

Dr. Daniel K. Darko, Prison Epistles, Session 29, Household Code, Ephesians 5:21-6:9

© 2024 Dan Darko and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Dan Darko and his lecture series on the Prison Epistles. This is session 29 Household Code, Ephesians 5:21-6:9.

Welcome back to the Biblical Study Lecture Series. You have been doing very well, so please keep going.

We have two more, and we'll be finishing our series on prison epistles. I hope you are learning as I am learning myself. In the past lecture, just recapping from the past lecture, I drew your attention beginning from chapter 5, verse 1, how Paul made all these contrasts, and then in the end, he contrasted light and darkness and challenged the readers to actually live as children of light.

In this lecture, I have called it the Household Code. The Household Code, basically, is a word that is translated from the German, Hausdorfer. Hausdorfer, in German, is for rules that should govern a house.

In other words, household management principles. Trying to bring it in English, English scholars actually found the appropriate way to translate it as Household Code, hence the title Household Code. But we are placing the Household Code in a context that you probably have not been looking at prior.

Let's begin by looking at verse 15 of Ephesians chapter 5 because that is where we will start our discussion on husband-wife relationship, parent-child relationship, and slave-master relationship from this particular point where Paul is going to contrast foolish ways and wise ways. So, let's read that. From verse 15, look carefully at how you work, not as unwise but as wise, making the best use of the time because the days are evil.

Therefore, do not be foolish but understand what the will of the Lord is. And do not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery, but be filled with the Spirit, addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody to the Lord with your heart, giving thanks always and for everything to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ. Let's pause here for a minute.

In verses 15 to 21, Paul continues his moral instruction on wise, foolish antithesis. Up until this time, his focus has been on how the community works together in unity as the body of Christ. He has been issuing all kinds of instruction to promote what we

call internal cohesion, in other words, solidarity, a sense of harmony within the community.

And here, with this particular contrast, we are going to see how he will switch in a very, very clever way from a relationship with the wider church that he has been describing as the household of God into a relationship with the micro household of individual believers, namely small family home setting. He starts by challenging them not to be unwise. I like that.

He doesn't start by using the Greek word foolish. He actually literally used the English word, the Greek word unwise as so forth instead of so forth. He said as so forth.

So English is the best translation, so do not be unwise. Instead, be wise. Just that kind of a rhetorical framework to strengthen the contrast he's trying to be, to make.

The wise person in the ancient world is a person who is able to make sound moral judgments. It is not somebody who has gone to the university and has got all A's in all their classes but lives a life that actually when you look at the actuality of the life they live, there's nothing commendable there. No, the wise person makes moral choices at the right time, at the right places.

In both the Old Testament and the New Testament, the wise person follows the precepts of God and exhibits them in real conduct. Their judgment is highly influenced by what God wants, and they do well in self-discipline to be able to live these things out. What is in the mind translates into their character and way of life.

The foolish person, rather, makes bad choices. The foolish person makes moral choices that, in the end, affect themselves affect other people, affect society in general and cause all kinds of problems. The foolish person's judgment is reflected in the kind of life they lead.

So, you can actually see the way they are living their lives, and you know that they have actually made some bad decisions in their lives. For Paul in Ephesians, the wise is the one who has come to know the Lord and is living to please the Lord. It is on this note he challenges those he has just, a verse or two earlier said, they should live as children of light to say, now I want you not to live as unwise people but as the wise.

Let me highlight a few things from this passage. Looking at the unwise-wise contrast, you see what Paul is doing here, trying to show life not to live so that you can embrace how to live. Showing unworthy patterns of thought and behavior that need to be abandoned so as to embrace the worthy thoughts and behavior commendable among the children of God.

Foolish ways versus wise ways. You note in the passage that I read, he made a clear contrast between unwise and wise, as I mentioned. Then, he goes on to challenge them to make the most of their time.

Verse 16, making the best use of the time. You know, English doesn't help a whole lot, so let me just clarify some things here. The Greek word is a commercial language.

It's a marketplace language. It's buying time. The wise person buys time.

They seize time. They make good use of time. They do not procrastinate.

