

STUDIA ANTIQUA

A STUDENT JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY
OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 1
SUMMER 2018

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH

STUDIA ANTIQUA

A STUDENT JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

EDITORS

Haley Wilson-Lemmón
Samuel Mitchell

FACULTY ADVISOR

Shon Hopkin

FACULTY REVIEW BOARD

Daniel Belnap
Nick Fredricksen
Shon Hopkin
Mike Pope
Avram Shannon
Thomas A. Wayment

August 2018

ISSN: 1540-8787

Studia Antiqua is an annual student journal dedicated to publishing the research of graduate and undergraduate students from all disciplines of ancient studies. The views expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Brigham Young University or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The continued publication of *Studia Antiqua* is made possible through an internship provided by the BYU Religious Studies Center. Additional financial contributions were made to this volume by Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Classics, and the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship.

Studia Antiqua accepts manuscripts for publication year-round. Manuscripts should be sent to studia_antiqua@byu.edu and should include a title page with the author's name, major, and year in school. For submission guidelines and other valuable resources, please visit studiaantiqua.byu.edu.

STUDIA ANTIQUA

CONTENTS

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 1

SUMMER 2018

ABBREVIATIONS iv

EDITOR'S PREFACE vii

JULIA CHIOU

Approaching the Joseph Smith Translation:

A Comparative Study of Matthew 4:1-12 1

HALEY WILSON-LEMMÓN

The Family of God:

A Christian Tradition as a Greco-Roman Phenomenon..... 15

ABBREVIATIONS

All abbreviations are taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.4.2.

<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
<i>AOAT</i>	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>AYBD</i>	<i>Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
<i>BDAG</i>	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
<i>BDB</i>	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>BibEnc</i>	Biblical Encyclopedia
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BSC</i>	Bible Student's Commentary
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BZAW</i>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>

DJD	Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert
<i>EBib</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
EDNT	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. ET. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93
<i>EgT</i>	<i>Eglise et théologie</i>
HBC	<i>Harper's Bible Commentary</i> . Edited by James L. Mays et al. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
IB	<i>Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1951–57
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IOS	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
JAC	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JE	<i>The Jewish Encyclopedia</i> . Edited by Isidore Singer. 12 vols. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1925
JFSR	<i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
<i>Mnemosyne</i>	<i>Mnemosyne: A Journal of Classical Studies</i>

<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> . Edited by Greg H. R. Horsley and Stephen Llewelyn. North Ryde, NSW: The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981–
<i>NIB</i>	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i> . Edited by Leander E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994–2004
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTS	Old Testament Studies
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
SHANE	Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East
SP	Sacra Pagina
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>

EDITOR'S PREFACE

I am happy to present to the reader this latest issue of *Studia Antiqua*. This will be my last issue as this journal's editor. These past two years, and my time at BYU in general, have been an amazing and unforgettable process of growth. I can only assume that the editing staff and reviewers who have had to put up with me have also experienced their share of growth through the publication process as well. I am deeply indebted to the contributors, editors, reviewers, advisors, and donors who have made this all possible. I would also like to thank Sam Mitchell, who will follow me as editor, for all the work he put in to helping me complete this issue. He will make a great editor and I move forward, confident that the journal is in competent and caring hands.

This year's issue saw numerous submissions, including seven submissions to the annual essay contest. After discussion with wonderful, attentive reviewers, the decision was made to publish two of the submitted articles. I am incredibly grateful for every single student that submitted their work. This journal wouldn't be possible without you. Both papers came out of Dr. Thomas A. Wayment's senior capstone class. It seems fitting, considering Dr. Wayment will leave Religious Education and join the Classics faculty this summer. I would like to personally thank him for all his help, both with the journal and for all the guidance he has provided for students over the years as they went through the Ancient Near Eastern Studies program.

This issue's two papers are by graduating Brigham Young University students, Julia Chiou and Haley Wilson-Lemmón. Julia challenges the typical assumptions and hermeneutics that many Latter-day Saints have when reading the "Joseph Smith Translation," using the example of JST Matt 4:1-12 versus KJV Matt 4:1-12 to highlight issues of "historical restoration." Haley examines the Greco-Roman traditions that lay behind the rise of early Christianity's "family of God." She explores the familial and kinship terminology that came to be associated with congregated worshippers of Jesus.

This journal would be impossible without the devoted time and talents of our faculty reviewers. They go above and beyond the call of duty as volunteers to our cause. I consider their continued efforts for us as students to be the most important aspect of this journal, and what really makes the entire experience worthwhile. I also wish to thank our financial donors for their support of *Studia Antiqua*. I would especially like to thank the Religious Studies Center, which provides the internship that makes this student journal possible. I am grateful to all involved.

Haley Wilson-Lemmón
Editor in Chief, *Studia Antiqua*

APPROACHING THE JOSEPH SMITH TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MATTHEW 4:1–12

JULIA CHIOU

Julia Chiou earned a BA in Ancient Near Eastern Studies, with an emphasis in Greek New Testament, from BYU in 2018. She hopes to pursue a career in editing and publishing.

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Smith's New Translation of the King James Bible, now designated among Latter-day Saints as the Joseph Smith Translation (hereafter JST),¹ has proven itself to be an intriguing and complex document.² The prophet himself never identified the exact purpose of his translation, and thus scholarship has adopted the challenge of deciphering the document's form and function. The common starting point of this conversation is Joseph Smith's belief that the Bible as received had been corrupted. This was prompted by a statement in the Book of Mormon which described that "many plain and precious things" had been taken from "the book" (1 Nephi 13:28). On February 16, 1832, while in the second year of his translation project, the prophet wrote, "From sundry revelations which had been received, it was apparent that many important points, touching the salvation of man, had been taken from the Bible, or lost before it was compiled."³ Again on October 15, 1843, ten years after the project was finished, he remarked, "I believe the bible [*sic*] as it read

1. Joseph Smith and his contemporaries referred to the prophet's work on the Bible as the "New Translation." In 1867, the Community of Christ (formerly the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints) published the manuscripts as the "Inspired Version." In the 1970s, the LDS Church adopted the name "Joseph Smith Translation" and the acronym "JST" to appear in the footnotes of the revised 1979 English edition of the LDS canon. See Kent P. Jackson, "1830: Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible," in *Joseph Smith, the Prophet and Seer*, ed. Richard Neitzel Holzapfel and Kent P. Jackson (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2010), 67–69.

2. See Robert L. Millet, "Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible: A Historical Overview," in *The Joseph Smith Translation: The Restoration of Plain and Precious Things*, ed. Monte S. Nyman and Robert L. Millet (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 1985), 23–50.

3. Joseph Smith History, vol. A-1, 183, The Joseph Smith Papers, accessed 11 December 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-1838-1856-volume-a-1-23-december-1805-30-august-1834/189>.

