

**THE DEUTERO-PAULINE AND PETRINE *HAUSTAFELN*:
EARLY CHRISTIAN *OIKONOMIA*, PASTORAL
GOVERNMENTALITY AND SLAVE-MANAGEMENT**

Chris L. de Wet

*University of Pretoria*¹

Abstract

This study traces the discursive links between early Christian oikonomia, pastoral governmentality and slave-management in the Deutero-Pauline and Petrine haustafeln. It especially utilises the concepts of discipline, surveillance and governmentality as extrapolated by Michel Foucault. The Colossian and Ephesian household codes are approached as social contracts, in which certain liberties are given up for the sake of identity and group cohesion. Slaves should render obedience to masters. From this, the codes exhibit a strict hierarchical system, one that is authorised by a potent Christic panopticism. From the Pastoral Epistles the development of Christian pastoral governmentality, or pastoralism, is clearly seen, and with this, a culture of psychagogy related to slave-management. Slaves become the objects of normalization, which assumes a general delinquency of slaves. Finally, the unique stance of the Petrine codes admonishes slaves to embrace unjust suffering as a Christomorphic process; this promotion of suffering as slaves of God would pervade the very essence of Christian virtue discourse.

¹ This study is based, in part, on my doctoral thesis entitled: 'Slavery in John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews: A Cultural-Historical Analysis', done under supervision of Prof. Hendrik F. Stander, Department of Ancient Languages, University of Pretoria, 2012.

1. Introduction

The aim of his study is to examine the Pauline and Petrine household codes, or *haustafeln*, and to delineate how the interrelated discourses of early Christian *oikonomia* (the art of household management), pastoral governmentality and slave-management developed. The study is especially dependant on analytical concepts used by Michel Foucault, especially the notions of discipline (*surveiller*), surveillance and governmentality. Discipline and punishment, in Foucault's sense, refer to the processes and technologies employed to pacify bodies and render them docile (Foucault 1977). This is achieved by means of disciplinary institutions; in Foucault's analysis, the prison, workhouse, school and military barracks were used. In this case of this study the ancient household is viewed as the central disciplinary institution in early Christianity. Governmentality can be understood as those technologies of and attitudes towards governance in which bodies are monitored, regulated and educated within society (Foucault 2010). The concepts of discipline, punishment and governmentality are essentially related. This paper then aims to trace the developments of early Christian governmentality, which may also be understood as pastoralism, and to understand how it was shaped within the institution of the household with specific reference to the problem of slave-management.

In the nascent years, the early Christian movement was seen as nothing more than a sect of Judaism. The earliest sources we have from this new apocalyptic Judaistic sect are the letters of Paul. The *haustafeln* of the New Testament are grouped within the documents of known as Deutero-Pauline writings (Lührmann 1980:83-97). These writings do not seem to display characteristics of authentic Pauline authorship, although they bear the name of Paul and show much continuity with the Pauline theology seen in the authentic Pauline epistles. The Epistles to the Ephesians 6:5-9, Colossians 3:22-4:1, 1 Timothy 6:1-2 and Titus 2:9-10 all contain advice to Christians on how to manage slaves in their households. In the non-Pauline First Epistle of Peter 2:18-25, a similar set of instructions is provided which will also be examined here. There are also very similar tables in *Doctrina Apostolorum* 4.10-11, *Didache* 4.10-11 and in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 19.7 (Harrill 2006:87-96). The instructions show a recurring pattern. The advice is clearly directed towards the Christian *pater familias* in relation to those falling within his sphere of domination. The different manifestations of the *pater familias* are discussed, namely as a husband, father and slaveholder.

These passages from the New Testament bear remarkable resemblance, and it gives a glimpse into early Christian understandings of *oikonomia* (Reumann 1967:147-167). They are not at all as elaborative as some of the other sources examined here. I will start by examining the sections in Ephesians and

Colossians. Harrill has made an important observation regarding these two passages. They are compared to the classical agricultural handbooks of Cato, Varro and Columella, and Harrill (2006:113-114) claims that the Christian master resembles the *vilicus* figure from these classical writings, with God as the absent *pater familias*. Harrill is correct in this observation since the sections regarding slaves and master indicate a type of delegated authority. Just as the slave is ruled by the earthly master, so too the earthly master is ruled by God by being a slave of God. The discourse functioning in the background of these statements is that of the body being heteronomous, in other words, bodies are in essence made to be ruled and dominated, either by other humans or, in the New Testament sense, by God or sin. But what do these sections say about early Christian *oikonomia*, pastoral governmentality and slave-management?