At every given time, they make the right decision to get the best out of their lives. Think about seizing or buying. In fact, the word, actually the root of it is like buying time.

You know, pay whatever price it needs to be paid to actually grab, take hold of the time, and make good use of it. Don't let time run you. Manage your time.

I've often stretched that particular line when I'm talking to church leaders about time management. But that's not the main point here. Paul's point is that in the moral contest when you are thinking about Christian behavior, make good use of your time.

The reason is that time is crucial here. The days are evil. Still, the concept of time in the word days.

The days are evil. You cannot afford just to live your life anyhow. In these times, make the most out of your time.

He goes on again, now using a different word to say, you should not be foolish. The word is also in Greek; what we call it, he introduces the prefix for a word that is phronesis or phronesis, another word for wisdom. Instead of saying, don't be foolish, he comes in and uses the prefix to say, yes, don't be foolish here.

But what he's saying is to be careful about making poor moral judgment but seek to use your brain power, your mental capacity, for something else. Understand what the will of God is and let that shape your life. Paul had prayed for the church, chapters one and three, that they may know so many things about God.

They may know the riches of his grace. They may know what pleases God. They may have knowledge of so many forms here.

He says instead of being foolish, seek to understand the will of God, the wishes of God, and the desires of God. And then he makes another contrast, which is just off what the foolish person is supposed to do. And that same contrast framework.

In other words, the foolish would like to get drunk, but do not get drunk with wine because it leads to debauchery. The word can be translated as licentiousness.

It leads to all kinds of sexual immorality and sexual deviance. It's a very loaded word. It's not poignant.

The word is esoteric, and it has this connotation. Do not get drunk with wine because it leads to debauchery. But on the contrary, as wise, be filled, avail yourself for the filling of the spirit.

When you are filled with the spirit, Paul grammatically introduces what we call participles in Greek, five participles, to actually explain the resultant effect of being filled by the spirit. For those who are filled by the spirit, five things happen in your lives. But before we go to those five things, let me draw your attention to the line: do not get drunk with wine and how we may understand it.

We may understand it as popular culture, a culture in which drinking and drinking in excess was all over the place. It was not new. A culture where drinking was part of the daily meals.

Some scholars have actually argued that we understand that particular line: do not get drunk with wine but be filled with the spirit in the context of Greco-Roman mealtime, where, where the family meets, they have food out there. They are likely to be sitting on the floor. They have wine there, and they are going to sing some hymns or some pagan songs.

I'm not talking about Christian here. They have their own family deity. So, even during the course of the food, they may say prayers thanks to the deity that supplied them with that meal.

And so, one particular scholar who pushed this forward that other scholars are picking up says, you know, he can see this being a context that is shaping this so that when Paul wrote this, the church in Ephesus hears this and say, yes, I got that. Paul is saying like meal time. When we come to meal time, instead of all these pagan activities, this is what should happen here.

That's one view. The other view is actually one that is increasingly picking up to read this text against the background of the activities of Bacchus, a particular pagan God, the God of wine. And those who hold that view, one particular guy, Rogers, who has advanced this particular view, has pointed out rightly that while practices and drinking were part of the rituals of this particular God.

In fact, one of the main rituals that people like to go to in the middle of the night in celebration of Bacchus or Dionysus is to eat raw meat, sometimes with blood in it, and they drink a lot of wine with it. And as they are doing that, they believe that they are being filled by the power of the god. And so here, the scholar who put this argument forward earlier on in the late, I think it's the late nineties, was to draw our attention to the fact that, you know, this is what is going on here.

These people know what it means to go to the shrine of this particular God, the God of wine, eat raw meat, be filled, or be empowered. So, you get the spirit; I like to make that analogy, the spirit of the bottle, actually filling them with the raw meat and feeling empowered by Bacchus being contrasted by being filled with another spirit with a big S. And now when that spirit of God fills you, something else happens. In fact, the Eggman is made quite well because one of the things we know about this particular shrine is that their rituals include a lot of drunkenness and promiscuity.

