the broader contemporary Hellenistic discussion of the theme “concerning the household” (Gk *peri oikonomou*), which developed from, but was not restricted to, Aristotle in terms of content and form.

For a number of reasons, looking to the contemporary culture for an understanding of the NT household codes is a useful approach. The absence of an identifiable source for the form recommends caution and sensitivity (Hartman). It is clear that the NT writers were indeed influenced by their environment, and in this respect it is important to note how the early church utilized the Hellenistic “household” concept as its own sense of identity developed. This concept, rather than formal considerations alone, would seem to be the common denominator that links NT with secular social ethics. The ancient household was regarded as the basic building block of society; its stability guaranteed the stability of the city-state, and so discussion of the relation of household members to the state authorities came naturally within the purview of a discussion of ethics related to the household. The teaching developed to safeguard the relationships and responsibilities in the household and respect for the state established some of the categories and suggested the method of instruction of the NT household code. But there is no question of an uncritical, wholesale adoption of secular ethics on the part of NT writers.

2.2. The Question of Causal Circumstances. Martin Dibelius and K. Weidinger answered this question on the basis of secularization in the early church. In their opinion the delay of Christ’s return and the pressing concern for survival in a hostile world led the church to find a way to make itself at home in society. The

cf. compare

secular code, with some slight Christian modifications, encouraged the kind of behavior that would facilitate this transition. The codes were taken over so completely, however, that nothing about a particular church's situation might be learned from them. This view has been largely rejected, though it has still influenced the interpretation of later NT writings.

Other scholars maintain that the household code was applied to quiet the unrest caused in Christian communities by the enthusiastic enactment of the Pauline equality tradition preserved in Galatians 3:28 (Col 3:11; 1 Cor 12:13; Schroeder 1959; Crouch; Martin, 3:931–32). Goppelt argued similarly that the tradition called Christians undergoing stress because of the faith to remain engaged in the social structure rather than emigrate out of it (Goppelt 1982).

E. Schüssler Fiorenza's feminist reconstruction combines the two preceding views, interpreting the household codes as evidence of the church's return to patriarchy. Early efforts to live according to the equality promised by Paul's gospel (Gal 3:28) led to some exuberant excesses and apparently drew criticism and hostility from secular critics. Rather than stand firm for the gospel and coequality of the sexes, church leaders in the name of Paul returned to the acceptable secular arrangement for the church in order to promote peace with the hostile world.

On the whole Schroeder, Crouch, Goppelt and Balch seem to be on the better track in their various ways. Balch (1981) especially pointed out that there is no sign of an emancipation movement in 1 Peter, much less one based on Galatians 3:28. What does seem evident in all cases is some sort of social instability in the church, whether brought on by errant theology or eschatology (Col; 1 Tim; and perhaps linked to false teaching) or stressful conditions in society in which Christians were being alienated and persecuted (1 Pet; see Elliott). In either case the solution arrived at was for the Christian community to structure its social behavior in ways that reflected conformity rather than opposition to the outside world. The more fundamental question is the intention in encouraging such behavior.

2.3. The Question of Intention. Along with the search for the source has gone the search for the motive or intention of the ethic taught by the NT household code, and numerous suggestions have been made (accommodation to secular ethics, Weidinger, Dibelius and more recently Schüssler Fiorenza; quieting enthusiastic unrest, Crouch, Martin; preventing internal disintegration brought on by outside pressures, Elliott 1981; defense-apologetic, Balch; mission, Schroeder, Goppelt).

However, the variation in the form the tradition takes and in the circumstances it addresses in the NT, as well as the absence of a single secular prototype, suggest that any one of the proposed solutions may be too narrow. It can be said generally that the NT household and church codes are concerned with Christian behavior in typical life situations; as in the secular Hellenistic setting, so too in the church: household roles and the household context provided the typical forum for discussing social ethics. Once the household metaphor is taken over as an expression of congregational identity (Eph; 1 Tim; Tit; 1 Pet), the same pattern of teaching can be expanded and applied to address life within the relationships in the broader Christian community and life as a Christian in the world. Goppelt observed

correctly that life lived at this level in the various social roles insured that Christians would be in daily contact with unbelievers with every opportunity to testify to the faith (Goppelt 1982, 2:170; 1993, 162–79).