2. Slave-Management in Ephesians 6:5-9 and Colossians 3:22-41: The Beginnings of Christian Social Contracts and Christic Panopticism

The argument in Ephesians is a very descriptive account of slave-management as seen in the *haustafeln*, and the advice given to slaves and slaveholders must be understood in the context of not only the other familial roles, but also in the wider context of the document. Harrill (2006:113-114) is correct in noting that the section in Ephesians 5:15-20, just before the *haustafeln* are given and even after (the dissertation on the armour of God in Eph. 6:10-20), other ‘codes’ are provided that are meant to bind the Christians together in one collective family, that is, kinship rhetoric. The section in Ephesians 5:15-20 is therefore a virtue discourse. In these verses, the author promotes the lifestyle of a wise person. Thereafter it is stated that Christians need to participate in liturgical events like the singing of songs and hymns. Behind all this is the basic assumption that after baptism, the believers are unified into one family, assuming a fictive kinship structure (Eph. 4:22-24). Then follows the basis for the *haustafeln* (Eph 5:21): ‘Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ’. This implies that a hierarchy is about to follow, one that is only functional if there is submission from the relevant members of the household. It is also seen that the statements in the *haustafeln* are very patriarchal and androcentric. God is depicted as the absentee *pater familias*, who is at the top of the hierarchy. Power is then designated to other participants, or rather duplicated as seen in the case of the *vilicus* and *pater familias* in the Roman agricultural handbooks (cf, Cato, *Agr.* 5.1-5; Varro, *Rust.* 1.17.4-5; Columella, *Rust.* 1.8.1-16). As a moral *vilicus* of God, the earthly *pater familias* becomes the duplicate of Christ and his authority. This Christic duplication serves as the major marker of authority and status, and is the basis for submission from all other participants. I would now like to focus on the underlying governmentality of the passage since this lies at the core of this

investigation. As mentioned earlier, governmentality is a common analytical concept in the political philosophy of Michel Foucault (cf. Foucault 2010; Burchell & Gordon 1991). The term specifically relates to the idea of being governed and the mechanisms or technologies of that governance. In the Ephesian *haustafeln*, we see a typical early Christian attempt at implementing ideas and practices of governmentality, as well as a negotiation of this form of governance within the wider context of ancient Mediterranean society and culture.

While acknowledging Harrill's argument that the *haustafeln* in both Ephesians and Colossians (and even to greater degree, the entire epistles themselves), represent primitive Christian 'handbooks' of *oikonomia*, I want to take a step further and argue that the *haustafeln* exhibit the typical features of a social contract. The use of the social contract model,² common to Foucault's method, implies that a system of hierarchical governance comes into being when participants in this system consent to give up certain liberties for the sake of group cohesion and identity. Social contracts are rarely novel; they are in most instances based on existing models of power relations with slight amendments or simply a new language to garb old concepts (Gordon 1991:37-45). One social contract can be quite different from another in order to show that the characteristics of the group are determined by its opposing values against other groups. Social theorists of the New Testament highlight the fact that societies from the New Testament times are quite collectivistic. Group-oriented collective personalities, according to Bruce Malina (2001:58-80), are one of the defining characteristics of the historical anthropology of the New Testament.

What are the characteristics of these microcosmic social contracts called the *haustafeln*? In the first instance, the notion of sovereignty is based on the notion of God as ruler of all human bodies (Berger 2003:64-66). Since these bodies are heteronomous, that is, always prone to be ruled and governed by a higher participant in the hierarchy, the first level of submission implies submission to God, better interpreted as submission to the early Christian pastoral governance (Lincoln & Wedderburn 1993:124). What these contracts

² Social contract theory developed early in the seventeenth century with the influence of critical thinkers like Grotius, Hobbes and Locke. It was further developed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and in the twentieth century most notably by Rawls, Gauthier and Pettit. Foucault uses the social contract model to demonstrate how macro- and micro-systems of government come into existence. The alternative to the social contract model is the social warfare model in which groups seize power without negotiation as such. Although Foucault agrees that governments often exploit people and violently seize power, he prefers to characterize the power of governance as a network that is complex and circulatory in terms of power dynamics (cf. Friend 2004; Danaher, Schirato & Webb 2000:82-89).

point to is that this form of *oikonomia* is the 'Christian' way. In the Ephesian *haustafeln* this is quite evident in the very first statements, where the submission of the wife to the husband is compared to the submission of the church to Christ. The discourse of ecclesiastical submission to Christ serves the purpose of authorizing the social contract being proposed. As mentioned, this is done by duplicating Christ in the earthly *pater familias* just like the *vilicus* was a duplication in the early Roman agricultural handbooks. The author of Ephesians implies that the social contract the *haustafeln* represent is based on a larger, authoritative contract - namely the covenant between Christ and the church. There is little practical sense in the Christ/church contract except its use as model for duplication and asserting authority. Ephesians depicts the authority and submission discourses in somatographic terms - the church is seen as the body of Christ, and Christ the soul or the reason, conforming to the Stoic-Philonic concept that the body, and its desires are to be disciplined and dominated. But the relationship of power is not simply top-down, but in a complex interchanging flux. The stipulation of the social contract of the wife to submit to her husband is complemented by the concept that the husband ought to love his wife as he does his own body (Sampley 1971:1-76). The concept of 'love' here should be understood in the curative sense. The husband should care for the wife as he does for his own body. This is supported by the statement in Ephesians 5:25b-33. The language of nurturing, purification and preservation is present especially when the author describes Christ's actions toward his bride, the church. The religious and political lines in this early Christian view of marriage are very much blurred, and the concepts are very much interrelated. In the culture of the ancient Mediterranean, where values like honour, and shame played an important role, purity was a crucial virtue for a woman and as Christ has kept the church, his wife, pure, so too the main curative role of the husband is to keep his wife pure. Some scholars have even argued that women in antiquity were much more concerned with purity guidelines than men (Schottroff 2004:88-93). It must be remembered in this instance that early Christianity was a sect of Judaism, and that purity maps played a key role in the identity of the group. Foucault's notion of the care of the self now transcends the body of the husband, which he must also keep pure, and the responsibility is extended to the body of the wife. In this manner, the wife's body becomes an extension of that of the husband, a symbolic appendage or body-part. The believers are then also called members of Christ's body. This premise and the premise from Genesis 2:24, that husband and wife will become one flesh, serve as points of comparative argumentation (Sampley 1971:51-60). In this social contract, then, the wife submits to the authority of the husband, and by doing this, she becomes an extension of his body - she is not autonomous. The