People get drunk; people sleep around on the shrine, and they behave in a way that is not appropriate by any standard. Here, the contrast of the Holy Spirit becomes one of the reasons why Rogers thinks definitely, definitely, definitely. Paul is making a very important point here because these people will sing, they will eat, they will drink, and now they feel like they are empowered by the spirit of this deity. It is on that note that he said that if the feeling of the spirit has to do with a supernatural infilling of the spirit of God, it would only be logical to suppose that the drunk with wine could have a supernatural implication.

The significance would then be in contrast with the feeling of the spirit of Bacchus through wine and the feeling of the true and living God by his spirit. I think sometimes we spend a lot of time in scholarship trying to make a whole lot out of this. I don't see a contradiction, actually, in terms of background.

What does the church read Paul's writings and begin to look like? It sounds like the mealtime discussion, or it actually seems like the imagery is what happens at the shrine of Bacchus. Fair enough. Paul's point here is what not to do.

Don't get drunk with wine. That is what the foolish do. The wise, on the contrary, are filled and passive.

They are filled. They avail themselves to be filled by the spirit. I have said several times and shown you several times in Ephesians how Paul puts what we call divine passive and actually prays that God may strengthen the people or the people might be filled to the fullness of God.

Here, too, he said they, personal responsibility, they have to avail themselves for God to fill them, and if only they do so, something will happen. When they are filled by

the spirit, five things result from that. And so, in Greek, you have these five participles addressing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs.

That's what happens to people who are filled with the spirit. This is a natural outcome. I have argued elsewhere that we actually need to take note of something else we often lose sight of.

The word in Greek is not singing to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. The word in Greek is speaking or addressing one another in psalms. So, can you imagine addressing somebody and the heart from which you speak, the demeanor you put forward, and your personal interaction nourishes and refreshes the person as if you are singing and all that?

I don't know what speaking, singing, and psalms will look like, but one thing I know is that they will nourish somebody. It will edify someone. Paul says that when you are filled with the spirit, the first thing that results from that grammatically, as the sentence status stands, is that your speech is affected.

The way you speak to one another is affected. It's affected. And the evidence is that when people hear you, they hear you talking.

The way you speak sounds like wonderful music. I'm not going to ask you about your favorite music because you may not give me an old Christian hymn, so I won't ask you for that. You might ask why you mentioned an artist that I don't know about. But can you imagine someone talking to you? And how you feel is a sense of feeling you get when you are listening to your favorite music.

When the Holy Spirit fills the believers, one of the outcomes, the resultant effects, is they speak to one another in psalms. The other thing they do is sing. And that is constructed with the conjunction-making melody, introducing the third one.

They do that to the Lord with your heart. They don't sing because it is this tedious work to do. They sing because out of the fullness of gratitude and joy of their heart, they sing to the Lord.

People who are filled with the Spirit have this effect on their lives. Can you imagine, guys, that you are just doing some housework, trying to fix something in the house, and all you hear is your wife singing, good voice or bad voice, who cares? Wonderful songs praising God because she is overjoyed. Do you think that the first thing that comes to your mind is that our house is so tense and difficult to be in? No.

The natural thing is, wow, what a beauty. This is wonderful. Ladies, can you imagine while cooking in the kitchen, your husband fixing something in the oven, and he turns the television off, and he stops that computer game, and he is just singing, and

at some point uncontrollably singing so loud to the point that you could hear him, and you know that he is praising God with joy and gladness.

Paul says that when people are filled with the Spirit, something about what comes of their hearts in praise to God, in making melody, is beautiful. The fourth thing he highlights there is thanksgiving. Note that is the only one that he always says.

Giving thanks always and for everything to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know he mentioned the virtue of thanksgiving? Thanksgiving. When people are filled with the Spirit, they are full of thanksgiving.

They know what God has done, and they know the power of God at work within themselves, and their behavior doesn't remain the same. Their way of conduct doesn't remain the same. Thanksgiving.