Whether the household codes were specifically missionary in orientation in every NT application is another question. What can be said is that through them the NT writers reflect sensitivity to the expectations of society at large and seem to encourage Christians to live according to patterns that were widely accepted as respectable. But in view of the emphasis on justice and fairness and the extent to which the ethic is grounded in theology, none of the NT household codes reflect uncritical secularization. A creative middle ground was sought, and at least in some cases (Tit; 1 Pet) this would facilitate a "salt and light" Christian existence in the world. In other cases it might serve a different purpose or have in-house matters more in mind.

3. Household and Church Codes in the Later New Testament and Apostolic Fathers.

3.1. 1 Peter. As indicated, the circumstances of the recipients of a letter containing a household code provide the more reliable clues to the intention of the teaching than anything inherent in the form itself. 1 Peter is somewhat distinct (as compared, for instance, with Titus) in that it addresses churches already experiencing or about to experience alienation and abuse in society. This dimension of Christian existence had apparently led some people in those churches to consider either a form of compromise to avoid this criticism and hostility or perhaps to pull out and attempt to live a Christian life beyond the range of pagan society.

Peter responds to these options by reinforcing rather than reducing the sense of tension felt by his readers with a theology that explained their experience of alienation. God's election to membership in his family set them in a paradoxical situation—nonmembers in a world in which they must continue to live (1 Pet 1:1–2). On the one hand Christians are "foreigners," those who reside without citizenship and without rights in a land that is not their own (1 Pet 1:1; 2:11). On the other hand they are the equivalent of resident aliens, a slightly different metaphor that implies the same sorts of limitations as "foreigners" but also implies the need to live on in that foreign country (1 Pet 1:17; 2:11). Since God's action in Christ for his people has determined their situation, they may rejoice; and however much the pressures of this life might seem to contradict it, the hope of salvation to be realized in full only in the end is sure (1 Pet 1:3–7). This theology may explain how the predicament has come about and provide some assurance about the future fulfillment of God's promises, but there is little incentive in it for a continued commitment to living the arduous Christian life in a hostile world.

Another factor is mentioned to convince Christians to stay engaged in the social life of the world, whatever the perils: mission. At 1 Peter 2:11–12, Peter makes the turn from the theology of the Christian identity as aliens to appropriate Christian living. The main motive for living an exemplary life before pagans is the hope of their salvation (1 Pet 2:12; cf. 1 Pet 3:1, 15). If Christian living can lead to this, then the importance of continued engagement in social life can be seen. It is this point

that the household code that immediately follows (1 Pet 2:13–3:7) seeks to explore. Engagement will mean living as far as possible in accordance with the patterns of social life, and the secular household ethos provides the essential categories.

1 Peter 2:13–17 calls for submission to the government authorities. This would include a general attitude of respect toward those in authority (cf. Tit 3:1; Rom 13:1–4), which would be demonstrated in the specific acts of paying taxes (cf. Rom 13:6–7) and offering prayers in behalf of civil leaders (cf. 1 Tim 2:1–2; 1 Clem. 61.1–3). The rationale is that the civil government has been ordained by God and that such behavior will disprove the false accusations of outsiders who have slandered Christian households as being disloyal to the city-state. Apparently this kind of accusation was a current problem; the implication from the letter is that even exemplary behavior in this regard might not stop the abuse from unbelievers.

1 Peter 2:18–25 commands Christian slaves to submit to their masters. It is possible that it was more common in these churches for slaves to be Christians than masters, since masters are not addressed (cf. 1 Tim 6:1–2; Tit 2:9–10) and since the lengthy theological foundation establishes Christ's suffering as the pattern for Christian slaves who must continue to suffer unjustly. The unique christological grounding reveals the special circumstances of the churches to which Peter writes (cf. the confessional material used to ground the behavior in Titus 2:11–14; 3:3–7). In any case, the church's calling to engagement in the world prohibited slaves from opting out of this social institution. To encourage anything else would be regarded by unbelievers as anarchy.