2 CHIOU: APPROACHING THE JST

when it came from the pen of the original writers; ignorant translators, careless transcribers, or designing and corrupt priests have committed many errors.”⁴

From this starting point, it was natural for LDS scholars to conclude that the New Translation was a restoration of the missing parts of the Bible. Indeed, Bruce R. McConkie explicitly promoted the JST as a restoration of original text. In his work *Mormon Doctrine*, published in 1958, Elder McConkie described the JST as follows:

As all informed persons know, the various versions of the Bible do not accurately record or perfectly preserve the words, thoughts, and intents of the original inspired authors. (Eighth Article of Faith; 1 Ne. 13.) In consequence, at the command of the Lord and while acting under the spirit of revelation, the Prophet corrected, revised, altered, added to, and deleted from the King James Version of the Bible to form what is now commonly referred to as the Inspired Version of the Bible.⁵

Consequently, Elder McConkie often quoted the JST, citing its passages as how the biblical author “originally wrote it.”⁶

More recent studies attempt to nuance this model while still maintaining that the JST is, in a sense, a restoration of text. Robert J. Matthews, considered the first leading scholar on the JST, offered a model for interpretation in his groundbreaking monograph, “*A Plainer Translation*”: *Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Bible—A History and Commentary*. He argued that Joseph Smith’s changes can be described by four categories: (1) restorations of material written by biblical authors that had been deleted from the Bible, (2) inclusions of actual historical events never recorded in the Bible, (3) inspired commentary related to the situation of the Latter-day Saints, and (4) harmonization of doctrinal concepts revealed to Joseph Smith but contradicted in the Bible.⁷ Likewise, Scott H. Faulring, Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews offered a five-part model in the introduction to their 2004 publication of the JST manuscripts. Their approach included: (1) “Restoration of original text,” (2) “Restoration of what was once said or done but which was never in the Bible,” (3) “Editing to make the Bible more understandable for modern readers,” (4)

4. Joseph Smith History, vol. E-1, 1755, The Joseph Smith Papers, accessed 11 December 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-1838-1856-volume-e-1-1-july-1843-30-april-1844/127>.

5. Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1958), 351.

6. Full quote: “Matthew’s account, *as he originally wrote it*, says: ‘Then—that is, following his baptism—‘Jesus was led up of the Spirit, into the wilderness, to be with God’” (Bruce R. McConkie, *The Mortal Messiah: From Bethlehem to Calvary*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1979–81), 1:408; emphasis added).

7. Robert J. Matthews, “*A Plainer Translation*”: *Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Bible—A History and Commentary* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1975), 253.

“Editing to bring biblical wording into harmony with truth found in other revelations or elsewhere in the Bible,” and (5) “Changes to provide modern readers teachings that were not written by original authors.”⁸ The common ground between these models is the initial assumption that the JST, at least in part, restores original biblical text or authentic historical events.

However, there are inherent issues in these models and their common assumptions. Those who argue that the JST is a historical restoration do so with the *absence of evidence* as evidence. The JST is seen to restore either a text that was deleted before the earliest manuscripts of the Bible can attest, or the records of historical events that were never extant. Because it has been demonstrated that the prophet’s revisions are not found in the earliest manuscripts of the Bible, scholars use the absence of these revisions as proof positive that the JST is a restoration.⁹ In other words, the evidence that the JST restores lost text is that that restored text is lost. For this paper, the concern is not that this type of “proof” is insufficient, for the absence of evidence can neither *disprove* that the JST is a historical restoration. Rather, the concern is that by this argument, there is no direct method of differentiating one type of JST change from another—from restoration or inspired commentary or English modernizations—because none would appear in biblical manuscripts. Thus, *all* changes can initially be assumed as historical restorations and readers are licensed to build their faith upon this foundation of unstable assumptions. The discovery that a particular passage is not a historical restoration then may have an uncomfortable, even unrecoverable, effect on faith.

The JST rendition of Matt 4:1–12—the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness—provides a prime case study that highlights these challenges. Assuming that this passage represents a restoration of lost text, this paper will engage the expectations associated with such an assumption. First, if the JST indeed restores a text that was originally in the Bible but later deleted, it can be expected that the revised version will enhance the continuity of the narrative by restoring the deletions.¹⁰ Second, as a more historically (and, presumably, theologically) correct account, the JST is expected to be used authoritatively in place of the altered King James passages.¹¹ However, in the case of JST Matt 4:1–12,

8. Scott H. Faulring, Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews, eds., *Joseph Smith’s New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts* (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 2004), 8–11.

9. See Matthews, “A Plainer Translation,” 237.

10. Matthews addresses this issue in “A Plainer Translation,” 237–42. See also Robert L. Millet, “The JST and the Synoptic Gospels: Literary Style,” in *The Joseph Smith Translation: The Restoration of Plain and Precious Things*, 147–62.

11. Here, “authoritative” will be used in the sense of described authority, rather than prescribed authority. See Bruce R. McConkie, “The Doctrinal Restoration,” in *The Joseph*

these expectations are left unmet and the assumption that it is a historical restoration is dismantled. Ultimately, this study will illustrate that the *approach* to the JST as a historical restoration is hermeneutically problematic. This examination is not an attempt to make definitive claims about what the JST changes are or are not. Rather, this paper will open a conversation that reevaluates not only the *models* for interpreting the JST but also the *assumption* upon which these models have been founded.

COMPARISON OF KJV AND JST

Joseph Smith made twenty revisions to the King James translation of Matt 4:1–12. Some changes modernize the language, such as replacing “saith” with “said” (vv. 6, 9, 10). Others clarify the narrative, such as changing an indefinite “he” to the specific identification “Jesus” (v. 4). Still others modify word order (v. 1), add a conjunction or preposition (vv. 8, 9, 12), or replace an indefinite with the definite article (v. 5). There are also revisions of more significant consequence. JST Matt 4:1 describes the purpose of Jesus’s seclusion as “to be with God,” rather than “to be tempted of the devil.” Likewise, in the JST the Spirit is the agent managing this event, while the devil merely interrupts the scenes (vv. 5–6, 8–9). Finally, the description of angels ministering to Jesus has been removed from this pericope and carried into the passage following, describing John the Baptist as having been ministered to by angels while in prison.¹²

KJV Matt 4	JST Matt 4
1 Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.	1 Then Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be with God .
2 And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred.	2 And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, and had communed with God , he was afterwards an hungred and was left to be tempted of the devil .
3 And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.	3 And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.

Smith Translation: The Restoration of Plain and Precious Things, 1–22.

12. The text of the KJV and JST have been taken from Thomas A. Wayment, ed., *The Complete Joseph Smith Translation of the New Testament: A Side-by-Side Comparison with the King James Version* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005), 8–9. Punctuation, versification, and spelling follow that model. The text cited is NT2; there are no significant doctrinal or narrative changes from NT1 to NT2 for this passage. Also note that the JST of the parallel passage in Mark (2:12–13) is left unabridged with regard to the ministry of the angels; see Wayment, *The Complete Joseph Smith Translation*, 92. Such incidences where a correction is made in one Gospel but left in another is addressed in Matthews, “A Plainer Translation,” 207–18.

4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.	4 But Jesus answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.
5 Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,	5 Then Jesus was taken up in to the holy city, and the Spirit setteth him on the pinnacle of the temple.
6 And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.	6 Then the devil came unto him and said, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.
7 Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.	7 Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.
8 Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them;	8 And again, Jesus was in the spirit and it taketh him into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them;
9 And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.	9 And the devil came unto him again, and said, All these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.
10 Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.	10 Then said Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.
11 Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.	11 Then the devil leaveth him.
12 Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee;	12 And now Jesus knew that John was cast into prison, and he sent angels, and behold, they came and ministered unto him. And Jesus departed into Galilee;

The JST is assumed to have restored the “many plain and precious things” that were taken from the Bible and fixed the “many errors” committed by “corrupt priests.”¹³ As such, it can be expected that the JST changes will enhance the integrity of the text as received in the King James Bible.¹⁴ If the JST smooths disruptions to the Bible, its changes should then be a seamless addition to the narrative that increases the overall continuity and message of the passage. Likewise, if the JST restores unrecorded historical events, a clearer historical picture should appear. Upon investigation, however, JST Matt 4:1–12 does not

13. See 1 Nephi 13:28 and Joseph Smith History, vol. E-1, 1755.

14. This pericope will be examined based on the English King James Version rather than the original Greek text, as that is the text with which the JST engages.

fit into the biblical narrative, but rather takes on a unique and alternate meaning. To demonstrate this, the meaning of the King James passage must first be established, followed by that of the JST.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE KJV

The text of the King James translation of Matt 4:1–11 has immediate parallels with the Old Testament narrative of Israel in the wilderness. The relationship between God and Israel was often characterized as a father-son relationship (see Exod 4:22–23; Hos 11:1). This became a running motif throughout Deuteronomy, particularly when Moses spoke of Israel's covenant with God and their wandering in the wilderness for forty years (see Deut 1:31; 8:5; 14:1; 32:5–6, 18–20). The purpose of that wandering was described as a test to prove that Israel would honor the covenant relationship: “And thou shalt remember all the way which the LORD thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no” (Deut 8:2). God's agent for their testing was the devil. As described in Job 1–2, Zech 3:1–2, and 1 Chr 21:1, the devil was seen as the prosecutor in God's heavenly court.