If you are watching this, and you are a married person, could you make an observation? Catch yourself when you are being ungrateful, and ask, is this virtue called thanksgiving or gratitude part of how I live my life? Why is it so difficult for me to say thank you? I notice when my children do what is almost the most obvious, and I say thank you, and we have guests, I see some reaction. It's almost like, what is going on here? Because I have been telling them that I live my life as if I am not entitled to anything. It is by the grace of God that someone shows me a favor by helping or offering some service to me.

Yes, they are my children, but they could have chosen to make my life very difficult. For that, I am grateful. I have not arrived, but I am cultivating this gratitude.

And you probably notice I spend a lot of time studying these kinds of things in Paul, and they are beginning to have an effect on me. You can give yourself that assignment. Please don't impose it on your spouse, but just ask yourself how grateful I am.

I have often told my family that when we travel, let's find an opportunity for someone to say thank you to us. That is when we know we are being human. Gratitude is a great virtue.

Paul said, fill with the spirit. We give thanks to God always, always. Always.

This place is not as nothing in the heart that is filled with this sense of entitlement. You probably have heard me say that word a few times. I am living in America right now, and I can't believe it.

It is all about the place. Everybody feels entitled to everything. Wow, really? Do you realize that it is not your right for the person who serves you at a grocery store to say

thank you for shopping with us? Do you know that is not your right? Do you know it's not your right that when you go to Target, and you just try to enter and say, oh, thank you, welcome, welcome, thank you for shopping with us?

Do you know it's not your right that somebody gives you the opportunity to brighten up? I think it's not my right. As the spirit of God works in us, let's look at what others are doing to contribute to who we are so that we can be grateful to God in this context and by extension to our fellow human beings. The fifth thing that happens when the spirit is filling us is the word is continually filling. When the spirit is filling us continuously, the fifth thing that happens is submission.

Yes, the S word. The Sword. Submission.

Submission to one another out of reverence for Christ. You have to know that here, submission is not to God. Yes, I know that most people, as soon as they talk about submission, say, oh yeah, I find it easy to submit to God.

That's not a point here. Submission to one another out of reverence for Christ. It is here that Paul is going to link this conversation to how husbands and wives should relate with one another.

If you are filled with the spirit, your speech is affected, and you sing and make melody to the Lord, and you are filled with thanksgiving always to God, and you are ready to submit, that submission is not to you like a failure. Then, when we go home from church, things will change for the better. So, let's see what Paul does.

I hope by this time, you are beginning to appreciate Paul. I hope you fall in love with Paul. You know I'm biased with Paul.

I just like him. Not because I like controversy, but that is Paul. Paul is going to begin from there, verse 22, wives submit to your husband's ask to the Lord.

I should draw your attention to something here before we move on, and I'll show you some cultural issues to make this conversation a decent way so that I don't get you irritated, you don't get Paul misunderstood, and you don't give your spouse a big trouble. Verse 22 in Greek does not mean that you are filled with the spirit. The five things that come as a result of that, one of them is what verse 22 will borrow as the verb.

So, when the text actually reads like wives submit to their husband's ask to the Lord, it should actually read like this if we were translating it literally. It should be verse 21 submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ, wives also ask to your own husbands. In other words, the word submit is not in verse 21 and is borrowed from the discussion on the filling of the spirit.

What that means is we were all filled by the spirit in the church presumably, and if we are willing ourselves to be filled by the spirit, then we can all submit to one another out of reverence for Christ. It is in that spirit that wives' submission should be extended specifically to their husbands. Hold on to that thought because I have had it several times teaching Paul.

Female students in the university tell me that we don't like the S word. And I say, oh, S word. Sushi, they say no.

Socials, no. I mean, you know, college students, I'm hitting on things they like. No, no, no, no.

S word, submit. Submission. Why submission? I get reaction, submission.

Paul said in 21, those who are filled by the spirit, submit to one another. Wives also ask to your husbands. Submit as you will submit to the Lord.

I will unpack that, but I will not be able to make this point clear enough, knowing that our audience is from different parts of the world following this series online. So, I need to point out some cultural issues in the first century that were very important to understand the instruction that Paul would give on husband-wife relationships, parent-child relationships, and master-slave relationships in Ephesians. So, let's look at a few of them, specifically five of them regarding cultural issues.