1 Peter 3:1–7 closes the household code with teaching addressed to wives and husbands (*see* Marriage). Wives are to be submissive to husbands, and the two possible scenarios of mixed and Christian marriages are envisaged. A Christian wife whose husband was an unbeliever might experience harsh treatment for insubordination because of her foreign religion (1 Pet 3:1–2). Exemplary behavior might also be linked to her faith and so win over the unbelieving mate to Christ. Outer adornment is the specific aspect of respectable conduct given to illustrate the teaching (cf. 1 Tim 2:9–10). Spiritual inner adornment is commended (a gentle and quiet spirit), and Sarah's demeanor provides a pattern. Christian husbands are to refuse to treat their wives harshly (1 Pet 3:7). They are fellow heirs of eternal life; failure to treat them with the respect they are due as human beings and fellow heirs will affect their relationship with God (cf. 1 Tim 2:8).

At this point in the letter the teaching addressed to the traditional household code categories comes to an end. There is no question of the wholesale adoption of a pagan ethical code. The conduct encouraged certainly corresponds to secular ideals of respectability, but the grounds and intention of the teaching are thoroughly Christianized. What is unique about the code as it is applied in 1 Peter (in contrast to Col, Eph, 1 Tim, Tit) is the insistence on respectability and engagement by Christians in the social life of the world even when they have been marginalized by unbelieving society.

Church concerns continue in 1 Peter 3:8–5:11, with various themes being linked to the dominant one of suffering. In 1 Peter 5:1–5 Peter returns briefly to the

traditional format, addressing the congregational categories of elders in authority and younger believers who are to submit to that authority. The teaching to both parties is traditional (for leaders, cf. Acts 20:28; Rom 12:8; 1 Tim 3:1–13; Tit 1:6–9; for the younger, cf. 1 Cor 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12–13; Heb 13:17); the decision to expand the household code to address behavior within the broader congregational setting is in keeping with Peter's overarching concern for the church in the world; this "household" of God must maintain the lines of authority and order that will insure its acceptability in a society looking precisely for such things.

3.2. The Apostolic Fathers. Several passages in the group of late first- and second-century Christian writings known as the apostolic fathers assume the pattern observed in the NT household and church codes. Circumstances and concerns have changed. It is more likely that a less critical endorsement of the traditional patriarchal social order (such as Schüssler Fiorenza argues for the NT household codes) has now become evident in some cases.

3.2.1. 1 Clement. Clement's (*see* Clement of Rome) main concern as he addresses the Corinthian congregation is for unity and harmony (see esp. 1 Clem. 20; 37–38; 46–48). One threat to church stability came from a group that had apparently challenged ecclesiastical authority (1 Clem. 21.5; 44.1, 4; 47.6). The two passages fashioned as household codes suggest that Clement urged a return to traditional family values as the key to harmony. Moreover, the authority of the male head of the house, central to Roman ethical thinking among the aristocracy, corresponded to Clement's views of ecclesiastical authority in the church.

Two passages in *1 Clement* take the form of household or church codes. *1 Clement* 1.3 addresses teaching meant for all to the head of the family according to a hierarchical organization: submission to leaders, honor to older men (elders?), instruction to younger men; women were to cherish their husbands and live in subjection. *1 Clement* 2.1 states the goal of this pattern: to live in humility as characterized by a willingness to be in subjection (as the household ethic dictates) rather than demanding subjection (cf. Eph 5:21).

1 Clement 21.6–8 serves the theme of harmony expounded in the hymn of *1 Clement* 20. This time in the hortatory first person plural, the same basic order of instruction is followed: to honor leaders and elders (possibly church officers), to teach the younger, to guide women toward the good, to teach the children in the faith. Despite the first-person address, the absence of instructions to the husbands or fathers suggests the main addressee is the male leader of the household.

Differences between the NT household codes and those in *1 Clement* are evident and probably indicate changed circumstances and outlook. Instructions concerning children emphasize teaching rather than obedience to parents, perhaps because of the concern to safeguard the faith for succeeding generations. Slaves and masters are not addressed. In addition to addressing instructions to the male head of the house, the emphasis on the behavior of wives (in terms of obedience, purity and silence without reference to status in marriage or in Christ; cf. Eph 5:22–33; 1 Pet 3:1–7) reveals Clement's preference for the accepted order of things in his Roman setting. The household codes outline the divine pattern for unity and stability (1

Clem. 1.3; 20.11; 21.4). But the divine pattern, as Clement interprets it for household ethics, seems completely uncritical of Roman patriarchal assumptions (see Stambaugh and Balch, Bowe, Jeffers).