The temptation of Jesus begins following the baptism, when God declared, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matt 3:17). Jesus as the covenant Son of God has now taken upon himself the position of the Israelites. Similar to them, he is led by God into the wilderness to wander, not for forty years, but for forty days. Parallel to the experience of the Israelites, this is a time of testing to prove that Jesus will keep the covenant relationship he had just begun at baptism. The agent of this testing is the devil, specifically identified also as the tempter or tester. The devil tests this covenant relationship by calling into question Jesus's divine sonship. He begins his temptations, “If thou be the Son of God...” (Matt 4:3, 6). By quoting Deuteronomy three times (8:3; 6:16; 6:13), Jesus defends himself against the accusations of the devil. Thus, where Israel failed their divine testing in the wilderness, Jesus, as the true Son of God, is triumphant.¹⁵

As a sign that he has passed his tests, angels minister to Jesus. The implication of the ministry of angels is that they administered food to Jesus, similar to the angelic ministry to Elijah in the wilderness (1 Kgs 19:5–6). Thus, Jesus finally receives the bread and angelic help he had denied in order to keep the commandments of God.¹⁶ By this act, God responds to the challenges of the

15. Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, SP 1 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 65–69.

16. M. Eugene Boring, “Matthew,” *NIB* 8:164.

devil and reaffirms that Jesus *is* his Son. The demonstration of divine sonship by means of angels persists throughout Matthew. Jesus will again deny the aid of angels in Gethsemane by saying to Peter, “Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?” (Matt 26:53–54) Again, God will prove Jesus’s faith by later sending an angel to the empty tomb, marking the resurrection as another sign that Jesus is the Son of God (Matt 28:2).

THE TEMPTATION IN THE JST

By redacting the purpose of Jesus’s time in the wilderness and removing the ministry of angels, the allusion to the Israelites and the message inherent in the biblical text are not found in the JST. The meaning of the New Translation perhaps springs from the baptism marking the beginning of Jesus’s ministry. Thus, the Spirit leads Jesus into the wilderness to be with God, and after forty days he communes with God, perhaps to receive instruction in preparation for his coming work. The period in the wilderness is then characterized as a divine experience which the devil interrupts. Surprisingly, this narrative is not unlike Joseph Smith’s own experiences in the Sacred Grove. As recorded in Joseph Smith—History, at the beginning of the prophet’s ministry, he sought communion with God in the woods and, upon attempting to pray vocally, was seized upon by a dark power (vv. 13–16). Both the Joseph Smith rendition of the temptation and the record of his own experience may teach the principle that great ministries are often begun with significant divine experiences that the devil may attempt to hinder.

The additional JST changes come together to characterize Jesus’s ultimate power and authority. In the JST rendition, the devil does not have the power to transport Jesus. Instead it is the Spirit, a divine power, that moves Jesus from the wilderness to the pinnacle, then to the mountain. The change in the object of the angels’ ministry also supports the characterization of Jesus’s ultimate authority. When he declares that the devil must not tempt the Lord, Jesus may be referring to himself as the Lord of the devil. With this reading, when Jesus sends the angels to minister to John, he confirms that he *is* the Lord, because he has the power to send angels, as the devil had challenged. Whereas in the King James translation the devil is defeated with God’s own power (proclaiming that Jesus is the Son of God), in the JST the devil is defeated with Jesus’s own power (proclaiming that he is God the Son).

To be sure, not all of Joseph Smith’s additions are mutually exclusive to the events described in the King James narrative. It is conceivable that the purpose

of being in the wilderness was both for Jesus to commune with God and to be tempted by the devil. Likewise, angels could have ministered to both Jesus and John on separate occasions. However, by removing these pieces of the King James Bible and replacing them with different material, the implication is that Joseph Smith did not intend for them to be interpreted with the narrative. Additionally, some changes are explicitly contradictory, such as the Spirit, rather than the devil, taking Jesus to the pinnacle of the temple. Consequently, between the King James translation and the JST, the LDS scholar is faced with two different, meaningful, and compelling accounts of the same event. With the assumption that theological truth is based on historical events and that these accounts are mutually exclusive, the reader is left to choose which to accept. This can be an uncomfortable position for the believing Latter-day Saint.

LDS AUTHORITATIVE USE OF JST MATT 4:1–12

If it is assumed that JST Matt 4:1–12 represents a more accurate record of a historical event, it can be rightly expected that this passage be used authoritatively in place of the altered King James passage. Additionally, it can be expected that if a single portion of a JST pericope is authoritative, then the entire pericope is authoritative as well. However, JST Matt 4:1–12 in its totality is not universally used by LDS authorities in place of the King James translation. Instead, the King James Bible, the JST, and modern LDS teaching interact with each other in a variety of different patterns, perhaps suggesting the need to amend the current models to the JST which lead readers to initially interpret it as a historical restoration. Through a study of the citations of these scriptures in the *Journal of Discourses* from 1839 to 1886, in the general conference corpus from 1942 to the present, and in various publications by prominent LDS authorities, this paper identifies two distinct patterns that describe how the King James translation and the JST have been used in LDS teaching.¹⁷ These are outlined as follows:

17. Additional publications by James E. Talmage, J. Reuben Clark, David O. McKay, Bruce R. McConkie, Howard W. Hunter, Dallin H. Oaks, and Jeffrey R. Holland were included in this study. As not every reference to KJV Matt 4:1–11 and JST Matt 4:1–12 in the history of LDS teaching has been footnoted—nor was every publication by all LDS general authorities examined—this study is not capable of proving how many instances one version of the pericope is quoted over another. Rather, this study elucidates a general pattern of KJV and JST interactions within modern LDS teaching. Additionally, not every category of interaction is mentioned in this paper. For example, some authors reference a noncontradictory passage of the KJV such as v. 4, without referencing any portion of the JST (for example, see D. Todd Christofferson, “Let Us Be Men,” *Ensign*, November 2006, 48). Likewise, not every example that falls into one of these categories has been cited. Only those which most clearly demonstrate the pattern have been mentioned in this paper.

1. Citing a King James passage, such as Satan taking Jesus to a pinnacle, without reference to any portion of the JST pericope, though available and accepted.
2. Citing a King James passage, such as angels ministering to Jesus, in addition to referencing a separate portion of the JST pericope, such as Jesus's communion with God.

Also worthy of mention is that no instances citing only the full JST pericope have been found.

PATTERN 1: CITING THE KJV ALONE

By February 2, 1833, Joseph Smith recorded in his journal that he had “completed the translation and review of the New Testament.”¹⁸ Five months later, on July 2, 1833, Joseph and his scribes had finished working through the entire Bible.¹⁹ Seven years later, on June 2, 1839, Joseph Smith delivered an address in Commerce, Illinois, that quoted the King James translation of Matt 4:5. This is the prophet's only known, explicit quotation of the temptation narrative, and he notably did not cite his own revision. Rather, to teach the Saints to be aware of false spirits and warn them of the power of the devil, the prophet said, “Every spirit, or vision, or singing is not of God. The Devil is an orator. He is powerful. He took our Savior onto a pinnacle of the Temple [Matt 4:5], and kept him in the wilderness for forty days.”²⁰ Additionally, there are no known instances of Joseph Smith citing his revision of the temptation narrative.