One, I would like to just give you a gist, a brief, brief discussion on the composition of households, the people who are in a household, and the size of the average household in some settings. I will also try to draw your attention to an important part of how households function, what we call the unwritten code of honor and shame. That is a cultural part of how people behave and how it affects the way people are accepted or embraced in society.

The next thing I would draw your attention to is age difference between husbands and wife, which is very important in the discussion we'll have in Ephesians to help you to understand how the ancient world, marriage, and age differences affect relationships. The fourth thing I will bring to your attention is what I have called, and I'm glad that some of my scholars friends are beginning to now think it's a valid word which you use, I created this expression oikos polis linkage, which is actually meaning the ancient concept, especially among Greeks, that order or concord in the household has a direct linkage or direct effect on order or concord in society. So, when there is order in the household, they are likely to be order in society.

And the philosophers will argue that the wider society, the wider polis, is made up of many households. And so if there is order in all these many households, there is

likely and more likely to have an effect on order in the wider society. We use paragraphs to explain this.

As I try to write this, and because I work on this subject, I began getting tired of using paragraphs to explain the same concept. So, I created that word, those words which come from Greek, oikos for the house, polis for the city, and I call it the oikos polis linkage. And I will try to explain to you how that relates to what is going on in our understanding of households.

I will also draw your attention to how scenic, stoic debates on marriage help us understand what is going on with Paul here. Now, as you see the diagram I have shown you, the number one that I reserved for last, because I wanted it to be the first thing you remember, and that's what I'll be talking about now, is the scenic stoic debate on marriage. In the scenic stoic debate on marriage, it is held among the stoics that marriage is desirable.

The stoics believe that marriage helps the philosopher in their pursuit for wisdom. And marriage also helps society in a good way. For the stoic, the ideal person is the wise person.

And so, they will argue that a wise person capable of wise judgment and moral reasoning ought to marry, have children, and raise those children responsibly, and in fact, they will also affect society in a positive way. The scenic, however, argue against that. The scenic don't like marriage.

They think marriage is an obstacle. They say that marriage is an obstacle to a person's pursuit in life. It hinders people from the ability to move around and do things anytime, anywhere they like.

They actually find it deplorable that a noble person would choose to marry and raise children. It is not a good thing. So, by the first century, this was a hot argument between the Stoics and the Cynics.

But the stoics were always winning. The stoic' ideals were more held in society. By the time of Paul, by far, the most influential philosophical group were the stoics.

You see what Paul is doing here. He is linking, knowing that his readers read Greek, influenced significantly by Greek culture. He knows that when you think about being wise and you talk about marriage, it may make a lot of sense.

So, he ends his discussion on marriage, on being wise, with not even a full stop. He weaves that, his last sentence of the discussion on living as a wise person, into how husbands and wives live together. I have drawn my colleagues' attention in

scholarship to the fact that I think that if this is not deliberate on Paul's part, Paul's readers in Asia Minor are going to say, bingo.

Being wise, it's okay to have a wife and children. You raise them responsibly, and you raise them in the fear of God. The stoics believe that the gods preside over marriage and the gods are very good and influential in helping the family actually doing things that they need to do, even with business and slaves and everybody in the house to function well.

Guess what Paul will do? Paul will place Christ, not the deities, at the center of marriage life as a model and motivation so that they will live at peace with one another. Talking about stoics, let me draw your attention to what Yambro writes. Yambro is the one who I think has given us one of the wonderful discussions on this issue of stoic cynic debate.

He writes in his book that they, the Stoics, argue that marriage is desirable and that a wife and children are helpful to man, running the household, taking care of him in old age, and setting him free from the pursuit of philosophy. The Stoics also have another reason for marrying, one which sets the debate in a new context. They argue that marriage not only frees one for the study of philosophy but also for taking part in political affairs.

Indeed, consent for the polis, namely the city, is primary for them. Without marriage, they argue, there will be no love for children, and without children, the cities will perish. It is on this note I would submit that Paul is perhaps bringing this at the background of his conversation on household.