3.2.2. Ignatius and Polycarp. In the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp main concerns include false teachers (Ign. *Pol.* 3.1; Ign. Eph. 6.2; Ign. Trall. 6.1; Ign. Magn. 8.1; Ign. Smyrn. 6.2; Pol. *Phil.* 7), and the answer to their threat comes in maintaining unity in the church and ecclesiastical (episcopal) order (Ign. *Pol.* 1.2; 6.1; Pol. *Phil.* 5.3). To aid the church in achieving this unity Ignatius in his *Letter to Polycarp* 4.1–5.2 introduces a church code (somewhat closer in tone and content to the NT codes than *1 Clement*) that combines instructions concerning treatment of widows and slaves and reciprocal instructions to wives and husbands with instructions to Polycarp himself concerning ministry. Although the immediate application of the code is to an internal matter, we should be aware of Ignatius's general positive attitude toward unbelievers and desire for their repentance that underlie his instructions to live in harmony with the world (Ign. Eph. 10.1-3). Thus the pattern of life described in the household or church code might be applied to internal instability, but it is not without outward effect. Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* 4.2–6.1 instructs the church similarly, according to household groups and church-specific groups—wives, widows, deacons, young men, young women, elders—blending them much as Titus 2:1–10 does. Although he does not elaborate, the order of life Polycarp encourages is introduced as that which pleases the Lord (Pol. *Phil.* 5.2; 6.1; 4.1).

3.2.3. The *Didache* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The *Didache* is partly (*Did.* 1.1–6.2) a catechetical work designed to prepare new believers for baptism (*Did.* 7.1) and partly a text on church order (*Did.* 6.3–16.8). The much different purpose of the *Epistle of Barnabas* is to demonstrate that Christians are the genuine children (see Son) of God. *Didache* 4.9-11 instructs parents to discipline their children, masters to treat their slaves reasonably and slaves to be subject to their masters. The reciprocity, the theme of submission and the motivation (the impartiality of God, who is over both master and slave) suggest a link with the tradition as used in Colossians and Ephesians. Probably the writer has incorporated material from the Pauline letters (the possibility that the writer had access to an earlier teaching source, which Colossians and Ephesians also knew, is explored by Munro). *Barnabas* 19.5, 7 uses the same material (the matter of source is unclear; there may have been a common source accessible to each writer) with slight alterations, reversing the order of instructions to slaves first, then masters. In each case the household code material has been incorporated into the collection of traditions used to explain the Two Ways teaching (of “life and death,” *Did.* 1.1; of “light and

darkness,” Barn. 18.1). The household and community relationship ethics implied by these sections are not applied in any discernible way to immediate situations. The material is simply included as orthodox.

4. Conclusions.

The household codes of both the NT and the apostolic fathers reflect an awareness of the expectations of the Greco-Roman environment of the church. However, they also reveal some subtle differences in the way the church at different times and in different situations sought to interact with secular society. NT usage of the device demonstrates sensitivity to secular values and in critically adjusting certain features (emphasizing justice and fairness and providing a theological rationale) aimed to direct Christians to a constructive middle ground, avoiding either the simple return to patriarchy or emancipation. 1 Peter utilizes the household code with Christian engagement in the social life of the world in mind (cf. Tit 2–3), and it is significant that this engagement is necessitated by the church's identity and mission as aliens and foreigners who are God's elect.

In the writings of the apostolic fathers, household codes are used—without evidence of the critical reflection upon the church's responsibility in the world seen in 1 Peter—to preserve the status quo. The shape of the two codes in *1 Clement* suggests a preference for patriarchy on the Roman model; Schüssler Fiorenza's interpretation may fit this later situation. The *Didache* and *Epistle of Barnabas* have employed another recension of the household code but in any case offer its teaching as traditional without reflecting on its implications. Ignatius and Polycarp are more in touch with NT household codes but are mainly preoccupied with restoring church stability and unity. For this the codes provide a structure for respectable behavior in relationships that complement the writers' understanding of ecclesiastical authority. Although Ignatius's outlook on the church in the world may be an exception, the household codes in the late first- and second-century church seem to function less to keep the church on the cutting edge of eschatological tension with contemporary society and more to preserve a status quo.