In 1867, the RLDS Church published the manuscripts of the JST under the title “Inspired Version,” which was available to Latter-day Saints. However, until the 1960s it was the general attitude of the LDS Church to suspect this publication as inaccurate and untrustworthy.²¹ Yet some prominent leaders still used the JST with caution. B.H. Roberts believed the JST to be an accurate historical restoration and wrote, “What [Joseph] did was to revise the English text of the Bible under inspiration of God; and that led him to not only give different renderings of various passages, but also to supply missing parts.”²² Interestingly, on January 28, 1884, Roberts gave an address citing the King

18. B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1930), 1:324.

19. Roberts, *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 1:368–69.

20. Synopsis of an address by Joseph Smith, in *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (London: Latter-day Saints' Book Depot, 1854–86), 6:240b.

21. See Thomas E. Sherry, “Changing Attitudes Toward Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible,” in *Plain and Precious Truths Restored: The Doctrinal and Historical Significance of the Joseph Smith Translation*, ed. Robert L. Millet and Robert J. Matthews (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1995), 187–226.

22. Roberts, *Comprehensive History of the Church*, 1:215n.

James translation of Matt 4:5–7. He used this passage to teach the congregants not to boast of the godly favor and power they will receive:

That is, we shall not boast before the world that God has promised to deliver us of these things. We may learn a lesson from Jesus on this subject—The devil took Him to the pinnacle of the temple, and now, said he, if thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written, I will give mine angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy food against a stone. “It is also written,” replied Jesus, “thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God [Matt 4:5–7].”²³

No additional reference to either the King James or Joseph Smith translation of this pericope appeared in the speech.

In 1979, the LDS Church published a revised edition of the English King James Bible that included footnotes with quotations of specific JST passages. These selected quotations were to be used freely and without need for caution. JST Matt 4:1–12 was included in this edition. Despite easy access and ready acceptance of the new JST verses, the King James translation of this pericope is still quoted. In his general conference address in October 2003, President Thomas S. Monson cited KJV Matt 4:1 to teach about obedience to the Father in the face of opposition. He quoted, “When [Jesus] was led of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of Satan, He was weak from fasting.”²⁴ This was the only reference to the temptation narrative in his address.

PATTERN 2: CITING THE KJV AND JST

Though still in the era that regarded the RLDS publication of the New Translation with suspicion, Elder Wilford Woodruff appreciated the insight of the JST. On December 12, 1869, he presented a discourse addressing the Holy Ghost, laboring in faith, the kingdom of God, and patriarchal marriage. Within it, Elder Woodruff quoted the JST passages of 2 Cor 5:10 and Gen 50:24. However, in the same address, when mentioning the temptation of Jesus, passages specific to the King James translation were used. To warn that the devil and his followers will try to overthrow the righteous, Wilford Woodruff quoted, “You see this manifested when [the devil] took Jesus on to the loftiest pinnacle of the temple and showed him all the glory of the world [KJV Matt 4:9]...”²⁵ On another occasion in 1880, he taught a similar message, though quoting the JST. He cited, “One-third part of the heavenly host was cast down to the earth ... and they labor to overthrow all the Saints and the kingdom of God. They even tried to overthrow Jesus Christ [JST Matt

23. B.H. Roberts, in *Journal of Discourses*, 25:140a.

24. Thomas S. Monson, “The Bridge Builder,” *Ensign*, November 2003, 68.

25. Wilford Woodruff, in *Journal of Discourses*, 13:163a.

4:1–10]...”²⁶ Interestingly, though he cited the JST, the information quoted is not specific to the Joseph Smith revision. He had made the same observation eleven years earlier with reference to the King James translation.

Bruce R. McConkie has been one of the most vocal supporters and strict interpreters of the JST. Addressing the validity of the JST in the context of Joseph Smith’s revelations canonized in the Pearl of Great Price, Elder McConkie wrote, “Of course we should use the Joseph Smith Translation in our study and teaching. Since when do any of us have the right to place bounds on the Almighty and say we will believe in these revelations but not those?”²⁷ Noticeably, Elder McConkie was still innovative in his use of both the King James translation and the JST. In volume 1 of his 1965 publication, *Doctrinal New Testament Commentary*, four JST passages and one King James passage from the temptation narrative were quoted. In his explication of the temptation of Jesus, Elder McConkie observed that “it is particularly important to note the changes made by the prophet in the Inspired Version.”²⁸ Specifically mentioned are the changes that add the notion of Jesus being with God, communing with God, and being transported by the Spirit rather than the devil. Later in the work, Elder McConkie cited the JST addition concerning the ministering of angels to John the Baptist: “While in Herod’s prison, angels sent by Jesus had ministered comfort and assurance to John (I.V. 4:11).”²⁹ In addition to this reference, the King James translation of Matt 4:11 was also included in a later portion of the book. In the chapter addressing the events on the Mount of Transfiguration, Elder McConkie commented, “Similar comfort had been given [to Jesus] by angelic visitants following his forty-day fast and its attendant temptations (Matt 4:11).”³⁰ Elder McConkie again cited this same collection of KJV and JST quotations throughout his later multivolume work, *The Mortal Messiah: From Bethlehem to Calvary*, published from 1979 to 1981.³¹

Elder Howard W. Hunter used the King James and Joseph Smith translations of the temptation narrative creatively. In 1976, at a time when the JST was gaining acceptance in the LDS community, Elder Hunter gave a masterful

26. Wilford Woodruff, in *Journal of Discourses*, 21:126a.

27. McConkie, “The Doctrinal Restoration,” 14.

28. Bruce R. McConkie, *Doctrinal New Testament Commentary*, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1965–73), 1:127.

29. McConkie, *Doctrinal New Testament Commentary*, 1:261. Note that as the 1979 edition of the King James Bible had not yet been published, “I.V.” stands for “Inspired Version”—the versification follows that publication rather than the model used in this paper.

30. McConkie, *Doctrinal New Testament Commentary*, 1:400.

31. McConkie, *Mortal Messiah*, 1:408–18, 435. See also McConkie, *Mortal Messiah*, 2:6, 187.

sermon on the temptation of Jesus.³² In his explication of the text, he quoted the JST: “When Jesus had completed the fast of forty days and had communed with God, he was, in this hungry and physically weakened state, left to be tempted of the devil.” Using this passage, Elder Hunter emphasized the preparatory purpose of Jesus’s time in the wilderness. Later in the sermon, part of the King James translation of the pericope is cited: “Matthew tells us that ‘angels came and ministered unto him.’ (Matt 4:11.)” With this passage, Elder Hunter taught that relief and miracles come to the righteous after the trial of faith.

In a 1982 BYU devotional, President Jeffrey R. Holland also delivered a significant exposition on the temptation of Jesus entitled “The Inconvenient Messiah.”³³ In it, President Holland explored the temptation narrative, using it to illustrate the high cost of discipleship while encouraging Saints to pursue the worthwhile course. His discourse was closely tied to a text of the narrative, which he quoted in its entirety at the opening of his speech. Markedly, his quotation was a combination of both the Joseph Smith and King James translations. The New Translation of Matt 4:1–10 was quoted word for word and directly cited, followed immediately, as if from the same text, by the exact King James translation of Matt 4:11. The citation reads as follows: “JST Matt. 4:1–10; KJV Matt. 4:11.” Notably, in the remainder of his speech, President Holland does not employ the doctrinal points added by the JST changes to teach a specific message. However, at the end of the speech, the King James translation of Matt 4:11 was requoted to emphasize the relief and aid that will be given to those who pay the cost of discipleship.