stipulation for the husband is that he needs to care for his wife since she is part of his own body. This discussion has shown how complex the power-relations of the social contracts of the *haustafeln* can be, and we can now see the shape of the hierarchy. It is not linear - in the sense that God is at the top, then the husband, wife, children and slaves. It may appear so from the literary structure, but the hierarchy is cyclical – it all revolves around the *pater familias* as the Christ-duplicate.

But how does this social contract play out for the slaves, and how does it shape early Christian discourses of slave-management? The dynamics of the contractuality between slaves and masters function in a somewhat different manner to the contractuality between husband and wife. The advice is not based on love here but on benign treatment (Glancy 2006:144-145). For the author of the Ephesian *haustafeln*, the most important facet of the slave/slaveholder relationship is that of appearance and representation. In the case of slaves and slaveholders, the social contract is almost identical, as Harrill (2006:113-116) has suggested, to those found in Roman agricultural and Greek oeconomic handbooks. Christ is symbolized as the absent *pater familias*, and the Christian slaveholder as the duplicated steward or *vilicus* of Christ. The notion of stewardship would become very important in late ancient Christian discourses of *oikonomia* (Sessa 2011:1-31). The slave is reminded that the true master of all is Christ. They are advised not to become ‘slaves to the eyes of people’ (ὀφθαλμοδουλεία), since they are not out to please people but to please Christ, whose eyes are constantly directed at the heart of the slave. An interesting dynamic of surveillance is present here. Being slaves to human eyes seems to indicate that the slave’s behaviour should not be determined by ‘human’ technologies of surveillance, but rather by Christ’s surveillance, which is, ironically, a cryptic and veiled form of human surveillance in itself. The author clearly understands the limited usefulness of the surveillance of slaves by the *vilicus*, and thus introduces the omnipotent panopticism of Christ, that not only surveys the deeds and actions, the quality of the work of the slave but also the attitude and heart of the slave. This powerful strategy of manipulation aims to ameliorate the problem of slaves doing mischief in secrecy, a problem that is especially highlighted by Cato, Varro and Columella. The main aim of the slave is to acquire the approval and satisfaction of the slaveholder, in this case, Christ, the ‘absentee’ *pater familias*, but also indirectly, the earthly Christian slaveholder. The author also knows of the importance of reward and punishment in terms of slaveholding. Now Christ is seen as the one who will ultimately reward or punish the slave (and, in fact, all slaves of God). This is a typical Stoic-Philonic notion, where the focus is on the moral slavery. The verse, in fact, says very little about the practicalities of slave-management. Emphasis is

placed on the notion of institutional slaves considering their enslavement to God as a higher priority than their enslavement to human beings. The result is that early Christian slaveholding resembles a type of creolization between Stoic, Philonic and Roman principles of slave-management. As in all of the oeconomical and agricultural handbooks, Christian slaveholders receive the conventional wisdom that they should treat their slaves kindly and not with threats, since the slaveholders too are ruled by a heavenly slaveholder. Christ is portrayed as the typical just and fair *pater familias*. There is no favouritism with him, and all are treated fairly. Furthermore, the advice on the treatment of children and slaves bear remarkable resemblance. Fear is still a common strategy in the disciplining of slaves (Eph. 6:5). Slaves need to fear their masters in the same way as they fear God. This same advice is repeated by the authors of the *Didache* 4.11 and the *Epistle of Barnabas* 19:7, showing its continuity in the didactics of the early Christians.

What are the characteristics of the Colossian *haustafeln*? As in Ephesians, the Colossian *haustafeln* are also preceded by a detailed virtue-discourse. Most notably, it contains an amended duplication of the baptismal formula in Galatians 3:28,³ which reads (Col. 3:10): ‘Here there is no Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all.’⁴ The thrust of this statement, as well as Galatians 3:28, is again the Stoic notion that one’s earthly status or ethnicity is not the determinative factor when seeking virtue (Motyer 1989:33-48). Like the arguments of Seneca (cf. *Ep.* 47), who reasoned that the same *logoi spermatikoi* or *semen* exists in both slave and free, the author of Colossians substitutes this metaphysical seed with the presence of Christ. This statement is framed in a chiasmic argument for virtuosity - it is preceded by a vice list (Col. 3:8-10) and followed by a list of virtues (Col. 3:12-14). It also indicates, as in Ephesians, that Christian *oikonomia* is discussed in the context of virtue discourse.⁵

We now find a simpler *haustafeln* in Colossians than in Ephesians when it comes to the relationship between husband and wife, but an equally elaborative code or contract when it comes to slaves. It should also be noted that these

³ Galatians 3:28 (NIV): ‘There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.’ Greek text (UBS⁴): οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

⁴ Greek text (UBS⁴): ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.