See also House, Spiritual House; Households, Family; Slave, Slavery; Social Setting of Early Non-Pauline Christianity; Woman and Man.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres* (EB; Paris: Gabalda, 1958); D. L. Balch, “Household Codes,” *ABD* (1992) 3:318–20; idem, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (SBLMS 26; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981); L. W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967); B. E. Bowe, *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome* (HDR 23; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988); J. E. Crouch,

Ign. Eph. Ignatius *Letter to the Ephesians*

Ign. Trall. Ignatius *Letter to the Trallians*

Ign. Magn. Ignatius *Letter to the Magnesians*

Ign. Smyrn. Ignatius *Letter to the Smyrneans*

Barn. *Epistle of Barnabas*

EB Études bibliques

ABD Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. D. N. Freedman

SBLMS Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series

HDR Harvard Dissertations in Religion

The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser an Philemon* (3d ed.; HNT 12; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953); J. H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981); L. Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993 [1978]); idem, "Jesus und die Haustafeltradition" in *Orientierung an Jesus*, ed. P. Hoffmann (Freiburg: Herder, 1973) 93–105; idem, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) vol. 2; L. Hartman, "Some Unorthodox Thoughts on the 'Household-Code Form'" in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, ed. J. Neusner et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 219–34; T. Herr, *Naturrecht aus der kritischen Sicht des Neuen Testaments* (Munich, Paderborn and Vienna: Schöningh, 1976); J. S. Jeffers, *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, eds. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings* (2d ed.; ed. and rev. M. W. Holmes; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); H. von Lips, "Die Haustafel als 'Topos' im Rahmen der urchristlichen Paränese," *NTS* 40 (1994) 261–80; D. Lührmann, "Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Ökonomie," *NTS* 27 (1980) 83–97; R. P. Martin, "Haustafeln," *NIDNTT* 3:928–32; W. Munro, *Authority in Paul and Peter: The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter* (SNTSMS 45; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); K. Müller, "Die Haustafel des Kolosserbriefes und das antike Frauenthema" in *Die Frau in Urchristentum*, ed. G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein and K. Müller (QD 95; Freiburg, Basel and Vienna: Herder, 1983) 263–319; W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Herm; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); W. Schrage, "Zur Ethik der NT Haustafeln," *NTS* 21 (1974) 1–22; D. Schroeder, "Die Haustafeln des neuen Testaments (ihre Herkunft und theologischer Sinn)" (unpublished dissertation; Hamburg: Mikrokopie, 1959); idem, "Lists, Ethical," *IDBSup* (1976) 546; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1984); J. E. Stambaugh and D. L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); G. Strecker, "Die neutestamentlichen Haustafeln" in *Neues Testament und Ethik: Festschrift für R. Schnackenburg*, ed. H. Merklein (Freiburg,

Basel and Vienna: Herder, 1989) 349–75; K. Thraede, "Zum historischen Hintergrund der 'Haustafeln' des NT" in *Pietas, Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*, ed. E. Dassmann et al. (Munich: JAC Ergänzungsband 8, 1980) 359–68; K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln: Ein Stück urchristlicher Paränese* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1928); A. Weiser, "Titus 2 als Gemeindeparänese" in *Neues Testament und Ethik: Festschrift für R. Schnackenburg*, ed. H. Merklein (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna: Herder, 1989) 397–414; K. Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971).

P. H. Towner¹

FRLANT Forschungen zur Religion und Literaturedes Alten und Neuen Testaments
 3d third edition
 HNT Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
 ed. edition; editor(s), edited by
 vol. volume
 2d second edition
 rev. revised (edition)
 SNTSMS Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
 QD Quaestiones Disputatae
 Herm Hermeneia

¹Martin, R. P., & Davids, P. H. (2000, c1997). *Dictionary of the later New Testament and its developments* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.