A NEW APPROACH

By evaluating these modern LDS texts, we note that JST Matt 4:1–12 is not universally viewed as authoritative by LDS authorities, particularly JST Matt 4:11–12. If evaluated by the terms of enhanced narrative continuity and authoritative usage, the assumption that JST Matt 4:1–12 is an accurate historical restoration is called into question. This study is not the first to notice these types of discrepancies nor is it the first to address them. Similar issues have been noted in the Joseph Smith revisions of Mal 4:5–6, Rom 13, Heb 11:40, and Rev 1:5–6. Robert L. Millet offered that at times when the JST seems to alter the context of a King James passage, it cannot be determined which translation of the Bible is historically correct. Instead of restoration, such a JST

32. Howard W. Hunter, “The Temptations of Christ,” *Ensign*, November 1976, 17–19.

33. Speech later published in Jeffrey R. Holland, *However Long and Hard the Road* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985; repr., 2002), 26–38.

passage could be prophetic commentary or harmonization. He also stated that though the prophet had finished his work on the Bible, he may have continued to quote the King James translation when a JST correction perhaps reflected a teaching the Lord wanted the Saints to know only at the time it was first revealed.³⁴ Likewise, Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews included in their model the possibility that rather than supplying a restoration of text, some changes were to give additional meaning more applicable to modern Latter-day Saints. In such cases, these distinctions cannot be fully determined.³⁵ As previously noted, the types of JST changes cannot be distinguished on the grounds of the absence of evidence. Still, both models continue to approach such questions from the perspective of restoration, explaining that when difficulties arise, they are the exception, not the rule. This is an irresponsible hermeneutic. These models build belief in an accessible historical theology, and faith in the JST as a historical restoration, without the proper tools to respond to concerns. This is not to say that the JST can in no way represent a restoration of text. It is to say, however, that there is danger in initially approaching it as such.

On the other hand, in an address at a BYU symposium on the JST, Elder Dallin H. Oaks presented an alternate angle to the conversation. He offered, “Suppose a person quotes the King James Version and not the Joseph Smith Translation in a circumstance where the Joseph Smith Translation makes a substantive change? We do it all the time. This is the same as quoting one of the four gospels without quoting a parallel but different phraseology in another gospel.”³⁶ This approach is radically different than the current precedent. Rather than viewing the JST as a tool to restore a more accurate history and superior theological truth, this perspective places the New Translation on the same hermeneutical “playing field” as other independent works, with its own unique point of view, occasional nature, audience, and message. Consequently, the LDS exegete is freed from the task of fitting the JST into the prescriptive boxes of a King James revision or a nonexistent autograph, and is given license to accept it as an independent entity. Simultaneously, Joseph Smith as its prophetic and inspired author is free to teach a theology unbound by the limits of strict historicity. This may be hard to recognize initially, as the JST interacts with every canonical book rather than being a singular scriptural work. It may understandably be even harder to accept, as it goes against the grain of a traditional harmonizing hermeneutic and a theology attached to history. However,

34. Robert L. Millet, “Hard Questions About the JST,” in *Plain and Precious Truths Restored*, 151–52.

35. Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews, *Joseph Smith’s New Translation*, 10–11.

36. Dallin H. Oaks, “Scripture Reading, Revelation, and Joseph Smith’s Translation of the Bible,” in *Plain and Precious Truths Restored*, 13–14.

its advantages are clear. This hermeneutic may explain why the King James translation and the JST can have alternate yet equally valid meanings that stand in dynamic tension. Both teach truths using similar narratives, shaped differently to explain their individual messages. This may also account for why the JST has not supplanted the King James Bible in authoritative LDS teaching. Either the JST or the King James translation may more properly and appropriately fit a teacher's message on that occasion. For these reasons, it may be more profitable for LDS scholars to approach the JST first as an independent work, then as a historical restoration in certain instances where it can be reasonably demonstrated.

CONCLUSION

The exact purpose and authority of the JST are still unclear. As the conversation now stands, there are few effective tools for deciphering this document. For example, the use of the absence of evidence to support an argument for historical restoration is problematic. Models that are built upon such a foundation offer that there are multiple types of changes in the JST without providing the proper tools for distinguishing them. The ability to accurately identify types of JST changes proves important because it has bearing on the lived faith of Latter-day Saints. As there is no sure method of identifying these types of changes, there may be need of a new approach. Rather than offering a method of identifying changes, this paper suggests a new view of the JST that sees it as an independent work. To be sure, more research must be conducted to substantiate this suggestion. Hopefully, however, a new angle to the conversation has been opened that will yield fruitful discussion on the JST.

THE FAMILY OF GOD: A CHRISTIAN TRADITION AS A GRECO-ROMAN PHENOMENON

HALEY WILSON-LEMMÓN

Haley Wilson-Lemmón recently graduated from BYU in Ancient Near Eastern Studies with an emphasis in Greek New Testament. She will pursue graduate work in Notre Dame's Early Christian Studies program beginning Fall 2018.

INTRODUCTION

Within the confines of early Christianity, the community of believers was frequently referred to as “the household of God” and the individuals themselves as “children of God.” Scholars have proposed numerous motivations for this tradition, but this paper will offer a previously unexplored possibility: that it emerged from the practice of hospitality and the idea of treating strangers as “family,” which can be found all throughout the ancient world. In short, the relationship of *syngenia* (συγγένεια) was foundational to the practice of hospitality. Hosts were obligated to treat strangers/guests as family. This is evident in the familial language utilized in the discussion of hospitality across Greek and Latin sources. Over time, that language and tendency evolved into the “family of God” in early Christian thought and practice. This textual study will draw on anthropological concepts to show that this practice as a Greco-Roman phenomenon can be glimpsed in the earliest Greek and Roman sources.¹ In other words, by establishing hospitality as a form of fictive or artificial kinship, it will also be demonstrated that the practice of hospitality provided the foundations for the language of the Christian community as the household of God, with the believers themselves as his children.² Numerous primary sources will be considered, including: the Greek epics of *The Iliad* and

1. Andrew Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in Its Mediterranean Setting* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005), 15. Arterbury has written one of the most comprehensive studies on hospitality in the ancient world. He points out at the very beginning that Homeric hospitality maintained a prominent sway over social interaction in the Greco-Roman world, though he focuses his study on hospitality as it appears in Luke-Acts.

2. In *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), Caroline Johnson Hodge makes the argument that

The Odyssey; the works of Plato and Aristotle; the story and commentary of Abraham's hospitality towards heavenly strangers in Genesis 18, along with other verses from the Hebrew Bible; and the discussion of family and hospitality as it appears in the New Testament.³ However, before an examination of the primary sources can begin, it is necessary to become familiar with the scholarship regarding the communities of early Christians as the "household of God" and the general conversation surrounding hospitality in early Christianity and the Greco-Roman world.

UNDERSTANDING KINSHIP

Scholars such as David Bossman have pointed out that there exists a wide range of meanings attached to kinship.⁴ The branch that will be further analyzed and applied to this work is the anthropological concept of artificial kinship.⁵ This refers to social ties that are neither consanguineal (based on blood) nor affinal (established through marriage).⁶ Sociologically, this idea is referred to as chosen or voluntary kinship.⁷ This understanding of kinship stands in contrast to the kinship found among family members and relatives, or true kin. While the institutions of family, both immediate and extended, create bonds forged by blood and unspoken obligation, fictive kinship often acts as a substitution for real kin. This paper will first demonstrate that hospitality-created relationships, based on voluntary kinship, coalesced outsiders into the household. It will then go on to show that early Christian communities (especially within branches of Pauline Christianity) formed groups founded upon these same ideas of fictive kinship by utilizing familial language to describe both the congregants and the growing congregations.