The next thing I want to draw your attention quickly to is the composition of the household with the people and the size. Some households will have 20 people or more. Some scholars have even estimated that most households may have 20 or more people.

These people will be made up of slaves, and some of the slaves may even have children. And you want to know that if you own a slave and the slave has children, the children are the property of the slave master. And even if the slave buys their freedom, the master still owns the children that were born while the person was in their slavery care.

So, you will have children there that are not legitimate children that are legitimate heirs of the father, but they could be children of the slaves. The other thing you want to know, I think I mentioned earlier in this series, is that in the average city, 30 to 35 percent of the population will be made up of slaves. So, slavery was pretty common.

I should draw your attention also to the fact that when you read about households in the New Testament, and you come across children, the children are not necessarily from the same mother because sometimes the children are the children of the man whose wife passed, and the man married another woman and have more children with the other woman. Or the children will be referenced to the children that the man had with his wife, the slave's children that are also in that house, that are also his children. If it is an older man, it could also be the children of his daughter who was married and the husband passed away, and the children were brought to her father so that her father would take care of the children so that she would have the opportunity to be able to go and get married and have children with another man.

Children in the ancient context then don't have the sense that we have today when we think about my children. In the household, there were class structures of relationship. The husband is the head of the household.

He's also the master of the slave. And you want to know that the husband being the head, the wife is what I call the chief operation officer, the COO of the house. He is the head.

The husband is the head. And Paul would invoke that. But he would do a lot of things with the wife and through the wife, as I will explain later.

I like to draw your attention to a female scholar who talks about this subject so that it will balance things out. Some of my female colleagues who have been working on this subject are shedding a great light on a few areas that we need to be aware of. Pomeroy writes the age difference between spouses at first marriage, the average age of death for men, which will be 45, and the aversion to living fertile women without a husband made it likely that children would be orphaned, fatherless, early in life, and a young widow will remarry, perhaps leaving her children in their father's house and becoming a mother again, or, and, or a stepmother elsewhere.

Another female, a colleague of mine who retired recently, a Catholic nun, Lynn Osiek, writes household and family units that include children, slaves, unmarried relatives, often freedmen and freed women, and other renters of shop or residential property. Women headed some households, too, both singly and with other women. Therefore, it would seem that in spite of the strictly patriarchal legal structure of families, there was a great deal of variety in the composition of actual households.

So, this is actually to remind us that when we think about the composition of the ancient household, we should be careful not to go too fast to get some of the way things are explained to us and just make it look like, oh, the men are always tyrannic, women have no rights whatsoever, and the family is made up in, just understand the composition. The other thing I want to draw your attention to is honor and shame. Honor and shame were the unwritten codes of the ancient world.

There is what we call the ascribed honor, which is actually attainable by birth, wealth, or power. So, if you are born into a noble home, you actually are ascribed this honor. There is what we call the acquired honor.

This is conferred. If you achieve something or you live a decent life and you are from even a poor background, you are known to put yourself together; you conduct yourself well in society, and you gain this honor. It was very, very important for household members to behave well to protect the honor of the household.

The worst thing that could happen to them in ancient society is to be deemed shameful or dishonorable family. Honor and shame were such an important thing; as Rivers put it, honor is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society. It is the estimation of his own worth, his claim to pride, but it is also the acknowledgment of that claim, his excellence recognized in society by his right pride.

Women in this context of honor and shame were potential sources of shame. And it was the role of the male household head to guard the family's honor by protecting the woman, the woman's sexual virtue. We know that one of the worst things that could happen to a man who is the head of the household is to have any of the women in his household violated sexually by an outsider.

It actually meant that he, the male head of the household, and all the males in the household were incapable of protecting the women in their household. The women are also, therefore, urged to do their part in keeping that family coercion intact. Everybody is doing their bit to make sure that the honor of the family is kept intact.

For the age difference, you need to know that the average woman, especially for the Romans, for Greeks, and most of the Greeks, will be around 14. But the Romans, women could be given up for marriage by 12, compared to the men. Men will go to marriage between 25 and 30 years old.