⁵ Some scholars assert that the *haustafeln* Christianize the subordination of women, children and slaves (cf. for instance, D’Angelo 1994:313-324), while others, rightly in my opinion, assert that these codes are very much derived from similar social and cultural codes from the ancient Mediterranean and not exactly a form of Christianization (cf. for instance, Osiek & Balch 1997:189).

household codes are somewhat exceptional in that they address slaves directly, something not very common in ancient literary sources (Osiek & Balch 1997:189). They also seem to assume that slaves' roles need more explanation than those of slaveholders, since the codes for the behaviour of slaves are much longer than those directed at the masters in both Ephesians and Colossians. What are the social contractualities of slaves and slaveholders in Colossians then, and what can they tell us about early Christian slave-management? The exact same Christic panopticism is also present in the Colossian *haustafeln*. Slaves are again reminded that Christ, their heavenly slaveholder is watching them (Lincoln 1999:93-112). At this point I want to emphasize again that the purpose of panoptic surveillance is to ensure discipline and pacification (Glancy 2006:142). Since the *haustafeln* are located within the context of virtue-discourse, the virtuous slave is the disciplined slave. Foucault's understanding of Bentham's Panopticon is neatly summarized: 'Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power' (Foucault 1977:201). This statement is also applicable to the Christic panopticon introduced to Christian slaves. It is to a certain extent more effective than any technologies of surveillance in the Greek and Roman handbooks of *oikonomia* due to its key feature - its permanence and thoroughness.⁶ The cyclical hierarchy that is the *haustafeln* now exhibits one of its most potent features of authority - it serves not only as a practical system of manipulation, domination and submission, but also serves as a symbolic apparatus that can alter behaviour and train or correct abnormal individuals. Since slaves are mostly viewed with suspicion in the ancient Mediterranean, the ever-present Christic gaze becomes corrective - it shapes the bodies of slaves into docile bodies that are loyal to their superiors, especially Christ, whose representative/*vilicus* on earth is the slaveholder. The Christic panopticism, despite its inherent metaphysical and Stoic-Philonic nature, is quite practical. The Stoic effect of de-institutionalizing physical slavery means that not only is the behaviour of the slaves regulated (MacDonald 2000:164-165), but all those taking part in the social contract. Hence we find the social contractuality directed at the Christian slaveholder (Col. 4:1): 'Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair, because you know that you also have a master in heaven.'⁷ The slaveholder is reminded, almost tongue-in-cheek, that he also has a master, i.e. he is also under the gaze of the Christic panopticon. Whereas the slaves are here also reminded of their rewards and

⁶ For an excellent discussion of slaveholding and supervision/surveillance, cf. Fenoaltea 1984:635-668.

⁷ Greek text (UBS⁴): Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ. Abusive masters would not be tolerated (Osiek & Balch 1997:189).

possible punishments, the slaveholders are reminded that they should provide fairness and justice to slaves. Both the Ephesian and Colossian contractuality directed at the slaveholder exhibit a secondary nuance of care. It is not like that displayed in Ephesians regarding the relationship between husband and wife. Here, the curative measure accorded to slaves should be fairness and justice.

3. Power and the Pastorals: The Development of Christian Pastoral Governmentality and Psychagogy related to Slave-Management

The Christic panopticism and curativity embedded in the *haustafeln* are also in line with the rise of pastoralism, and pastoral power in the Christian communities, which would have a profound effect on Western conceptualizations of governmentality. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs, are known as the ‘Pastoral Epistles’. In this regard, Foucault (2010:127) makes a crucial observation in his elaboration of the *pasteur*:

[T]he form it [pastoral power] takes is not first of all the striking display of strength and superiority...The shepherd is someone who keeps watch. He ‘keeps watch’ in the sense, of course, of keeping an eye out for possible evils, but above all in the sense of vigilance with regard to any possible misfortune.

It is evident that this type of governmentality, already present in the earliest Christian discourses, promotes a pastoral power whose main mechanism for exercising power is by keeping watch, or surveillance (Foucault (1977: preface) uses the French word *surveiller*, while Bentam used ‘inspect’). In the following discussion from the Epistle to Titus, it will be shown that this type of surveillance always has the correction and regulation of bodies in mind, whether they were free or enslaved.

Moreover, by placing the free, Christian male in the center of all these social contracts, the proliferation of androcentrism in early Christian household practice becomes quite evident. The free Christian male body is responsible for issues of purity, obedience and quality service. The everyday life of the wife, children and slaves are all determined by their relations with the Christian *pater familias*, the *vilicus* of Christ on earth. This androcentrism is a crucial element in ancient slave-management.