HOUSEHOLD AND HOSPITALITY: A BRIEF DISCUSSION

Many scholars have dedicated articles and books to the rhetoric surrounding adoption, principally about the distinctions between Christian adoption

"fictive" is not a good term since all relations are social constructions. While I am aware of this and the points made, I will not engage this argument in this work.

3. The Greek and Latin text in this paper comes from the LCL, while the Hebrew was entered by hand, based on entries in the BDB.

4. David M. Bossman, "Paul's Fictive Kinship Movement," *BTB* 26 (1996): 163–71.

5. For a further discussion of artificial kinship, see Hugh Lindsay, *Adoption in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

6. Abera Mengestu points out that "kinship ties that are not genealogical [i.e., that are not built on the notion of procreation] have been referred to as 'fictive,' 'pseudo,' 'ritual,' 'artificial,' 'play,' and 'as if' relationships" (Abera M. Mengestu, *God as Father in Paul: Kinship Language and Identity Formation in Early Christianity* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013), 26).

7. Helen Rose Ebaugh and Mary Curry, "Fictive Kin as Social Capital in New Immigrant Communities," *Sociological Perspectives* 43, no. 2 (2000): 189–209.

(governed by theology) and Roman adoption (governed by the law).⁸ The discussion surrounding adoption frequently segues into a conversation emphasizing the uniqueness of the Christian community as the “household of God” and Jesus followers as “the children of God.” While I am aware of these studies and the ongoing conversations, it will not be necessary to engage them in the present work. Rather, the phrases οἶκος θεοῦ, τέκνα θεοῦ, and υἱοὶ θεοῦ, which are found throughout the New Testament,⁹ will be the concentration.

Up to this point scholars have frequently mentioned in passing that the practice of hospitality has deep roots embedded in the Jewish and Greco-Roman worldviews.¹⁰ In 1983, David C. Verner published a monograph discussing the pastoral epistles couched in their Greco-Roman context.¹¹ Within his work he provided a brief discussion on οἶκος that is invaluable to this paper: In classical Athens, οἶκος denoted the fundamental social and political unit. The οἶκος was vital to Athenian society for multiple reasons, but was arguably most significant because Athenian wealth depended on household estates. The οἶκος was headed by the male κύριος who held authority over his wife, his children, and his slaves.¹² The Roman family (*familia*) was simultaneously similar and unique when compared with the Greek household.¹³ The households of ancient Judaism were also patriarchal, but Jewish law regarding family contrasted sharply with Greek and Roman law.¹⁴ Despite the differences that existed, individuals were received into the οἶκος through analogous

8. Robert Brian Lewis, *Paul's 'Spirit of Adoption' in Its Roman Imperial Context*, LNTS 545 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016); Michael Peppard, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

9. οἶκος θεοῦ – Eph 2:19; 1 Tim 3:15; 5:1–2; Titus 2:1–10; τέκνα θεοῦ – John 1:12, 11:52; Rom 8:16–17, 21; 9:8; 2 Cor 6:18; Eph 5:1; Phil 2:14–15; 1 John 3:1–2, 10; 5:2; υἱοὶ θεοῦ – Gal 3:26, 4:6–7; Rom 8:14, 19; 9:26.

10. Andreas J. Köstenberger, *Commentary on 1–2 Timothy and Titus*, vol. 2 of *Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander, Andreas J. Köstenberger, and Thomas R. Schreiner (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2017); J. Paul Sampley, ed., *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook, Volume 2*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 195.

11. David C. Verner, “The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles,” SBL Dissertation Series 71 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983). While Verner provides a helpful discussion on the household over time and culture (specifically the *Haustafeln* in the pastoral epistles), a discussion of hospitality—a facet of ancient society that is vital to the conversation—is virtually nonexistent within his work.

12. Aristotle, remarking on this idea in his *Politics*, pointed out that a complete household consisted of both freemen and slaves (1253b). He goes on to describe the role of κύριος as threefold: as master (δεσπότης), husband (πόσις), and father (πατήρ). It should be noted that familiar relationships within classical Athenian households were surely more complex than Aristotle’s straightforward and simplified explanation.

13. Verner, “The Household of God,” 33–35.

14. Verner, “The Household of God,” 44–47.

means: women through marriage, children through birth, and slaves through purchase or pedigree.

In the ancient world, when strangers were received by their hosts, they were assimilated into the household (οἶκος) and cultivated a relationship reminiscent of kinship (συγγένεια, ἔθνη, *domus*, and *familia* all reflect a pattern of kinship¹⁵ and framework), undertaking the obligations bestowed on family members at birth, inherited through marriage, and maintained until death.¹⁶ This action of strangers becoming kin through the act of hospitality will be demonstrated, establishing a foundation upon which Christianity would build its community as the οἶκος θεοῦ.

THE GREEK FAMILY AND HOSPITALITY

Familial relationships as explained above, as well as the extension of hospitality to strangers and foreigners, find their beginnings in ancient Greece. According to recent studies surrounding the practice of hospitality in the ancient Mediterranean, guests, regardless of cultural context, would be invited into the house, provided with supplies, and possibly escorted to their next destination. In ancient Greece, the host was expected to tend to the needs of his guests. The ancient Greek term *xenia* (ξένια), or *theoxenia* (θεοξένια—when a god sought refuge with a mortal host), expressed this ritualized guest-friendship relationship. Hospitality was so interwoven into ancient Greek society that there existed a general human obligation to the practice. A few examples of this idea can be found particularly in Homer's *Odyssey*. Nestor, Menelaus, and Alcinous not only received the basic amenities of food, drink, and lodging, but were also bathed, gifted clothing, offered or provided with transportation to their next destination, and given valuable gifts to take with them. Additionally, in the 5th century BCE, the guest-friendship between the Spartan Archidamus and the Athenian Pericles led the latter to believe that when the Spartans invaded Athenian territory, Archidamus would avoid his estate.¹⁷ Furthermore,

15. David E. Wilhite, *Tertullian the African: An Anthropological Reading of Tertullian's Context and Identities* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

16. "The *xenoi* were a part of the Greek idea of the family, and fair treatment of (and respect for) their *xenoi* was among the 'unwritten commandments' upon which the ethical standards of the *polis* were based, 'that you should honour the gods, your parents and your *xenoi*.'" W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece*, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, ed. H.H Scullard (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968), 31. Paul Roth claims that marriage and *xenia* are parallel social institutions in "The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia* in Aeschylus' 'Oresteia,'" *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993): 3. He even goes so far as to say that "the basic function of each was to bring an outsider into the kin-group" (Roth, "Corrupted *Xenia*," 3). See also John Bell Matthews, "Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study" (ThD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1964), 127–39.

17. Thucydides 2.13.1; Plutarch, *Pericles*, 8.4, 33.2.

in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, it become clear that the Greek army could not have accomplished their lengthy march without the hospitality of the various towns who provided them with food, drink, and other necessities. As these examples highlight, the stranger who had a *xenos*¹⁸ in a foreign land had an effective substitute for a kinsman, a protector, a representative, and an ally. He had a refuge if he were forced to flee his home, a storehouse on which to draw when compelled to travel, and a source of men and arms if drawn into battle.¹⁹

The archaeological evidence which aids us in our reconstruction of classical Greece and customs relating to hospitality in this time is sparse. Most of our knowledge is taken from texts surrounding the epic heroes and events, lauded in songs and legends. However, numerous scholars agree that when patterns are detected across the corpus of a single author or among the writings of numerous contemporary authors, the points of commonality likely reflect historical practices. It is under this assumption that I will proceed with this study.²⁰ Thus the task of enumerating the many instances in which hospitality is either extended or accepted is a daunting one, and will not be undertaken in this work.²¹ However, a few of the most valuable occurrences pertinent to this study demand a brief mention and analysis.