So be aware that when you read husband and wife relationship in the New Testament, and you hear about the husband being the head, he's not only being the head because he's a male culturally, yes, it is true that because he's a male in the patriarchal society, he gets to have some prerogatives and priority. But the other thing is, he's 10 years or more older than his wife. And in that culture, age is very important.

You respect those who are older than you, you obey and comport yourself well in the presence of those who are older than you. So, when Paul tells the wife to submit to your husband, he's not saying anything that will upset the woman of the first century. In fact, what Paul is doing in Ephesians, that you may appreciate, is he was taking a lot of rights away from the man.

And I'll draw your attention to that. The other thing I told you I'll draw your attention to is the Oikos-Polis linkage, which basically, to put it in a very simple way, order in the household and the roles each household member plays is important for order in a society. The key word when they are talking about household and politics is concord or word harmony.

Early Christians found it very, very important. And they actually thought this is a good concept. So, they began to refer to the church as a household.

They use household imagery for the church. So when Christians behave well in their micro household, the macro household of God begins to function well. Just draw your attention to how household in the private home relates to the wider political society.

I'll show you something about Aristotle in a minute. So please understand that what Paul is doing here is he has talked about relationships in the household of God all this while. Now he says, if you are being filled by the Holy Spirit, all these things come out of you.

And among them is humility or submission. Submission then moves on to say, why submit to your husband? Then, he discusses the micro household. So if the micro household is functioning well, the macro church of God will do well.

Because you know what? The church is made up of families. And if the families are not functioning well and you get a few families in a household, guess what the problem would be? These are churches that met in people's homes. There was no nursery, just in case you're thinking about that, for the children in the service.

There's no youth group. They all meet together. So, imagine if there is a lack of order in the micro household; how that will come into effect when you come to church in somebody's home and you don't have time limits?

God bless our Western churches. We go to church sometimes for one hour, one hour, 15 minutes, one hour, or 30 minutes, and the service is over. No, you go to church and you have fun as long as and the children are there.

The structure, the upbringing, the love, all that is going on in the household begin to have direct effect now, not necessarily on the political society, but on the household of God. I have argued that Paul seemed to be playing on that in the way he construct the ethics of the micro household and the macro household of God in Ephesians. On a political sense, I will not do well if I don't draw your attention to two things.

One is the one who actually argued this out clearly after Plato stated it, Aristotle, and how other philosophers picked it up, and then by the first century, it became part of popular culture in the way people look at families. So, Aristotle, in his politics, writes that justice is the bond of men in states for the administration of justice, which is the determination of what is just is the principle of order in a political society. Seeing then that the state is made up of households, before speaking of the state, we must speak of the management of the household.

Aristotle goes on to say that wives need to submit to their husbands. He will give clear directions, almost like Paul, in how members of the household need to behave. As far as the male head is concerned, I've chosen to draw your attention to Plutarch.

When an orator, this is a criticism against an orator, Gorgias, read to the Greeks at Olympia a speech about Concord. In other words, he wants to move the people for unity. And Plutarch is critiquing what is going on.

And yet, in his own household, he has not prevailed upon himself, his wife, and maidservant, three persons only to live in Concord. For there was apparently some love on Gorgias' part and jealousy on the wife's part toward the girl. A man, therefore, ought to have his household well harmonized who is going to harmonize the state, forum, and friends.

The point is that Gorgias comes in and says, hey, I am this great orator. I am going to get you guys to come out together. And the critique is this.

All three people are in his household, and he couldn't keep them together. Why do you think he has any message on harmony for the rest of the police? And so Plutarch will criticize that sternly. It is on that note I draw your attention to the husband-wife relationship in Ephesians.

Ephesians will go on to actually call wives to submit to their husbands voluntarily. The word is voluntary submission in the Greek expression. She should submit in the Lord.

That is Christological validation for why she should submit. It is the right thing for Christians to do. As a wife, it is in your own interest at a time to submit to your husband.

For the husband, you have a lot to do, actually. Paul challenges the husband to love the wife as Christ loves the church. Christ has to be the model for the husband.