The guidelines given to slaves in the Pastoral Epistles will now be discussed. We find discussions on slave-management in 1 Timothy 6:1-2 and Titus 2:9-10. These discourses, like all the others, are very much interwoven within the virtue teaching of the entire letter. Both confirm the view that Christian slaves should work harder, and that proper submissive slave-behaviour

is necessary for social acceptance. We also find no guidelines to slaveholders; only slaves are addressed. Slaves ought to show their owners respect despite their status of being Christian or not, and the author also emphasizes the mutual fictive kinship between slave and slaveholder. Whereas Colossians and Ephesians exhibit remarkable resemblance and similarities in terms of their *haustafeln*, Titus 2 stands out as being quite unique. As with Ephesians and Colossians, the entire Epistle to Titus can be described as an oeconomical exhortation. The language used in Titus has different emphases in contrast to Ephesians and Colossians. It also differs from the account in 1 Timothy. One of the reasons for this is because the letter, allegedly written by Paul to a younger co-worker named Titus, who is to manage a congregation of Christians in Crete, comes in the form of individual exhortations and duties (Dibelius & Conzelmann 1972:139-141). It gives us a glimpse from a different angle into the early Christian oeconomical *imaginaire*. Titus, as shepherd or pastor, is guided in pastoral governance. Chapter 2 of Titus, which forms the far equivalent of the Ephesian and Colossian *haustafeln*, is also framed by moral exhortation and virtue discourse (Tit. 1:10-16). But the nature of this is more specific in Titus - Titus is advised to present the Cretans with sound, or morally pure teaching (Verner 1983:112-126). The motifs of teaching and discipline, related to submission and obedience regarding slaves, are rife in the letter (Glancy 2006:148). Sound doctrine is equivalent to good *oikonomia*. I do not want to raise introductory issues relative to commentaries in this discussion. I am rather curious as to how Titus is presented as a teacher of *oikonomia*. This letter, quite appropriately grouped with the epistles called the 'pastorals,' represents some of the earliest direct instances of the rise of pastoral governmentality. As we mentioned earlier, the *pasteur* is someone who 'keeps watch'. But in Titus, the pastoral surveillance assumes teaching and correcting delinquent (often called heretical) behaviour. In this epistle, the church itself becomes the *domus* where correction takes place. This correction should also be duplicated in the real households, and hence guidelines for household management are given. The *pasteur* therefore also becomes the domestic advisor. This will become even more prevalent in the later centuries with the rise of the episcopacy and papacy. In this sense, the *ekklesia-oikos* becomes both an observatory and reformatory. Discipline occupies a key role here. We have already spoken about the importance of surveillance here, but the *pasteur* or domestic advisor should not merely 'keep watch,' but also correct delinquent behaviour. The ability to apply corrective measures for the production of docile bodies assumes that the surveillance and correction is hierarchized. It assumes an authoritative power-knowledge (in this case, the healthy doctrine) that serves as measuring stick to determine proper behaviour - it therefore has the function of normalizing bodies

within the group. Although Titus is said to have the sound doctrine, when it comes to slave-management, the power-knowledge matrix is quite conventional, and one almost suspects the author is cribbing lines from Cato. Slaves are to be taught to be submissive in everything, aim to please their masters, not to talk back at them, nor to steal from them (Tit. 2:9-10). Austerity is a fitting description of the teacher and the institution, church or household, in this regard. There is a rhetoric of strictness in the pericope (Towner 2006:733-734). Titus 1:7-9 is very reminiscent of this:

*Since an overseer manages God's household, he must be blameless - not overbearing, not quick tempered, not given to drunkenness, not violent, not pursuing dishonest gain. Rather, he must be hospitable, one who loves what is good, who is self-controlled, upright, holy and disciplined.*⁸

These guidelines for the overseer again resemble the qualities of the *vilicus* promoted by authors like Cato and Columella. The overseer here must be a worthy example, a mirror image, a duplication of the absent, but ever-watchful heavenly *pater familias*. The overseer must be a Christian virtuoso. From the wider context of the epistle, specifically its emphasis of virtuosity, this teaching is presented in what could be called psychagogy, that is, the instruction of 'souls'. The discourse of psychagogy is a very potent and strategic discourse. The soul, here, is more than a mere ideology. The soul should be understood as a technology of power of the body (Foucault 1977:29). In this manner, psychagogy is also somatography, since the soul as a somatic technology writes itself on bodies in a very real manner, and its presence is well attested in early Christianity.⁹ Here, the correction of the 'soul' is in fact the correction of the

⁸ Greek text (UBS⁴): δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ, ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον, φιλάγαθον, σώφρονα, δίκαιον, ὄσιον, ἐγκρατῆ...

Regarding its later reception, a very interesting discussion on this topic is found with Lactantius. In his discussion of people who worship false gods, he refers to these people as being slaves to their passions, but he does this in a very unique manner. In typical invective rhetoric, he states that such people have made their soul a slave to the body, while the inverse is the more desirable condition. He states: 'And since they have turned away once for all from the contemplation of the heaven, and have made that heavenly faculty the slave of the body, they give the reins to their lusts, as though they were about to bear away pleasure with themselves, which they hasten to enjoy at every moment; whereas the soul ought to employ the service of the body, and not the body to make use of the service of the soul' (*Inst.* 6.1.2); Translation: NPNF; Latin text: CSEL 19.479-480: *Et quoniam se semel a caeli contemplatione averterunt sensum que illum caelestem corpori mancipaverunt, libidinibus frena permittunt tamquam se cum ablaturi voluptatem, quam momentis omnibus capere festinant, cum animus ministerio corporis, non-corpus ministerio animi uti debeat.* Here we already