The first is arguably one of the most well-known examples from *The Iliad*. On the field of battle, Glaucus and Diomedes meet in face-to-face combat. In response to Diomedes's challenge to him, Glaucus says that as a grandson of Bellerophon, he will fight anybody. Upon learning of Glaucus's ancestry, Diomedes plants his spear in the ground and recounts that his grandfather Oeneus was a close friend of Bellerophon, and declares that the two of them, despite being on opposing sides, are guest-friends (ξένοι).²² This passage demonstrates the widely accepted view that once this relationship had been established, the guest-friends were linked by a bond similar to that of family. Just like a familial connection, the guest-friendship relationship was passed on to the offspring of the respective individuals.

18. ξένος – “guest-friend.”

19. Moses I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (1954; rev. and repr., New York: New York Review Books, 2002), 118.

20. For this same postulation, see Moses I. Finley, “The World of Odysseus Revisited,” *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 71 (1974): 13–31; and Walter Donlan, “Reciprocities in Homer,” *CW* 75 (1982): 137–75.

21. Some notable passages include: *The Iliad*—Hector and Ajax (7.299–302), Achilles shows hospitality to Odysseus (9.197–265), Hephaestus hosts Thetis in his home (18.406–409), Achilles shows hospitality to Priam (24.643–76); *The Odyssey*—Telemachus hosts Athena (1.102–324), Diocles hosts Telemachus and Peisistratus (3.487–93; 15.185–91), the Phaeacians host Odysseus (5.382–13.187), Eumaeus hosts Odysseus (14.1–533).

22. Homer, *The Iliad*, 6.212–15, 226–31.

Yet the most important passage from the Homeric epics in regard to the current discussion is found in *The Odyssey*. Telemachus comes to Nestor seeking information about his father. Nestor receives him with open arms, offers him lodging, and hosts a feast in his honor.²³ While there is not much to note in the encounter itself, when Telemachus later recounts the experience to his mother, he recalls: “Well now, mother, I’ll recount the truth to you. We went both to Pylos and to Nestor, the shepherd of men. That one received me in his lofty palace and kindly welcomed me. As a father would his own son, newly come from elsewhere after a long time, so that one kindly cared for me with his gloried sons.”²⁴

In the above passage we see that, according to Telemachus himself, when Nestor extended hospitality to him, invited him to dine at his table, and attempted to provide him with the information he sought, the young man was treated as one of Nestor’s sons and indirectly accepted into his household. Here the idea of artificial kinship asserts itself. While Telemachus was not family by blood in being received into Nestor’s home and at his table, in every other way he became kin. Indeed, Glotz described hospitality in ancient Greece as “a legal institution; a solemn contract [which] creates between two individuals an artificial kinship and consequently an imprescriptible obligation of mutual protection, hereditary forever.”²⁵ This concept of artificial kinship extended across cultural and theological divides, eventually seeping into early Christianity. During the Hellenistic period, concepts of kinship, family, and hospitality changed very little.²⁶ Yet there were some minute deviations, and it is worthwhile to note that ideas of kinship, both legitimate and fictive, extended beyond private parties and entered the political sphere.²⁷

23. Homer, *The Odyssey*, 3.4–485; 15.193–214.

24. Homer, *The Odyssey*, 17.108–13: ψχόμεθ’ ἕς τε Πύλον καὶ Νέστορα, ποιμένα λαῶν: δεξάμενος δέ μ’ ἐκεῖνος ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει, ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ ἐὼν υἴα ἐλθόντα χρόνιον νέον ἄλλοθεν: ὡς ἐμὲ κείνος ἐνδυκέως ἐκόμιζε σὺν υἴασι κυδαλίμοισιν. Translation is my own.

25. Gustave Glotz, *Ancient Greece at Work: An Economic History from the Homeric Period to the Roman Conquest*, *The History of Civilization*, trans. M. R. Dobie (1926; repr., New York: Routledge, 1996), 54.

26. Gabriel Herman, *Ritualized Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 7. It is notable that in early Rome, the patron-client relationship was integrated into the cultural framework and colored social interactions and motivations.

27. Though a thorough discussion of political kinship is not entirely relevant to the work at hand, it is worth pointing out that Christopher P. Jones offers a helpful and enlightening discussion on the topic. In it he distinguishes between traditional kinship and mythical kinship (the idea that individuals share ancestries through gods and heroes of Greek myth). See Christopher P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, vol. 12 of *Revealing Antiquity*, ed. G. W. Bowersock (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL AS “THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD”

The roots that early Christianity had in Judaism cannot be overlooked, especially in this discussion of household and hospitality.²⁸ The Greek word οἶκος is related to the Hebrew word בַּיִת.²⁹ Yet within the confines of Judaism, instead of Homer marking the epitome of hospitality, the essence of the guest-host relationship was embodied in the figure of Abraham and, in a lesser sense, Lot (see Gen 18:1–8 and 19:1–8, respectively).³⁰ In Hebrew, the practice is called *hachnasat orchim*, or “welcoming guests” (הַחֲנֻסַת אֹרְחִים). In addition to the previously mentioned expectations, hosts provided nourishment, comfort, and entertainment for their guests,³¹ and at the end of the visit, they would also customarily escort their guests from their homes toward their subsequent destination.³² At its simplest level, Jews were commanded to extend hospitality to strangers.³³ It was customary to seek hospitality from kinsmen.³⁴ In Philo, this custom was taken a step further when he commented on the hospitality Abraham extended to the heavenly messengers who had come to announce the pending birth of Isaac. Philo pointed out that the angels perceived Abraham as their kinsman (συγγενῆς) and, had they not, they would not have sought hospitality from him. While some scholars have suggested that the holy messengers’ perception of Abraham as a kinsman is more of an indication of blessedness and worthiness, I would suggest that the kinship Philo alluded to is yet another example of fictive kinship.³⁵

This postulation is not without evidence from the community of Israel as it appears in the Hebrew Bible. Real and fictive kinship relationships provided

28. In some instances, Israel was portrayed as a household (Amos 5:25; Jer 38:33). In others, it was called the “house of Yahweh” (Num 12:7, Jer 12:7; Hos 8:1; and Mic 4:2); cf. Brendan Byrne, “Sons of Gods,” *ABD* 6:156–58. Further, in Ephesians 2, Paul emphasizes the inclusiveness of the gospel/church and draws heavily on the kinship language of Old Testament (see more specifically Eph 2:19: ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ [j] ἐστὲ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ).

29. While Koenig does not necessarily overlook this point, he does argue that Jewish hospitality arose out of the Bedouin tradition. See John Koenig, “Hospitality,” *ABD* 3:299–301 (cf. Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 57n8).

30. Other figures which exemplified hospitality in the Jewish tradition are Lot (Gen 19:1–3; cf. 1 Clem 11:1), Laban (Gen 24:10–61), Jethro (Exod 2:15–22), Rahab (Josh 2:1–21; cf. Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25; 1 Clem 12:1–3), Manoah (Judg 13:1–23), the Shunammite woman (2 Kgs 4:8–36), and Job (31:32; cf. *T. Job* 10.1–3, 25.5, 53.3). Cf. Julius H. Greenstone, “Hospitality,” *JE* 6:480–81.