Christ gave himself up for the church, and so should the husband give himself up for the wife. If he's going to do so, what is going to happen ultimately is that he might sanctify her by what he does, and he might present the church to himself. In other

words, his wife to himself was like the church to Christ in splendor, in glory without spot or wrinkle or in a sighting.

I like that. You love and care for your wife. She will be so glorious that the wrinkles and all that will disappear.

That he, she might be holy and blameless. The theological basis for this is clear. It is biblical that the wife and the husband must be together.

Musonius Rufus has drawn our attention to something that scholars have tried to play down and to some of us came in as young scholars to bring out. There was a notion that in the ancient world, men never loved their wives. Absolute false.

We are unpacking a lot of data that actually shows that men love their wives. In fact, sometimes men are criticized by being so attached and so emotional in their loving relationship with their wives. Some philosophers don't want to do their work well because they are too attached to their wives and loving them.

They want to have romantic out dates and all that with your wife, and they are criticized for that. Musonius Rufus says that the primary end of marriage is a community of life with a view to the procreation of children. The husband and wife, he used to say, should come together for the purpose of making a life in common and of procreation of children and furthermore of regarding all things in common between them and nothing peculiar to one or the other, not even to their own bodies.

In marriage, note this: there must be, above all, perfect companionship and mutual love of husband and wife. This is not a Christian writing. Both in health and in sickness and under all conditions, since it was with desire for this as well as for having children that both entered upon marriage.

It was clear from all the accounts we have in the ancient world that love was expressed through men, and love for the wife was important. Men here are encouraged to love their wives when wives are not asked to allow their husbands to dictate to them, but they are asked voluntarily to submit to them. If you know the ancient culture, you would know that women in this context would be very, very happy about what Paul is saying because he's not giving the husband any mandate to impose anything on them but that they would do it willingly because they are free with their spirit and it's a natural outcome to submit to their husbands.

On the relationship with fathers and children, fathers do not provoke your children to anger, Paul writes, but bring them up in discipline and instruction in the Lord. Children, obey your parents in the Lord for this is right. Honor your father and mother because if you do so there will be two promises for you.

Things may go well, and you may live longer. It's the right thing to do. Lastly, on the slaves, Paul challenges the slaves to obey their masters with fear and trembling, with sincere heart as they would to Christ and their masters; he challenges them to do the same in the way they treat their slaves, knowing that God will hold all of them accountable.

He urges them not to threaten their slaves, and when he uses the word master, he uses the word that we translate as master for Jesus Christ. Paul in the household is calling wives to submit and husbands to love, and if you look at the instruction of the husband, the husband is supposed to love beyond the realm of submission that is just stated for the wife. The elaboration of it actually calls for another sense of submission, but this time in the framework of love, knowing that man, that is one of the things we struggle with, to love very well.

We lack love when it comes to the romantic part. Love is self-giving and service, and we don't like that a whole lot. And then he asks children to obey their parents, parents to raise their children responsibly.

Slaves obey their masters. Masters, be careful not to irritate the slaves. If the Christian community is working together in this way, a few things will happen.

They will have an honorable household. Society will respect them. The structure and order in the household will have a direct effect on the wider church.

They will understand that as a family, they are being loved and love one another, and because of that, they will not find it difficult to love other people in the church or love God. The church will grow to be the church God wants it to be, not a church where people meet and be Christian and go home and become devils. Paul links both together here.

Wise Christians live with integrity. Christian integrity in the home is similar to what is reflected in the community of faith. I hope this places the discussion in context for you.

I've not had a lot of time to unpack the details, but I hope that the background I gave you on the household discussion opens you up to take time, soak it in, and as a man, be challenged by how much you are asked to give. And wife, take a look at this passage again, and you will notice that if only your man would do what is being asked of him, then your submission would be almost nothing. I hope you are still happy about Paul and his instructions on marriage.

I think there is rich stuff here. Being a mother and being a father is not a liability. Let's not allow society to take this noble task from us.

It is a noble thing. God has called us to be parents. Let's work together and create a safe environment for our children.

Thank you, and God bless you. You

This is Dr. Dan Darko and his lecture series on the Prison Epistles. This is session 29 Household Code, Ephesians 5:21-6:9.