body via the technology of ‘soul’ - probably the closest ancient equivalent to what we call psychology today. Foucault has argued that the excess power exercised on the body has led to somatic duplication - the soul is a duplication of the dominated body; he states: ‘Rather than seeing this soul as the reactivated remnants of an ideology, one would see it as the present correlative of a certain technology of power over the body’ (Foucault 1977:29). The corrected slave-body in Titus 2 is the body that is docile and obedient to the earthly master. The idea of Christ as heavenly master may be assumed, but is not explicitly mentioned. Here contrary advice is given from that of the Ephesian and Colossian *haustafeln*. Slaves here should act in a pleasing manner to their masters. They may be ‘slaves to the eyes’ here, that is, exhibit behaviour corresponding to what is expected from slaves in the conventional sense. Typical slave stereotypes are present - the thief, the untrustworthy slave, and the slave with the loose tongue (Glancy 2006:148). Thus, the psychagogy directed at the slave-bodies should be directed at correcting the delinquencies displayed in the stereotypes. The soul, and accompanying notion of psychagogy, with its roots in Stoic and Philonic thinking, influenced Christian approaches to slave-management to a great extent. The concept of ‘soul’ as a corollary to virtue, served as a somatographic technology for producing and regulating docile slave-bodies, and functions quite well in the Christian pastoral governmentality of surveillance and correction.

4. Pastoral Technologies and the Petrine *Haustafeln*: Slavery, Suffering and Early Christian Discourses of Normalization

The Petrine *haustafeln* (1 Pet. 2:13-3:7), which probably come from a very different context compared to Titus, nevertheless also display several overlapping discourses (Davids 1990:1-44). The pastoral governmentality is much more pronounced in this document. At the end of the exhortation to the slaves Christ is directly referred to as both shepherd and overseer (1 Pet. 2:25): ‘For “you were like sheep going astray,” but now you have returned to the shepherd and overseer of your souls.’¹⁰ So what does the author of 1 Peter have to say about slave-management? The author only gives advice to slaves, and nothing is said to the owners (Balch 1981:96). One can consider his advice to be quite radical and even shocking. Slaves are advised to not only submit to those slaveholders that are fair and just, but also to harsh slaveholders. The discourse here is even more laden with Philonic notions of being slaves of God, as the

see an understanding of the interplay between soul and body, where the soul is characterised as a slave of the body in those who are slaves of the passions and idols.

¹⁰ Greek text (UBS⁴): ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.

author explicitly states (1 Pet. 2:16): ‘Live as free people, but do not use your freedom as a cover-up for evil; live as God’s slaves.’¹¹ The centrality of suffering is what makes the Petrine advice to slaves unique.¹² It should not necessarily be assumed here that the suffering slaves are Christian and the slaveholders are non-Christian. Christian principles and techniques of slave-management were not much different from Greek, Roman and Judaistic equivalents. The construction of the suffering slave as the innocent victim is important in this instance. Suffering, Judith Perkins has shown, was central to the development of early Christian identity, and it seems in this instance that symbolic links are drawn between the suffering death of Christ, the suffering loyal slave and the martyr. Perkins (1995:214) states:

The production of this subjectivity, the recognition and acceptance of a self-definition of sufferer, was essential for the growth of Christianity as an institution. Christianity offered itself as a community of sufferers and could not have developed had it lacked subjects present to respond to its call...Christianity did not produce its suffering subject alone...this subjectivity was under construction and emanated from a number of different locations in the Graeco-Roman world.

This is a very important observation made by Perkins. Here I want to argue that one such influential subjectivity to the notion of Christian self-definition as sufferers was the notion of the suffering but loyal slave. This literary *topos* of the slave who suffered unjustly is especially prevalent in the Roman agricultural handbooks, and especially with Columella. The author of 1 Peter, however, does not advise the slaves who are suffering unjustly to rebel or resist. They are to remain docile, passive bodies; both slaves and women (Winkler 1990:207-208). Two important essays on Roman sexualities, those of Jonathan Walters (1997:29–46) and Holt Parker (1997:47–65), both suggest that the concepts of penetrability and impenetrability were crucial in constructing manliness and normality. Parker (1997:48-49) provides a teratogenic grid in which the sexual roles of men and women are placed into perspective and relation to each other. The male (*vir*) is normal when he occupies an active, penetrating role (Parker 1997:49). Unlike modern conceptions of sexuality, which often center on gender

¹¹ Greek text (UBS⁴): ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ’ ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι.

¹² Suffering is one of the central motifs in the entire letter, and is here inextricably connected to formulations of community and also the author’s Christology. The intersection of these three motifs will also be seen in this discussion on slaves (cf. Bechtler 1998).

(hetero-/homo-/bisexuality, etc.), Roman concepts of sexuality were about penetration and passivity (Walters 1997:39-42).