31. Yisrael Meir Kagan, *Ahavath Chesed: The Love of Kindness*, 2nd ed., rev. (Warsaw: Feldheim, 1888), 284.

32. Babylonian Talmud Sotah, 46B.

33. Exod 22:21, 23:9; Lev 19:33–34; Deut 16:14, 26:12.

34. Gen 24:15–27; Tob 5:6, 6:11, 9:5.

35. Philo writes that the angels also perceived Abraham as “a fellow servant with them, bound to the service of the same master as themselves” (Philo, *On Abraham*, 116).

the foundation for social organization in ancient Israel.³⁶ While lineage (also known in Hebrew as *בַּיִת-אָב* or “father’s house”) provided identity and inheritance,³⁷ tribes, which presumed descent from a common ancestor (i.e., Benjamin, Judah, Ephraim, etc.), were not exactly united in blood or marriage and made up another level of the societal hierarchy.³⁸ Christopher Wright offers an excellent explanation about the pertinence of kinship to the composition of ancient Israelite society and community: “First the family was the basic unit of Israelite kinship and social structure ... with important military and judicial functions. Second, it was the basic economic unit of Israel’s land tenure ... Third, it was of central importance in the experience and preservation of the covenant relationship with Yahweh.”³⁹

Kinship was subsequently extended to outsiders through covenants or legal fictions by which non-kin might be incorporated into the kinship group.⁴⁰ The assimilated individuals gained fictive kinship and shared the mutual obligations and privileges of real kinsmen. We glimpsed this same idea of assimilating outsiders in ancient Greece and will see it again with the development of early Christianity.⁴¹

THE CHRISTIAN “FAMILY”

The typical discussion that surrounds the early Christian community as the “household of God,” in addition to the inevitable conversation regarding “adoption” as children of God,⁴² is that the concept of “household” in Christian communities was often referred to as a metaphorical and abstract idea.⁴³ At

36. Richard D. Nelson provides a thorough discussion on this point in *Historical Roots of the Old Testament (1200–63 BCE)*, BibEnc 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

37. Gen 24:15–27; Tob 5:6, 6:11, 9:5.

38. See Judges 5.

39. Christopher J. H. Wright, “Family,” *AYBD* 2:765.

40. The familial nature of covenant relations can be glimpsed in Gen 29:14 (NRSV). When Laban encounters Jacob he says, “Surely you are my bone and my flesh!” In Judg 9:2 (NRSV), Abimelech pressures his mother’s kinsmen to repudiate Jerubbaal as ruler in favor of himself by saying, “Remember also that I am your bone and your flesh.” Cf. Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises*, Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library, ed. John J. Collins (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

41. Frank Moore Cross, “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel,” in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 3–22 (esp. 7).

42. See Rom 8:15–17 for believers as adopted sons, and 1 Pet 4:10 for believers as servants and stewards.

43. Gerald O. West, “Taming Texts of Terror: Reading (Against) the Gender Grain of 1 Timothy,” *Scriptura* 86 (2004): 160–73; John M. G. Barclay, “The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London: Routledge, 1997). Verner

other times the obvious point that gatherings were often held in homes and households is frequently asserted.⁴⁴ While these are valid arguments, they are only facets of the complex spectrum of possibilities.⁴⁵ For just as strangers accepted by hosts were integrated into private households in a Greco-Roman context, outsiders were incorporated into the tribes of ancient Israel through the making of covenants. Similarly, individuals who were embraced into various Christian communities through baptism entered into a communal household and a relationship founded on fictive kinship.⁴⁶ Likewise, as hospitality carried certain reminders of kinship in the Greco-Roman world, parallel responsibilities existed among the Christian believers and their “kin.”⁴⁷ Furthermore, this kinship relationship in the New Testament, especially in the language used by Paul, goes beyond the function served in the traditional Greco-Roman household. Instead, over time, it morphed into the “dynamic, versatile, and elastic realm of ‘fictive kinship,’” which provides additional significance and function. Thus, these terms, in a Christian context, are not limited by the confines of a traditional household.⁴⁸

points to the idea that referencing the church as “the household of God” determines the conception of their individual households as a church on a smaller scale. See Verner, “The Household of God.” For those who describe family language as a “key image,” and the “most significant metaphorical usage” that compares the Christian community with a “family,” see K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 20; K. C. Hanson, “Kinship,” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 62–79; Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 82–83, 134–60; David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000); Joseph H. Hellerman, *The Ancient Church as Family* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001); Robert J. Banks, *Paul’s Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Historical Setting* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 53–54.

44. Acts 2:46, 12:12, 16:40; Rom 16:35; Col 4:15; Phil 1:1–2.

45. Mengestu, in *God as Father in Paul*, 204, writes that the image of God as father and followers as children of God “shapes and expresses the self-understanding(s) of early Christ followers, providing an orienting framework to understand who they are, how they came into existence as a community and how they need to relate to God, to one another, and to the outside world.”

46. Wolfgang Stegemann, in “The Emergence of God’s New People: The Beginnings of Christianity Reconsiders,” *HTS Theological Studies/Theological Studies* 62, no. 1 (2006): 23–40, wrote, “Unlike the many other ancient peoples, the *Christianoi* as God’s people shared no common genealogical descent from a common ancestor. Instead, they were connected through fictive kinship, which means that they belong to the household of God (*familia dei*) and ultimately traced their birth to and from God” (37).

47. For the aforementioned obligations, see Acts 2:42, 44; 4:34; Rom 12:13, 15:26; Gal 6:6; 2 Cor 8:4, 9:13; Phil 1:7, 4:15; 1 Tim 6:18; Heb 13:16.

48. For further discussion, see Mengestu, *God as Father in Paul*, 205.

Scholars have evaluated the early Christian community through this anthropological lens. Jerome Neyrey goes so far as to say that when individuals left their natural kinship groups, they were compensated by the fictive kinship of the congregants that formed around Jesus and continued in various forms after his death.⁴⁹ Dennis Duling supports this idea, arguing that the *ekklēsia* (ἐκκλησία), specifically in Matthew, should be regarded as a fictive kinship group or brotherhood.⁵⁰ Gerhard Lenski proposes that early Christian communities developed into social entities most equivalent with the voluntary associations, including ancient hospitality, of the first century Greco-Roman world. By employing these concepts of fictive kinship, it appears that Christian sects attempted to insulate themselves from the pressures of a larger society, identifying an internal cohesion with obvious demarcations of social and moral boundaries.⁵¹ In summary, early Christian communities referred to collectively as the “household of God,” and the members of the communities as “children of God,” represented groups of fictive kinship. The same can be demonstrated for relationships built and established through the practice of hospitality in the Greco-Roman world.

CONCLUSION

Within the last decade, Jerome Neyrey has mourned that the issues of “family and fictive kinship remain underdeveloped in [biblical] scholarship.”⁵² Similarly, Trevor Burke has written, “This neglect not only relates to the gospels but to the Pauline letters as well, which is surprising, given the fact that Paul’s theology was inextricably related to social reality.”⁵³ This paper has, first and foremost, attempted to bring a discussion of fictive kinship to the forefront. Establishments of fictive kinship have been examined and discussed, specifically regarding hospitality, which has foundations in the familial institution. Through this study I have also sought to prove that the community of early Christians as a household entity, and the believers themselves as “children of

49. Jerome H. Neyrey, “Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour: The Cultural Context of the Original Makarisms in Q,” in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*, ed. Philip F. Esler (London: Routledge, 1995), 139–58. See Matt. 12:49, in which Jesus describes his disciples as his “mother and brothers.”

50. See Dennis C. Duling, “The Matthean Brotherhood and Marginal Scribal Leadership,” in *Modelling Early Christianity*, 159–182.

51. Bruce J. Malina, “Early Christian Groups: Using Small Group Formation Theory to Explain Christian Organization,” in *Modelling Early Christianity*, 96–113; Esler, ed., *Modelling Early Christianity*, 58.

52. Neyrey, “Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour,” 157.

53. Trevor J. Burke, *Family Matters: A Socio-Historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians*, LNTS 247 (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 3.

God,” developed in part because of the pseudo-familial relationship of hospitality that can be traced back to the Homeric epics. Furthermore, this paper intended to show, as many scholars have before, that early Christianity and its texts cannot be studied in isolation. In order to advance our understanding of early Jesus followers and the religion they professed, the context in which they developed and thrived must always be called upon and considered.