Why this elaboration on Roman sexuality at this point of the study? By creating an androcentric system as found in the *haustafeln*, not only is the category of the normal, free male constructed; a category of ‘abnormals’ and subordinates is also constructed, and their part in the social contract is always related to their behaviour toward the free male. Furthermore, this society has been termed not only androcentric, but also phallogocentric (cf. Glancy 2006:25-26; Kartzow 2009:24-25). The male slave is not a normal male since, as Glancy (2006:25) has illustrated, he was not considered as having a phallus, that is, no legal right to *patrimonium*. A penis is not equal to a phallus; a male slave has the former, but not the latter. Mastery does not only define masculinity, but it also defines its opposite; not exactly femininity, but rather, as Parker has stated, passivity. Kartzow (2009:25) correctly states:

“In a phallogocentric system, the male has the power to define what the world consists of, what is right and what is wrong, and the female is naturally subsumed under the male.”

Moreover, penetration then serves as a strategy of normalization. It must be understood that the suffering the author of 1 Peter refers to, in most instances, is not only unfair punishment, but also sexual abuse. Glancy (1998:481-501) has problematized this issue in the context of 1 Corinthians 5-7, but the same issues are found in this section, and for that matter, in the other sections of the *haustafeln* (cf. also Osiek 2003:255-274). Strong Christian reactions against *porneia* do indicate that the use of slaves for sexual purposes would be taboo for Christian slaveholders; but this does not mean that it did not happen. The unjust suffering the slave experiences relating to penetration in the form of punishment perhaps or sexual abuse is here accepted by the author of 1 Peter, a notion that would be quite present in the Christian authors of late antiquity (Clark 1988:630-635). Suffering and being penetrated unjustly becomes a virtue. Shaw (1996:269-312) has shown this in his study of early Christian martyrdom. A tension in the virtuosity of the early Christians therefore becomes clear - on the one hand, we see a strong promotion of masculine values, androcentricity and andronormativity, yet there is also the proliferation of feminine values, notions of suffering and also, as Shaw (1996:278-282) has indicated, endurance (ὑπομονή) (cf. also: Spicq 1930:95-106). The verb ‘endure’ (ὑπομένω) is found in 1 Peter 2:20: ‘But how is it to your credit if you receive a beating for doing wrong and endure (ὑπομενεῖτε) it? But if you suffer for doing good and

you endure (ὑπομενεῖτε) it, this is commendable before God.¹³ A value we have not yet seen before now becomes prominent - the passive suffering and endurance of wronged slaves is a ‘gift’ (χάρις). According to Columella (*Rust.* 1.8.1-16), the unjust *vilicus*, who punishes and ill-treats slaves, must be strictly regulated, and punished if necessary, if he is unfair and disobedient. But here, slaves should rejoice when this occurs. This advice is justified with a very potent rhetorical strategy - namely Christomorphism. When slaves suffer, it is a gift and a virtue because Christ has also suffered, and by suffering, they become more like their master. Here, Christ is not the absentee *pater familias*, but inexplicitly, Christ becomes a suffering slave. It is supported in 1 Peter 2:22, 25, where the author quotes sections from Isaiah 53 from the Septuagint. Isaiah 53 speaks of the suffering servant of God, and suits the context of this section, which is addressed to suffering slaves of Christ. The third century church historian Eusebius of Caesarea would also not hesitate to make this same connection (*Comm. Isa.* 1.76).

Slave-behaviour is still strictly controlled. Suffering is only just when the punishment is unjust. It stands to reason that by suffering for disobedience, the slave is not special. Punishment and control of delinquent slave-bodies is still very much promulgated. First Peter does not give any advice to Christian slaveholders, simply to slaves, husbands and wives. We therefore see how the image of the slave suffering unjustly was used to promote passive values in the early church. It should also be noted that by promoting values of passivity, masculinity is also complemented. By encouraging those in the social hierarchy for whom it is normal to be penetrated to endure suffering, it makes strategies for producing and affirming masculinities more efficient and facile. The normal slave-body is one that should be penetrated. Punishment could also be sexual. Furthermore, it should again be stressed the close links between slavery (of males or females) and prostitution. Aulus Gellius (*Noct. att.* 9.12.7) refers to Cato’s view that the bodies of male prostitutes, like slaves, can be violated. This is also what defined the status of the free male, according to Walters (1997:38-40), namely bodily inviolability and impenetrability. This is why Roman citizens were not supposed to be beaten or raped (Parker (1997:50-51) has pointed out that rape was a common yet feared punishment for adultery; cf. Martial, *Epig.* 2.47, 3.73, 3.83). The problem of the heteronomy of the slave-body also contributes to this issue. The ease with which the slave-body could be penetrated and violated is exactly what defined the status of the slave-body. Walters (1997:40) rightly states: ‘To allow oneself to be beaten, or sexually penetrated,

¹³ Greek text (UBS⁴): ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ’ εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῶ.

was to put oneself in the position of the slave, that archetypal passive body.’ Many early Christian authors identified with the archetype of the suffering slave-body - Paul, in fact, uses the same archetype to make sense of Christ’s suffering in the Christological hymn of Philippians 2:5. According to this pericope, by taking on the nature of a slave, Christ embodied the values of obedience and suffering. The idea that Christ is restored to his former glory also supports the notion that slaves who were suffering unjustly will be rewarded. Paul constantly refers to himself, in the opening formulae of his epistles, as a ‘slave of Christ.’

5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to trace the discursive links between early Christian *oikonomia*, pastoral governmentality and slave-management in the Deutero-Pauline and Petrine *haustafeln*. It especially utilised the concepts of discipline, surveillance and governmentality as extrapolated by Michel Foucault. The Colossian and Ephesian household codes were approached as social contracts, in which certain liberties are given up for the sake of identity and group cohesion. Slaves should render obedience to masters. From this, the codes exhibited a strict hierarchical system, one that is authorised by a potent Christic panopticism. From the Pastoral Epistles the development of Christian pastoral governmentality, or pastoralism, was clearly seen, and with it, a culture of psychagogy related to slave-management. Slaves become the objects of normalization, which assumes a general delinquency of slaves. Finally, the unique stance of the Petrine codes admonished slaves to embrace unjust suffering as a Christomorphic process; this promotion of suffering as slaves of God would pervade the very essence of Christian virtue discourse.

Moreover, this study has also shown how the pervasive discourses related to slavery permeated early Christian ethics and theology. If, by some miracle, slavery were to be removed from history, Christian theology and ethics would look very different than today. How this oppressive practice managed to shape a religious movement like Christianity is very complex, but there should be vigilance for current discourses related to slavery, such as androcentrism, violence and domination, still active in Christianity today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balch, David L 1981. *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Bechtler, Steven R 1998. *Following in His Steps: Suffering, Community and Christology in 1 Peter*. SBL Dissertation Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Berger, Klaus 2003. *Identity and Experience in the New Testament*. Translated by Muenchow, Charles. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Burchell, Graham, and Gordon, Colin (eds) 1991. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, Elizabeth A 1988. Foucault, the Fathers, and Sex. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 56.4, 619–41.
- D'Angelo, Mary R 1994. Colossians, Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth (ed.). *Searching the Scriptures Volume 2: A Feminist Commentary*, 313–24. New York: Crossroad.
- Danaher, Geoff, Schirato, Tony, and Webb, Jenn 2000. *Understanding Foucault*. London: Sage.
- Dauids, Peter H 1990. *The First Epistle of Peter*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dibelius, Martin, and Conzelmann, Hans 1972. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Fenoaltea, Stefano 1984. Slavery and Supervision in Comparative Perspective: A Model. *The Journal of Economic History* 44.3, 635–68.
- Foucault, Michel 1997. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Sheridan, Alan. New York: Random House.
- 2010, Gros, Frédéric (ed.). *The Government of the Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1982–1983*. Translated by Burchell, Graham. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Friend, Celeste 2004. Social Contract Theory. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. No Pages. Cited 29 April 2012. Online: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/soc-cont/>.
- Glancy, Jennifer A 1998. Obstacles to Slaves' Participation in the Corinthian Church. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117, 481–501.
- 2006. *Slavery in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Gordon, Colin 1991. Governmental Rationality, Burchell, Graham, and Gordon, Colin (eds.). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, 1–52. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halperin, David M 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York: Routledge.

- Harrill, J Albert 2006. *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social and Moral Dimensions*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Kartzow, Marianne B 2009. *Gossip and Gender: Othering of Speech in the Pastoral Epistles*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lincoln, Andrew T 1999. The Household Code and Wisdom Mode of Colossians. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 74, 93–112.
- Lincoln, Andrew T, and Wedderburn, Alexander J M 1993. *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lührmann, Dieter 1980. Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und Antike Ökonomie. *New Testament Studies* 27.1, 83–97.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y 2000. *Colossians and Ephesians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Malina, Bruce J 2001. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Motyer, Stephen 1989. The Relationship Between Paul's Gospel of 'All One in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3:28) and the 'Household Codes. *Vox Evangelica* 19, 33–48.
- Osiek, Carolyn 2003. Female Slaves, *Porneia*, and the Limits of Obedience. Balch, David L, Osiek, Carolyn (eds). *Early Christian Families in Context*, 255–74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Osiek, Carolyn, and Balch, David L 1997. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Parker, Holt N 1997. The Teratogenic Grid. Hallett, Judith P, and Skinner, Marilyn B (eds). *Roman Sexualities*, 47–65. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perkins, Judith 1995. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*. London: Routledge.
- Reumann, John 1967. Oikonomia-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*. *New Testament Studies* 13, 147–67.
- Sampley, J. Paul 1971. "And the Two Shall Become One Flesh": *A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21–33*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schottroff, Luise 2004. Purity and Holiness of Women and Men in 1 Corinthians and the Consequences for Feminist Hermeneutics, Wire, A C, Chaney, M L and Hearon, H E. *Distant Voices Drawing Near: Essays in Honor of Antoinette Clarke Wire*, 83-93. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Sessa, Kristina 2011. *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy: Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Shaw, Brent D 1996. "Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4.3, 269–312.
- Spicq, Ceslas 1930. Ὑπομονή, Patientia. *Revue des sciences philologiques* 19, 95–106.
- Towner, Philip H 2006. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Verner, David C 1983. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. SBL Dissertation Series. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Walters, Jonathan 1997. Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought, Hallett, Judith P, and Skinner, Marilyn B (eds). *Roman Sexualities*, 29–46. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Winkler, John J 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge.