ENTERTAINING ANGELS

New Testament Monographs, 8

Series Editor
Stanley E. Porter

ENTERTAINING ANGELS

EARLY CHRISTIAN HOSPITALITY IN ITS MEDITERRANEAN SETTING

Andrew E. Arterbury

SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS

2005

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press
Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield
Sheffield S10 2TN

www.sheffieldphoenix.com

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Typeset by Forthcoming Publications
Printed by Lightning Source

ISBN 1-905048-21-1
ISSN 1747-9609

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992)
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Ryland's University Library of Manchester*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CW	*Classical World*
DGRA	William Smith, William Wayte and G.E. Marindin (eds.), *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (2 vols.; London: John Murray, 3rd rev. and enl. edn, 1890)
EGHT	Graham Speake (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition* (2 vols.; London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000)
ERE	James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (12 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908–22)
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
GR	*Greece and Rome*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LS	*Louvain Studies*
NASV	New American Standard Version
NCB	New Century Bible

NCE	*The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (18 vols.; New York: McGraw–Hill, 1967)
NIB	Leander Keck (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Bible* (10 vols.; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995)
NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum*, Supplements
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OCD	Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 1996)
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983)
Parab	*Parabola*
PCA	*Proceedings of the Classical Association*
PRS	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	*Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SD	Studies and Documents
SP	Sacra pagina
ST	*Studia theologica*
TDNT	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
ThTod	*Theology Today*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YJS	Yale Judaic Series
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*

Acknowledgments

It cannot go without saying that I am deeply indebted to many people for the completion of this monograph. First, I want to acknowledge the tremendous assistance and guidance that both Mikeal C. Parsons and Charles H. Talbert provided to me during the course of this endeavor, which began as a PhD dissertation. Both men helped me identify the topic, structure my research, and improve upon my conclusions. *Mentor* is a fitting label for both men.

Second, I want to thank the editors at Sheffield Phoenix Press for making the publication of this monograph such an enjoyable experience. David Clines, Stanley E. Porter, and Duncan Burns all spotted inadvertent errors and helped me make significant improvements to the manuscript for which I am grateful. Any remaining errors and weaknesses are of course my own.

Third, I need to thank a variety of people who either read or commented on portions of this book. These people include: William H. Bellinger, Jr, William H. Brackney, Joel S. Burnett, Derek S. Dodson, Sharyn E. Dowd, David E. Garland, Jeffrey S. Hamilton, Ronald F. Hock, Naymond H. Keathley, Gregory E. Sterling, John Thorburn, Jr, and N.T. Wright. I also need to thank Trisha M. Wheelock for helping me compile the list of abbreviations.

Fourth, I want to thank the editors of *Perspectives in Religious Studies* for permission to draw upon some of my initial research on the custom of hospitality, which was published in their journal. Those articles are: 'The Ancient Custom of Hospitality, the Greek Novels, and Acts 10:1–11:18', *PRS* 29 (2002) 53-72, and 'Abraham's Hospitality among Jewish and Early Christian Writers: A Tradition History of Genesis 18:1-16 and its Relevance for the Study of the New Testament', *PRS* 30 (2003) 359-76.

Finally, I want to express appreciation to my family. I am grateful for the continued support of my mother, Laura Earlene Brown, and father, Elvis H. Arterbury. My sons, Timothy Luke and Daniel Amos Arterbury, bring me much joy and provide me with many welcome diversions. More than any other, however, I must thank my wife, Kristin, whose loving and kind disposition encourages me to complete projects like this one.

1

Introduction

What do we mean when we say that an early Christian offered 'hospitality' to someone else? Can we accurately claim that anytime a host provided a meal for someone else in his or her home, the host had offered 'hospitality' to that person? That might very well be true if we are using a modern definition of hospitality, but it may not be accurate if we are using an ancient understanding of hospitality. Yet, biblical scholars routinely neglect an ancient understanding of hospitality (ξενία) and instead work with a contemporary definition of hospitality that grows out of our own social or theological contexts rather than a historical one.

For instance, in contemporary contexts it is common to use the word 'hospitality' to describe a host who provides a meal to another person, even if the recipient of that meal is one's next door neighbor. Similarly, in contemporary theological contexts it is common to use the word 'hospitality' when referring to the act of expressing love or demonstrating receptivity to someone outside of our primary social group. In these theological discussions, the only requirement is that the 'guest' be different from the 'host' in any number of possible ways, such as gender, race, physical appearance, and socio-economic status.[1] Yet, neither set of thoughtful gestures would have been described as hospitality (ξενία) in antiquity.

Obviously, there is no need for alarm when twenty-first century authors use the word hospitality to describe the actions of feeding, showing generosity, or showing love to another person. A problem does arise,

1. For example, Letty M. Russell, 'Practicing Hospitality in a Time of Backlash', *ThTod* 52 (1996) 476-84. Russell designates women, 'persons of color, gay and lesbian persons, poor persons, disabled persons, and just about any marginal group that we would want to name' as those who are in need of Christian hospitality (p. 476). She goes on to say that 'If God has extended a welcome to all "outsiders", including ourselves, then we are called to practice hospitality by being for others, standing with them in their struggles, and understanding election from their perspective' (p. 482).

however, when biblical exegetes incorporate contemporary ideas about hospitality into their interpretations of ancient texts that discuss ancient hospitality (ξενία).

These tendencies manifest themselves in a variety of ways in biblical scholarship. Commonly, scholars use the word hospitality to refer to only one of a handful of actions associated with hospitality (ξενία) in antiquity, in particular that of providing a meal to another person. Conversely, while providing a meal to a traveler is perhaps the most common expression of Mediterranean hospitality, one cannot say that all expressions of table fellowship are expressions of hospitality. Yet unfortunately, biblical scholars commonly use the terms table fellowship and hospitality interchangeably.

For instance, in his article entitled 'Jesus, Table-Fellowship, and Qumran', James D.G. Dunn attempts to use the words hospitality, guest-friendship, and table fellowship interchangeably.[2] These terms then become problematic for Dunn's thesis. While it is perfectly acceptable for Dunn to use a modern definition of hospitality when he makes observations about Jesus' ministry, his discussion of table fellowship becomes confusing when he alludes to Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Abraham's hospitality in Genesis 18 as examples of the 'background' for a 'discussion of Jesus' practice of table-fellowship'.[3] This is problematic because these three people are well known examples of those who practiced the ancient custom of hospitality (ξενία), which refers to the hosting of strangers or travelers. Hence, Dunn has mixed specific terminology with general terminology thereby clouding the issue of whether he is discussing Jesus' eating habits in general or more specifically the occasions in which Jesus is the guest in a hospitality (ξενία) encounter.

John Gillman runs into a similar problem in his article, 'Hospitality in Acts 16'. For instance, even though Gillman works with examples of hospitality in Acts 16 that correspond to the ancient custom of ξενία, he begins with a definition that simply revolves around the eating of food. As a result, in his first paragraph Gillman claims that when the believers broke bread in their own homes they were engaging in hospitality.[4] Yet, when he discusses Lydia's reception of Paul and Silas, he discusses an occasion in which Lydia, as the head of her household, invites two

2. James D.G. Dunn, 'Jesus, Table-Fellowship, and Qumran', in *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected Essays of James D.G. Dunn*. I. *Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 96-111 (96-98).
3. Dunn, 'Jesus, Table-Fellowship, and Qumran', 97.
4. John Gillman, 'Hospitality in Acts 16', *LS* 17 (1992) 181-96 (181).

travelers to lodge with her. Thus, even though one of the provisions Lydia supplies to her guests is food, asking two strangers to eat and lodge overnight in one's home is somewhat different from a worshiping community sharing a meal together in their home region.

These underdeveloped perspectives on hospitality not only affect biblical scholarship in general, but they have also led to misguided conclusions about Cornelius's conversion in Acts 10–11. For instance, Sarah Schurz Henrich's 1994 dissertation, 'Godfearing in Acts 10: The Changing Rules of Hospitality in Early Christianity', illustrates the need for a more complete definition of hospitality (ξενία). Prior to her extended treatment of Acts 10–11 and her helpful discussion about what it means for Cornelius to be a god-fearing person, Henrich discusses 'shared hospitality' as it is manifested within Luke–Acts.[5] Furthermore, when she treats 'shared hospitality' in Luke–Acts, she not only points to common patterns of human behavior as evidence of this 'shared hospitality', but she also rightly points to a consistent vocabulary that can be found in a variety of passages that she refers to as 'mission' passages.

Yet, Henrich inadvertently falls into two traps. First, she relies exclusively on a literary-critical approach[6] to argue that Luke constructed the pattern of ministry that Jesus passes on to his disciples in Luke–Acts.[7] And, because Luke wanted his readers to perceive this similarity, he used a consistent set of Greek words in order to make this connection obvious to his readers.[8] In this work, however, I will demonstrate that the behavioral patterns and the repetitious vocabulary that Henrich cites are not the exclusive results of Luke's own literary artistry. Instead, both the recurring actions and the repetitious words are simply reflections of standard Mediterranean expectations related to the custom of hospitality (ξενία) and standard Mediterranean terminology that was generally employed when writing about hospitality (ξενία). As a result, when Henrich turns to Acts 10, she attributes too much importance to Luke's skill as a narrator.

Second, Henrich's dissertation would benefit from a more complete understanding of hospitality. Although Henrich never actually defines what she means by hospitality, it becomes clear she is referring to a loving and accepting community of believers when she uses the phrase 'shared hospitality'. For instance, at one point she writes, 'In these verses

5. Sarah Schurz Henrich, 'Godfearing in Acts 10: The Changing Rules of Hospitality in Early Christianity' (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1994), 16.
6. Henrich, 'Godfearing', 8 n. 23.
7. Henrich, 'Godfearing', 14.
8. Henrich, 'Godfearing', 16.

we see the earliest followers gathering in a unified community in one place (i.e. shared hospitality)…'[9]

Perhaps most problematic, though, when Henrich refers to hospitality, she appears to envision it exclusively as an outgrowth of a Christian conversion. As a result, Henrich cannot account for all of the hospitality scenes that she herself identifies. For instance, Henrich is unable to discuss Mary's visit to Elizabeth in Lk. 1.39-56 or the centurion's invitation to Jesus in Lk. 7.1-10 within her more extended discussion of 'shared hospitality' passages. Instead, even though Henrich points out the semantic connections between these passages and other Lukan passages, such as Acts 10.1–11.18, she chooses not to work with them because they do not result in Christian conversions. Therefore, she is forced to label the centurion's offer of hospitality to Jesus in Lk. 7.1-10 as 'the frustration of the mission paradigm'.[10] In the end, Henrich, along with many contemporary biblical scholars, has not yet visualized hospitality as a societal practice that was common throughout the Mediterranean world in antiquity.

Previous Scholarship on Hospitality

Two notable works on the custom of hospitality have been produced that subsequently reduced the confusion over this custom. First, John Bell Mathews's 1964 dissertation, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study',[11] is the seminal study on the presence of hospitality in the New Testament. Mathews builds upon and greatly advances the work of Helga Rusche[12] and Gustav Stählin[13] to provide a comprehensive definition of hospitality in antiquity before moving on to a consideration of the custom in the New Testament. In particular, Mathews advances our understanding of hospitality by not only investigating the way that the Jews assisted strangers, but also by investigating the way that Greeks and Romans assisted them. Thus, his treatment of hospitality in the New Testament made significant strides. Therefore, I will seek not so much to correct Mathews's work, as to supplement it.

9. Henrich, 'Godfearing', 37.

10. Henrich, 'Godfearing', 21 n. 22.

11. John Bell Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study' (ThD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1964), iii-vi.

12. Helga Rusche, 'Gastfreundschaft und Mission in Apostelgeschichte und Apostelbriefen', *ZMR* 41.4 (1957) 250-68; and *Gastfreundschaft in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments und ihr Verhältnis zur Mission* (Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1958).

13. Gustav Stählin, 'ξένος, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, φιλοξενία, φιλόξενος', in *TDNT*, V, 1-36.

Even though Mathews draws heavily from Greco-Roman materials, he primarily discusses topics rather than texts, thereby failing to illustrate fully his assertions at times. Furthermore, he does not demonstrate any knowledge of the Greek novels, and even though he briefly discusses the importance of the gift exchange, more needs to be said about its pivotal role in the transition from a temporary to a permanent hospitality relationship in a Greco-Roman context.[14] Moreover, Mathews does not significantly advance Stählin's helpful but limited *TDNT* article on the Greek vocabulary of hospitality.

In the end, Mathews adeptly describes the core practices involved in hospitality, but it remains difficult for scholars who read Mathews to determine when ancient authors have moved from discussing the custom of hospitality to discussing the act of hosting a banquet and the like. In addition, since Mathews's dissertation was never published, many scholars have now begun to lose sight of his significant contribution. Finally, Mathews does not include a complete discussion of Acts 10–11 despite the fact that the ancient custom of hospitality provides the underlying logic for the events that take place in Acts 9.43–11.18.

John Koenig then provides us with a second major work on the custom of hospitality. Koenig's monograph, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission*,[15] is insightful in many ways. In fact, the strength of Koenig's work lies with his exegetical treatment of the various passages he identifies. The weakness of Koenig's work, however, lies with his definition of hospitality. In essence, Koenig works with a definition of hospitality that is simultaneously too broad, too narrow, and too fluid.

First, Koenig often works with a contemporary definition of hospitality in which his focus is upon a unified community of believers that is able to cooperate and partner together in ministry.[16] His discussion about unity, however, moves outside the bounds of ancient hospitality (ξενία). Second, at times Koenig's definition is unnecessarily narrow. For instance, Koenig makes 'strangers' the only object of hospitality.[17] Koenig's restriction neglects the long-term, reciprocal nature of hospitality that is associated with ancient friendships and extended families.

Third, Koenig's definition is too fluid. Koenig often contorts passages in order to classify people as 'strangers'. Occasionally, he even chooses to argue that people are like strangers in an emotional or spiritual sense, rather than a literal sense.

14. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 134-38.

15. John Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (OBT, 17; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

16. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 8-10.

17. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 8.

Perhaps the clearest example of Koenig's understanding can be seen when he states, 'everyone involved is or can become a stranger'.[18] Koenig even treats the prodigal son as a stranger to himself.[19] I would argue, however, that ancient Mediterraneans would not have spoken about hospitality (ξενία) in such a way. Hence, in the end, despite his great skill as an exegete of the New Testament, Koenig lumps together biblical texts that do refer to hospitality (ξενία) with biblical texts that do not.

The Approach of this Study

In an effort to provide clarity for modern interpreters of the New Testament, I will first seek to understand the social convention of hospitality as it was understood in the world in which the authors of the New Testament were writing. Here, I will argue that, at its core ancient hospitality (ξενία) referred to the act of assisting one or more travelers for a limited amount of time. This assistance essentially consisted of provisions and protection. Yet, the provisions and protection often took many forms.

For instance, in Greco-Roman contexts, meritorious hosts typically received any visitor who approached their door or courtyard. If the host did extend hospitality to the visitor, he or she would then lead the traveler into the house. Once inside, the host found a seat for the guest, and showered provisions upon the guest. These provisions took a variety of forms, but commonly the host provided an elaborate meal, a bath, a place to sleep, possibly valuable gifts, supplies for the guest's journey, and possibly an escort to the guest's next destination.[20] Generally speaking, however, it was not even appropriate for the host to inquire about the guest's identity until after the host had given the guest an opportunity to refresh himself or herself with food and drink.

Similarly, in Jewish contexts, hosts typically provided food, sometimes lodging, water whereby the guest could wash his or her feet, protection from one's enemies, and, at times, an escort out of town.[21] Subsequently, early Christians continued to provide travelers with the standard elements of food, lodging, an escort to the guest's next destination, and provisions for the journey.[22]

18. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 8.
19. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 7.
20. Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1993), 12-39. Examples of hospitality relationships in Homer's *Odyssey* include Nestor and Telemachus (*Od*. 3.4-485; 15.193-214) and the Phaeacians and Odysseus (Odysseus narrates the material from *Od*. 5–13 while staying with the Phaeacians).
21. For example, Gen. 18.1-16; 19.1-25; 24.15-61.
22. For example, Lk. 10.38-42; 24.13-31; Acts 28.1-10.

In order to describe hospitality in antiquity, I will comb through a variety of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian texts looking for literary depictions of this ancient custom. In addition, I will combine the insights of both classicists and biblical scholars to create a far more complete description of this social convention than has heretofore been compiled. In the end, I will advance our understanding of this custom in at least three ways. First, in addition to many other Greco-Roman texts, I will draw upon the Greek novels.[23] These texts have been neglected in the existing work on hospitality even though they provide us with vivid pictures of Greco-Roman life from around 200 BCE to around 200 CE.[24]

Second, in addition to constructing a list of actions associated with an ancient extension of hospitality, I also intend to provide an extended list of conventional, semantic terms that were generally utilized by ancient authors when they referred to this social practice. As I noted above, a handful of scholars have pointed out some of the most common terms that are associated with hospitality (e.g. Gustav Stählin[25] and Abraham Malherbe[26]), but a more comprehensive list of these terms is needed. Consequently, the combination of common behavioral patterns associated with hospitality and a comprehensive list of semantic markers associated with hospitality should aid New Testament scholars in their future research.[27] The combination should enable them to differentiate between the custom of hospitality and other interpersonal interactions that are present in Mediterranean texts—a skill that is missing among many contemporary biblical scholars.

Finally, Acts 10–11 is a pivotal passage within Luke's two-volume work. It records the conversion of Cornelius and his household, which constitutes the first public conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity in the book of Acts. Importantly, though, hospitality holds a prominent position within this narrative unit. Yet, none of the scholars who work

23. The Greek novels include Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus's *An Ephesian Tale*, Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story*.

24. Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story* is the exception to this statement. For example, see J.R. Morgan, 'Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Story', in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 349-588 (351-52). Morgan dates *An Ethiopian Story* between 300 and 400 CE, though it is set in a literary context of 400 BCE.

25. Stählin, 'ξένος'.

26. Abraham Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2nd edn, 1983), 96.

27. For a similar approach, see Charles H. Talbert and Perry L. Stepp, 'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity, Part 1: The Lukan Milieu', *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998* (SBLSP, 37; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), I, 148-68, and 'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity, Part 2: Luke–Acts', I, 169-79.

with an ancient understanding of hospitality has applied this knowledge to a substantive reading of Acts 9.43–11.18, despite the fact that some scholars have noted the 'connection between the conversion of Cornelius and the issue of *hospitality*'.[28]

Methodology

As I undertake the objectives I have stated above, I will seek to provide a close reading of the final form of Acts 10–11 from the perspective of the authorial audience, or the hypothetical audience for which the text was designed, as articulated by Peter J. Rabinowitz[29] and applied to the study of the New Testament by scholars such as Mary Ann Tolbert and Warren Carter.[30] Hence, I will employ 'a literary-critical approach that emphasizes audience-critical methodology',[31] though much still needs to be said about what Rabinowitz means by the authorial audience.

As Rabinowitz introduces his version of audience-oriented criticism, he acknowledges that he can be loosely grouped with previous reader-oriented critics.[32] Yet, he does not share the same assumptions, goals, or methods as many other reader-oriented critics.[33] Unlike other audience-oriented critics, Rabinowitz finds it necessary to identify at least four 'different *levels* of audience interaction' that can be discussed in 'any

28. Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* (OBT, 20; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 109.

29. Peter J. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences', *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977) 121-41 (123).

30. Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); Warren Carter, 'The Crowds in Matthew's Gospel', *CBQ* 55 (1993) 54-67; *idem*, 'Recalling the Lord's Prayer: The Authorial Audience and Matthew's Prayer as Familiar Liturgical Experience', *CBQ* 57 (1995) 514-30; and *idem*, 'Matthew 4.18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective', *CBQ* 59 (1997) 58-75. See also, Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience Oriented Perspectives* (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998).

31. Martin M. Culy, 'Jesus—Friend of God, Friend of his Followers: Echoes of Friendship in the Fourth Gospel' (PhD dissertation, Baylor University, 2002), 16.

32. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 124. In a footnote, Rabinowitz cites nine well-known scholars whom he places in this stream of reader-oriented criticism. He mentions Wayne C. Booth, Stanley E. Fish, Norman Holland, Wolfgang Iser, John Preston, Walter Slatoff, Roland Barthes, Serge Doubrovsky, and Alain Robbe-Grillet.

33. Peter J. Rabinowitz, 'Whirl without End: Audience Oriented Criticism', in G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow (eds.), *Contemporary Literary Theory* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 81-100 (81-82). Perhaps the scholar with whom Rabinowitz shares the most in common is Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (trans. Timothy Bahti; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982).

narrative literary text'.[34] He labels these four levels of audience interaction as the *actual audience*, the *authorial audience*, the *narrative audience*, and the *ideal narrative audience*.[35]

It is his discussion of the *authorial audience*, or the *intended reader* as he refers to it at times,[36] that proves most helpful for the objectives of this project. Rabinowitz contends that the *authorial audience* is the 'specific hypothetical audience' for whom the author 'designs his work rhetorically'.[37] In the same vein, he defines the *intended reader* as 'the hypothetical person who the author hoped or expected would pick up the text'.[38] Rabinowitz's definitions then lead him to draw conclusions about both the author and the audience.

First, in regard to the author, he writes, 'Like a philosopher, historian, or journalist, he cannot write without making certain assumptions about his readers' beliefs, knowledge, and familiarity with conventions'.[39] Next, in regard to the audience, he writes, 'Since the structure of a novel is designed for the author's hypothetical audience (which I call the *authorial audience*), we must, as we read, come to share, in some measure, the characteristics of this audience if we are to understand the text'.[40]

As a result, Rabinowitz goes on to say that, 'If historically or culturally distant texts are hard to understand, it is often precisely because we do not possess the knowledge required to join the authorial audience'. For example, 'the belief structures of a society must often be 'explained' to the reader before he can fully understand the text'.[41] Rabinowitz then claims that if actual readers want to read the text as the authorial audience was expected to read the text, then they must conduct research to gain a better understanding of the beliefs and practices of the authorial audience's cultural context.[42]

Hence, if actual readers, like you and me, are going to read Luke and Acts as Luke's authorial audience read it, then we must bridge the gap of knowledge and beliefs that exists between the first century of the Common Era and today through research of the ancient Mediterranean world. As a result, since my objective in this study is to read Acts 9.43–11.18 in the same manner that the audience for whom Luke wrote his text would have read it, I must first conduct research that allows me to

34. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 124-25.
35. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 125-36.
36. Rabinowitz, 'Whirl without End', 85.
37. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 126.
38. Rabinowitz, 'Whirl without End', 85.
39. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 126.
40. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 126.
41. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 127.
42. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 131.

understand better the ancient Mediterranean custom of hospitality with which Luke's authorial audience was quite familiar.

Consequently, one might describe the methodology employed in this study as an exercise in historical audience-oriented criticism. My question is not, 'How do I make sense of the text?' Rather my question is, 'How did Luke's authorial audience make sense of the text?' It is precisely at that point, however, that I am assuming the authorial audience not only drew upon Luke's written words to make sense of Acts 9.43–11.18 but also upon their own preconceived notions about the social conventions and belief systems of their day. Rabinowitz makes a similar argument. He concludes that reading a text as the authorial audience did can be accomplished 'only by an examination of the interrelation between the text and the context in which the work was produced'.[43]

Hence, while I will not refrain from discussing the ways in which Luke has shaped and molded the final form of the text, neither will I primarily focus upon Luke's skill as a narrator. As a result, I will avoid trying to guess what Luke's intent as a narrator may have been. Instead, I will focus upon how Luke's work as a narrator would have logically impacted Luke's authorial audience. Rabinowitz also wants to acknowledge the close association between these two ideas while differentiating them as well. He writes:

> The notion of the authorial audience is clearly tied to authorial intention, but it gets around some of the problems that have traditionally hampered the discussion of intention by treating it as a matter of social convention rather than of individual psychology. In other words, my perspective allows us to treat the reader's attempt to read as the author intended, not as a search for the author's private psyche, but rather as the joining of a particular social/interpretive community.[44]

As a result, my first objective should allow me to achieve my second objective. In order to approach the conversion of Cornelius and his household from the perspective of the authorial audience, I will first need to read ancient, Mediterranean texts outside of the New Testament in order to gain a better understanding of the typical expectations that Luke's Mediterranean audience would have held in regard to hospitality.

Second, my research on hospitality will serve as the means by which I will attempt to achieve my goal of reading Acts 10–11 as Luke's authorial audience would have. By learning about ancient, Mediterranean social customs, we will simultaneously be learning about Luke's Mediterranean

43. Rabinowitz, 'Whirl without End', 85.

44. Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 22.

readers. We will be learning about the expectations and thought patterns of Luke's authorial audience. This knowledge of Luke's audience will then help us to make sense out of Acts 10–11.[45] Consequently, a thorough definition of hospitality will serve both to empower and to limit our reading of Acts 9.43–11.18 as we draw upon at least some of the expectations that were held by Luke's intended readers. Our research of the ancient world will allow us to see things that we may have otherwise missed, while simultaneously preventing us from importing ideas into the text that would have been foreign to Luke's authorial audience.

An Overview of this Study

While this study will not address many of the numerous scholarly debates that are related to the inclusion of the Gentiles, I am confident that the application of an ancient understanding of hospitality to Acts 9.43–11.18 will bring some clarity to the ongoing discussions about Acts 10–11. I will demonstrate that there are three separate manifestations of hospitality within Acts 9.43–10.48. In particular, at the story's most basic level, Peter and Cornelius interact with one another according to the social expectations that accompany a hospitality interaction in antiquity. Furthermore, I will demonstrate that Luke utilizes traditional hospitality terminology when he describes the interactions of Peter and Cornelius, thereby increasing the validity of my argument. Finally, I will show that Peter and Cornelius's hospitality relationship has implications for Luke's theology as well as Luke's understanding of the Gentile mission.

For instance, we will see that in Acts 10–11 Peter functions as God's representative, while forging an ongoing, reciprocal hospitality relationship with Cornelius. Yet, as these events take place, God is the primary actor in the events described in Acts 10–11. As a result, we will be able to speak of God's offer of hospitality to the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's house. Here, Luke appears to characterize the Christian God, over against Zeus, as the true God of Hospitality, who gives the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles.

Furthermore, throughout Luke's writings, Luke appears to lift up the custom of hospitality to his audience as an effective method for evangelizing those who are not Christians. Yet, while this is true on a general level, Luke appears to heighten his focus upon this social convention even more when he treats the Gentile mission. As a result, Luke's

45. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1997), ix, and *Reading Luke–Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu* (NovTSup, 107; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 14-18.

audience should have been able to conclude that the most effective means of evangelizing the Gentiles in particular may be through the observance of the Mediterranean custom of hospitality. In addition, Luke's readers may have concluded that hospitality can play a helpful role in uniting Jews and Gentiles within the Church and transforming believers into people who better understand the will of God.

In the first portion of this monograph, I will seek to describe the behaviors that were commonly associated with the social convention of hospitality in antiquity while compiling lists of the common semantic terms employed by authors who wrote about hospitality. To do this, I will turn first to Greco-Roman texts in Chapter 2. Here, I will examine a variety of Greek and Roman texts, though I will concentrate upon Homer's works because they illustrate ideal Greek hospitality and upon the Greek novels because they demonstrate the manner in which Homeric hospitality was practiced in Luke's day.

In Chapter 3 I will then turn to Jewish hospitality. Again, I will seek to describe the way in which this social convention manifests itself as evidenced throughout the Jewish Scriptures and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Here, I will highlight the hospitality of Abraham and its role as the paradigm for Jewish hospitality through the rabbinic period. In Chapter 4 I will once again seek to describe hospitality, but here I will focus on the way in which it was described among early Christians. Here, I will draw upon the writings of the New Testament, the Apostolic Fathers, and other early Christian writers.

In Chapter 5 I will first survey a variety of Lukan passages that demonstrate Luke's familiarity with the custom of hospitality. Then, I will read Acts 9.43–11.18 in light of ancient hospitality relationships. Here, I will point out the presence of hospitality in Acts 10–11, and then I will explore the theological significance of hospitality in Acts 10–11 for Luke's overarching message. Finally, in the Conclusion I will summarize my composite description of ancient hospitality.

Part I

Mediterranean Hospitality in Antiquity

2

Greco-Roman Hospitality in Antiquity

To identify Greco-Roman forms of hospitality in the first century CE, I first need to describe the custom of hospitality as it was practiced in ancient Greece. In part this is a necessary step because hospitality, as it was practiced in ancient Greece, greatly influenced many aspects of later Mediterranean hospitality. As a result, even though the Greek vocabulary associated with hospitality will evolve over time, the basic expression of this social convention will remain constant from the time of Homer throughout the Hellenistic age. Therefore, in this chapter, I will first describe hospitality in ancient Greece. Next, I will illustrate ancient Greek hospitality using Homer's works. Afterward, I will then turn to the Hellenistic period. Here, I will primarily illustrate Greco-Roman hospitality using the Greek novels and the work of Dio Chrysostom. Consequently, we will see that Homeric hospitality continued to have a prominent role in the social life of the Greco-Roman world well past the time period in which Luke was writing.

Describing Hospitality in Ancient Greece

Admittedly, reconstructing the custom of hospitality in ancient Greece is not easy because archaeologists provide us with very little concrete data and much of the information we do have is gathered from texts that include mythical characters and events. I think we can, however, draw heavily upon the literature from ancient Greece in order to discuss an ancient Greek social convention. Here, following M.I. Finley and Walter Donlan, I assume that when we detect patterns of social interactions within the corpus of one author (e.g. Homer) or among the writings of multiple authors, the points of commonality in the texts reflect actual, historical practices and expectations from ancient Greece.[1]

1. M.I. Finley, 'The World of Odysseus Revisited', *PCA* 71 (1974) 13-31 (16), and Walter Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', *CW* 75 (1981–82) 137-75 (137).

The practice of hospitality (ξενία) in antiquity had a long heritage as a valued custom among the Greek peoples. Furthermore, the term 'hospitality' is somewhat expandable and can refer to a variety of actions, which we will need to delineate. Generally, however, when scholars define hospitality, they define it as the kind treatment of travelers or strangers,[2] which included welcoming, feeding, lodging, protecting, and aiding the traveler.[3] Yet, even though the actions of hospitality are distinctive, a proper definition of hospitality hinges upon the identity of the persons involved. For instance, when defining hospitality Gabriel Herman chooses to highlight the foreignness of the two parties. As a result, Herman defines hospitality as a reciprocal relationship 'between individuals originating from separate social units'.[4] In other words, the recipient of hospitality (ξενία) in antiquity was a person who was traveling outside of his or, more rarely, her home territory.[5] In fact, Herman concludes that 'in the extant sources, no two people with the same group identity are ever referred to as *xenoi*'.[6]

Herman then goes on to make a necessary distinction between *friendship*s in ancient Greece and hospitality relationships in ancient Greece, which he refers to as '*ritualised friendships*'. Herman contends that 'friendship in the Greek states bound together individuals partaking of the same social system and sharing similar values'. Alternatively, Herman argues that 'ritualised friendship, by contrast, was concluded between persons who originated from different, and at times, drastically dissimilar social systems and who had no previous record of social intercourse'.[7]

2. See, e.g., Ladislaus J. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1977), 1, and 'From Xenophobia to Altruism: Homeric and Roman Hospitality', *The Ancient World* 1 (1978) 45-64. In both pieces, Bolchazy discusses Greek hospitality before he moves on to Roman hospitality.

3. Walter Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1999), 271; and Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 149. See also, Paul Roth, 'The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia* in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993) 1-17 (11); and Cynthia W. Shelmerdine, 'The Pattern of Guest Welcome in the *Odyssey*', *CJ* 65 (1969) 124.

4. Gabriel Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 10.

5. Even though female heads of households provide a noteworthy exception, the individuals in an ancient Greek hospitality relationship tend to be males rather than females (see Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 34). As a result, I will often use the masculine pronoun throughout this chapter.

6. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 11. One might be able to argue for a qualified exception to Herman's statement in Euripides, *Alc.* 1007-21. In this passage, Admetus reluctantly offers hospitality to his wife, but Alcestis is veiled so that Admetus has no way of knowing the woman in question is his wife.

7. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 29.

Even then, the host and guest relationships that are associated with Greek hospitality are very diverse. Beyond one to one relationships, hospitality at times referred to the relationship between nations (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist*. 1.27.50, 69.3),[8] communities (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist*. 6.21),[9] families (e.g. Homer, *Il*. 6.215-31),[10] and individuals or the combination of any of these categories (e.g. a nation and a person).[11] To organize this diversity, we must first demarcate a variety of distinctions. For instance, we must distinguish between hospitality as a permanent relationship and a temporary relationship, between hospitality as a value and an action, and between public hospitality and private hospitality. In addition, we will discuss the vast array of motives that underpin extensions of hospitality in Greco-Roman contexts.

First, we need to distinguish between temporary and permanent forms of hospitality. When someone extended hospitality to a traveler, it was understood that the guest would be willing to reciprocate the host's generosity if the host ever traveled to the guest's home region. This agreement was generally implied even if it was not stated formally. Yet, despite this cultural expectation, it is best to describe some of these hospitality encounters as temporary, whereas other hospitality encounters led to ongoing relationships or friendships that spanned generations.[12]

When Walter Donlan discusses the distinction between temporary and permanent hospitality, he uses different terms. He refers to a temporary hospitality interaction as 'simple hospitality', and a permanent hospitality relationship as a 'guest-friendship'. For instance, Donlan thinks,

> It is important…to distinguish between simple hospitality (τὰ ξείνια) to a stranger, and the formal bond of guest friendship. Custom, reinforced by divine sanction, demanded that any stranger (ξεῖνος)

8. John Thorburn, 'Hospitality', in *EGHT*, I, 775-78 (776). Herodotus speaks of the ties of hospitality between Croesus, king of Lydia, and the Ionians in 1.27, as well as between Croesus and the Spartans in 1.69.

9. St George Stock, 'Hospitality (Greek and Roman)', in *ERE*, VI, 808-12 (10). Herodotus also discusses the hospitality relationship between Sybaris and Miletus in *Hist*. 6.21.

10. The actions of Glaucus and Diomedes are often cited as an example of the ongoing hospitality between families. See, e.g., Thorburn, 'Hospitality', I, 776. Glaucus the Trojan and Diomedes the Greek meet on the battlefield during the Trojan War. Once they realize that their fathers had previously engaged in a hospitality relationship, they put their weapons down, exchange gifts, and vow not to fight one another.

11. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808. For example, Xenophon describes a public hospitality relationship between the Lacedaemonians and Polydamas of Pharsalus (*Hell*. 6.1.2-4).

12. Julian Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest and the Hostile Host: An Introduction to the Study of the Laws of Hospitality', in J.G. Peristiany (ed.), *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology: Mediterranean Rural Communities and Social Change* (Paris: Mouton, 1968), 13-31 (26-27).

> who appeared at the door be given protection and sustenance. The giving of obligatory or altruistic hospitality does not automatically establish a continuing ξεῖνος-relationship.[13]

Thus, in ancient Greece, any traveler could expect a moral Greek host to provide him or her with at least a one night stay—no questions asked. On the other hand, if the host deemed the stranger worthy and if the host wanted to enter into a long-term, reciprocal relationship with the stranger, then the host could forge a guest-friendship with his or her guest. This guest-friendship, however, carried with it additional obligations for both parties.

Using this distinction, Donlan points out that both types of hospitality are present within Homer's writings. He contends that *Odyssey* 1.187, 417; 4.171-80; 15.195; 17.522; 19.191; and 24.114 are examples of guest-friendship whereas *Iliad* 11.779; 18.387, 408, and *Odyssey* 3.490; 4.33; 5.91; 7.190; 14.494; 15.188, 514, 546 are examples of 'simple' hospitality.[14] For example, in *Iliad* 6.215-31 Glaucus and Diomedes relate to one another as guest-friends when they honor the relationship that their fathers had previously forged many years earlier. Moreover, they go on to exchange valuable gifts. Conversely, when Calypso, the nymph, entertains Hermes, Zeus's son and messenger, the relationship is a temporary relationship that ends when Hermes departs.

In addition, both Gabriel Herman and Marshall Sahlins allude to the differences between temporary or 'informal' hospitality and guest-friendship or 'formal' hospitality. Herman argues that formal hospitality takes on a pseudo-kinship relationship while informal does not.[15] Similarly, Sahlins lists hospitality under the categories of both *generalized reciprocity* and *balanced reciprocity* in his proposed spectrum of reciprocity in ancient Greece.[16] For Sahlins, *generalized reciprocity* deals with the societal expectation in ancient Greece that it was morally right to reciprocate after someone had helped you, but there was no clear expectation about when or to what degree the reciprocity would actually take place. Here, he envisions 'assistance that is freely given' and 'putatively altruistic'.[17]

Yet, Sahlins also groups hospitality in the category of *balanced reciprocity*. Here, Sahlins is referring to the type of hospitality that included gift exchanges. For Sahlins, *balanced reciprocity* deals with reciprocity among the ancient Greeks that occurred within a predictable time period and to

13. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 272.
14. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 148-49.
15. Gabriel Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', in *OCD*, 611-13 (612).
16. Marshall D. Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine–Atherton, 1972), 191-95. See also, Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 57.
17. Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 191-92.

a roughly equitable degree. For instance, he defines *balanced reciprocity* as 'transactions which stipulate returns of commensurate worth or utility within a finite and narrow period'. Furthermore, Sahlins contends that in *balanced reciprocity*, 'the material side of the transaction is at least as critical as the social'.[18]

Donlan echoes Sahlins's sentiments when he contends that formalized or permanent hospitality, which he equates with guest-friendships, involved a *quid pro quo*.[19] As a result, when a guest and a host entered into a guest-friendship, the guest actually expected to see, to welcome, and to give gifts to his host when his host visited him in his own home at some point in the future. Entertaining his former host at some point in the future was no longer simply a possibility, rather it was an expectation. Furthermore, the host who offered these gifts expected to receive comparable benefits from his guest at a later date. 'The return need not be forthcoming at once, and it might take several forms. But come it normally would.'[20] In addition, the later generations of the two parties were morally bound by this contractual agreement (e.g. *Il*. 6.215-31).[21]

Due to the ongoing nature of formal hospitality and the mutual obligations that came with it, M.I. Finley argues that guest-friendships functioned very much like ongoing alliances. In fact, Finley argues that guest-friendships were the traditional form of political alliances in the days before the formation of the *polis*. He writes, 'Guest-friend and guest-friendship were far more than sentimental terms of human affection. In the world of Odysseus they were technical names for very concrete relationships. And they remained so well thereafter.'[22] Finley goes on to argue that after the rise of the *polis*, guest-friendships evolved along with society. For instance, he cites the hospitality (ξενία) relationship between Croesus, king of Lydia, and Sparta in the sixth century BCE (Herodotus, *Hist*. 1.69). As a result, Finley contends that by the sixth century guest-friendships had evolved from a relationship between individuals as we see in Homer's writings to a relationship between nations even though the fundamental mechanics of formal hospitality remained the same.[23]

18. Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 194-95.

19. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 144.

20. M.I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (New York: Penguin, 2nd edn, 1954 [repr. 1979]), 65.

21. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 271.

22. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 102, 123. See also, Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 271.

23. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 100. It should be noted that guest-friendships were also the precursor to the practice of political hospitality, which I will discuss shortly.

Gabriel Herman goes on to illustrate more fully the dynamic that Finley notices. For example, Herman lifts up Glaucus and Diomedes in *Iliad* (6.215-31) as an example of the time period prior to the *polis*. In this case, the hereditary hospitality relationship between the two men takes precedence over their comrades in war. On the other hand, Herman turns to Xenophon's *Hellenica* 4.1.29-36, which was written in the fourth century BCE after the rise of the *polis*. In this text, however, the citizen's loyalty to his *polis* clearly has priority over his loyalty to his ξένος, his hospitality counterpart (4.1.34). Thus, Herman concludes that after the rise of the *polis* 'civic obligations had come to take priority even over guest-friendship'.[24]

During this developmental process, the questions of who forged these permanent hospitality relationships on behalf of a community and with whom a community was willing to enter into an alliance became more significant. As a result, a thorough evaluation of the guest became more important. For instance, a host (or a host community) was most interested in forming a permanent hospitality relationship with a traveler (or foreign community) who held an equitable social status or at least a status that the host found to be strategically beneficial.[25] Furthermore, during the Homeric period, kings and tribal leaders often played the pivotal role in the extension of hospitality to a noteworthy guest.[26] As representatives of a group of people, the kings and tribal leaders often made the decision regarding who was worthy of their valuable gifts and who was worthy of a political alliance.

Finally, we need to ask, 'How can we discern when the ancient texts are describing a temporary hospitality relationship as opposed to a permanent hospitality relationship?' Walter Donlan and L.J. Bolchazy both argue that the transition from simple hospitality to a more formal, guest-friendship took place when the host offered gifts to the guest. Thus, when the guest accepted the gifts or when the host and guest exchanged gifts, the two parties had forged a permanent hospitality relationship.[27] 'For that to occur, it is necessary that both men agree to a relationship, declare it formally, and symbolically cement it by an exchange of gifts.'[28] Therefore, beyond supplying provisions and other common courtesies like food, drink, a bath, clothes, a bed, protection, and supplies for the

24. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 1-2.
25. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 272-73.
26. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 102.
27. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 150, and Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 57. See also Stock, 'Hospitality', 809-10, and Oscar E. Nybakken, 'The Moral Basis of *Hospitium Privatum*', *CJ* 41 (1945–46) 248-53 (248).
28. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 272.

journey, if the host wanted to enter into a guest friendship, the host gave valuable gifts to the guest (e.g. *Od*. 1.311-18; 15.536-38; 17.163-65; 19.309-11).[29] Consequently, the guest-friend was enriched through tangible gifts that symbolized the extent to which the host valued his guest.

Herman argues for a more complete ceremony that was carried out either upon the formation of a formal hospitality relationship or upon its reactivation if it had been dormant for many years. He includes 'a solemn declaration ("I make you my xenos", and "I accept you")', a handshake, and a feast (Xenophon, *Hell*. 4.1.39; Livy 23.9.3-4) in this ceremony. Yet even then, Herman sees the 'exchange of symbolic gifts' as the center of this ceremony.[30] Thus, the most significant difference between temporary and permanent hospitality relationships is the gift exchange. Gift exchanges within a hospitality interaction inaugurated a permanent, reciprocal relationship.

Second, in ancient Greece, hospitality appears to have been both 'a relation and a quality'.[31] On the one hand, hospitality refers to the relationship that was forged between the resident(s) of a community and a traveler when the resident(s) treated the traveler with kindness. On the other hand, hospitality refers to the ethical quality that the one who welcomes a stranger possesses. For instance, Xenophon says that Polydamas of Pharsalus 'was hospitable (φιλόξενος) and magnificent, after the Thessalian manner' (Xenophon, *Hell*. 6.1.3 [Brownson, LCL]).[32] In addition, Aristotle praises hospitality as a virtue (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 1123a.3). Thus, hospitality was more than simply a relationship between two entities; it was also a quality or virtue.

This distinction between hospitality as a relation and a quality seems to have been manifest in the language of the ancient Greeks. For instance, George Stock argues that the Greek word ξενία was generally employed to refer to the relationship between a host and a guest, whereas the Greek word φιλοξενία was employed to refer to the quality.[33]

Third, and probably more significantly, once we move from the time of Homer into the sixth century BCE and following, a clear distinction arises between public and private hospitality among the ancient Greek peoples.[34] Within this framework, public hospitality primarily refers to political hospitality that was granted by a state to an individual.

29. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 65.
30. Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 290.
31. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808.
32. Stock, 'Hospitality', 811, also cites Xenophon, *Hell*. 6.1.3.
33. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808.
34. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808. See also, Leonard Schmitz and William Wayte, '*Hospitium* (ξενία, προξενία)', in *DGRA*, I, 977-82 (977).

Conversely, private hospitality refers to hospitality that was voluntarily extended to a guest for purposes other than political relations or commercial exchanges, especially in the days after the formation of the *polis*.

For the sake of simplicity, it is most helpful to begin with the vocabulary of the ancient Greeks when illustrating the differences between public and private hospitality. Traditionally, the Greeks spoke about a private person involved in an extension of private hospitality by employing the word ξένος. Similarly, when they spoke about the private hospitality relationship, they employed the word ξενία (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 5.91; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.119). Yet, by the sixth century BCE, when the Greeks spoke about a person involved in public hospitality they used the word πρόξενος. Likewise, when they spoke about this public hospitality relationship, they used the word προξενία (Livy 1.45).[35]

I will illustrate the practice of private hospitality more fully when I provide examples from Homer's writings later in this chapter, but it would be helpful to say a little more now about the term ξένος. The Greeks often used the term ξένος quite freely to refer to any of the parties involved in this social interaction. For instance, ξένος was used to refer to complete strangers (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 3.34; Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.114-15), established guests (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 3.350), and even hosts (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 1.214; Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.114-15).[36] Thus, the ancient Greeks seldom found it necessary to distinguish between the various roles in a hospitality interaction. This practice continued through the Roman period. Yet, by failing to demarcate the roles of the host and guest semantically, we can see the degree to which the Greeks (and Romans) considered this social convention to be based upon a fluid and reciprocal relationship. It should be noted, however, that when the Greeks were virtually forced to distinguish between the host and the guest, 'they expressed the entertainer by the word ξενοδόκος, leaving ξένος for the person entertained' (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 8.542).[37]

Political hospitality, on the other hand, became a recognized custom in Greek cities after the Homeric era. At least by the sixth century BCE, states or *poleis* would often appoint a πρόξενος:

> A *proxenos* was a person living in a city-state either as a citizen or resident alien, who was officially chosen to take care of the interests of another city-state—he was, in effect, the other state's accredited representative in the one where he dwelled. He was necessarily a man of wealth and position;

35. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808. See also, Schmitz and Wayte, '*Hospitium*', 977. The latter study includes a helpful discussion of private and public hospitality (*hospitium privatum* and *hospitium publicum*) within a Roman context.

36. Stählin, 'ξένος', 1. See also Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 100, and Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 10-11.

37. Stock, 'Hospitality', 808.

> the family of Alcibiades, for example, was for generations Sparta's *proxenos* at Athens, Demosthenes was Thebes', Nicias, the political successor of Pericles, was Syracuse's.[38]

Essentially, the primary duties of the πρόξενος involved assisting the traveling citizens of the foreign *polis* and serving as a local advocate for the interests of that foreign *polis*. For instance, the πρόξενος was expected to assist the travelers who arrived in his residential *polis* by granting hospitality to them, securing entrance to the Assembly or the theatre, aiding them if they were involved in a lawsuit, providing loans to the guest if they were needed, and finalizing the estate of a guest who happened to die while in a foreign city. Furthermore, the πρόξενος was also expected to help the two *poleis* arrive at an agreement on treaties and other political negotiations (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist*. 8.136-43; Thucydides 8.92.8).[39]

Even though a πρόξενος occasionally received payments for his services, most of the time he did not.[40] Instead, serving as a πρόξενος increased one's honor among the residents of both *poleis*. For instance, in one or both of the *poleis*, the *polis* that appointed the πρόξενος would erect a carved stone in a public place. Through these inscriptions, the *polis* that appointed the πρόξενος was able to announce to everyone who passed by whom their πρόξενος was in that region.[41] In addition, the πρόξενος benefited from commercial interactions between the two *poleis*.[42] These inscriptions, however, also make political hospitality 'by far the most copiously documented political institution of antiquity. It is attested by thousands of inscriptions on stone or lead stemming from a geographic area roughly coterminous with the Greek world and covering a temporal span from the seventh century BC to the second century AD.'[43]

Finally, we need to delineate the various motives for hospitality among the ancient Greek peoples. M.I. Finley discusses the diversity of reactions to ancient strangers. On the one hand, some ancient peoples, especially barbarians, feared and mistreated strangers (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 7.31-33; 9.275-76; Herodotus, *Hist*. 4.103). Others felt compelled to assist strangers if for no other reason than that Zeus *Xenios*, the god of hospitality, would punish those who mistreated strangers (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 14.57-58).[44] Within this spectrum, Ladislaus Bolchazy believes that he can

38. Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 93.

39. Casson, *Travel*, 93. See Hermann Hager, '*Hospitium* (ξενία, προξενία)', in *DGRA*, I, 978-81 (978-79), for a similar discussion about Roman political hospitality.

40. Stock, 'Hospitality', 811.

41. Stock, 'Hospitality', 811, and Casson, *Travel*, 94.

42. Casson, *Travel*, 93.

43. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 130.

44. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 100-101. See also Nybakken, 'The Moral Basis of *Hospitium Privatum*', 249-50.

trace at least five different motives for hospitality in antiquity. Bolchazy's categories are: (1) 'Medea' hospitality; (2) theoxenic hospitality; (3) *ius hospitii, ius dei*; (4) contractual hospitality; (5) altruistic hospitality.[45]

First, Bolchazy derives the term 'Medea' hospitality from Euripides' *Medea.* Euripides tells the story of Medea, a sorceress in the barbarian land of Colchis, who takes Jason in, saves him from death, and falls in love with him. As a result, Jason marries Medea and takes her with him as an act of reciprocity. Yet, after ten years Jason leaves Medea in order to marry the daughter of Creon, the king of Corinth. As a result, Jason becomes a victim of Medea's 'magic and ferocity'.[46] Consequently, Bolchazy describes 'Medea' hospitality as hospitality that is 'motivated by magico-religious xenophobia which made it imperative to be kind to strangers with a view to disarming them of their bad will, and thus making it unlikely that they would use their occult powers against the host'.[47]

Hospitality motivated by the desire to protect oneself from strangers with occult powers can also be substantiated by Plato's writings. 'In the *Laws* (5.729E), Plato says that a stranger has both a personal *xenios daimon* and a god who avenge and succor him and who follow in the train of Zeus Xenios.'[48] Therefore, at least one motive for hospitality in antiquity was fear of the stranger. The host treated the stranger kindly so that the stranger and the stranger's divine avengers would not harm him.

Next, Bolchazy discusses theoxenic hospitality. In theoxenic hospitality, the motive is based on the belief that the gods or their representatives often visited humans in the form of beggars or strangers. Thus, since the gods could disguise themselves as humans, the gods were capable of testing the hospitality of humans to see if they were upright. If the human hosts treated the gods appropriately, the gods would bless their hosts. But, if the human hosts were found lacking, the gods would exact punishment on them. As a result, many Greeks and Romans were subsequently motivated to treat all strangers with kindness due to the knowledge that any given stranger may turn out to be a god.[49]

45. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, i.

46. Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 47, 52.

47. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity,* 8-10. Cf. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 140. In my opinion, Bolchazy's reference to Euripides' *Medea* is quite confusing. Nevertheless, it does appear that Bolchazy properly identifies a distinct motive for hospitality in his discussion of 'Medea' hospitality.

48. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity,* 9. The reference should read Plato, *Laws*, 5.729E-730A.

49. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity,* 11-14. See also Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest and the Hostile Host', 19-20; Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 142, 146; and Rainer Kampling, 'Fremde und Fremdsein in Aussagen des

A variety of Greek texts support this long standing view.[50] Yet, perhaps the best known examples from antiquity are found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Ovid, who lived from 43 BCE to 18 CE,[51] tells the story of how Jove (or Zeus) decides to descend from Olympus and test the humans to see if the reports of their immorality are true (1.125-215). In particular, Zeus disguises himself in the form of a human and travels back and forth throughout the land (1.212-15). Most notably, Zeus approaches 'the inhospitable (*inhospita*) abode of the Arcadian king', just as the sun is setting (Ovid, *Metam*. 1.218-19 [Miller, LCL]). When he arrives, Zeus signals 'the common folk' to let them know that he is a god (1.220-21). Consequently, these people begin to worship Zeus. Yet, Lycaon, the Arcadian king, mocks the people and constructs a plan to test the stranger to see if he is a god or a human (1.221-23). Lycaon's plan for testing his guest, however, consists of killing the guest as he sleeps in order to demonstrate that he is not a god (1.223-25). Furthermore, Lycaon kills a man from the Molossian race, cuts him up, cooks him, and serves him to Zeus as dinner (1.226-31). Zeus, in return, punishes Lycaon for his immorality (1.210). First, Zeus uses a thunderbolt to destroy Lycaon's house, and second, he turns Lycaon into a wolf (1.231-44).

In addition, in the *Metamorphoses* (8.618-724), Ovid includes another story that is relevant for our discussion of theoxenic hospitality. Lelex tells a story about Jupiter (Zeus) and Atlas. Once again, Zeus, along with Atlas, disguises himself as a mortal (8.626-27). They arrive as strangers in the Phrygian hills and approach a thousand homes, but none of the people take them into their homes (8.628-29).[52] Finally, one elderly couple, Baucis and Philemon, receive them despite the fact that the couple is very poor and live in a very modest house. In fact, Ovid tells us that their house is 'thatched with straw and reeds from the marsh' (8.629-35).

Yet, once Zeus and Atlas 'enter in at the lowly door', Baucis and Philemon entertain them as extravagantly as they possibly can. For instance, Baucis and Philemon are too impoverished to afford servants, so they personally serve their guests (8.636-39). First, they seat their guests on a bench. Next, Baucis kindles a fire using wood from the roof of her house and prepares cabbage. In the meantime, Philemon prepares

Neuen Testaments', in Ottmar Fuchs (ed.), *Die Fremden* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1988), 215-29 (228).

50. For example, Euripides, *Alc*. 1-71. In this example, Apollo rewards Admetus for welcoming him (Apollo) as a guest.

51. See *Ovid*. III. *Metamorphoses* (trans. Frank Justus Miller; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 3rd edn, 1977), ix-xi.

52. Alan H.F. Griffin, 'Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *GR* 38 (1991) 62-74 (64).

a piece of 'long-cherished pork'. In addition, the hosts prepare a couch, which is draped with a well-worn piece of cloth that they only use on festal days, and they cause their guests to recline upon it (8.640-60). Next, after leveling their table, which has one shortened leg, they fill the table with olives, berries, endives, radishes, cream cheese, eggs, nuts, figs, dates, plums, apples, grapes, honeycomb, and wine (8.661-76). Besides all of this 'traditional Roman peasant fare',[53] the hosts serve this abundant meal with pleasant faces (8.677-78).

Then, two startling events take place. First, even though the mixing bowl has been drained of its wine, the bowl keeps refilling (8.679-80).[54] Second, as Baucis and Philemon attempt to catch and sacrifice their only goose in honor of their guests,[55] the goose keeps eluding its owners. Finally, the goose seeks refuge with the guests (8.687-88). At that point, the incognito gods tell their hosts not to kill the goose (8.688-90), and they reveal their identities. Furthermore, they reward their generous hosts for their kind hospitality. They say, 'We are gods…and this wicked neighbourhood shall be punished as it deserves; but to you shall be given exemption from this punishment. Leave now your dwelling and come with us to that tall mountain yonder' (8.690-93). In the end, despite the fact that water floods the entire area, the house of Baucis and Philemon is spared and is transformed into a marvelous temple for the gods (8.695-703). Finally, Baucis and Philemon are granted their wishes to serve as priests in the temple and to die together when their lives are over (8.704-24).

Thus, the rationale for a theoxenic type of hospitality is clearly illustrated and promoted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.125-244; 8.618-724). We see that Lycaon is punished for the inhospitable treatment that he issues to the incognito Zeus. Alternatively, Baucis and Philemon are rewarded for their kind hospitality, which they extend to Zeus and Atlas even though they think their guests are merely human strangers. As a result, Ovid has built upon this belief about the gods taking on human form and testing human hospitality, while simultaneously providing his readers with a strong motivation for extending hospitality to every stranger they encounter. This motivation, however, does not originate during the time period of the Roman Empire. Instead, it is well attested as far back as the Homeric literature as we will see (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 17.483-87).[56]

Third, Bolchazy describes what he calls the '*ius hospitii, ius dei*' hospitality, which can be translated as 'right of the guest, right of god'

53. Griffin, 'Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', 65.
54. Cf. 1 Kgs 17.8-19.
55. Griffin, 'Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', 63.
56. Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 54-55.

hospitality. Here, Bolchazy claims that hosts were motivated to extend kind hospitality to human strangers because the host believed hospitality was in accordance with the desires of the gods. It was motivated by the host's desire to please the gods.[57] For instance, Homer confirms that Zeus has sanctioned the stranger's right to hospitality. Upholding these rights pleases Zeus, while violating these rights angers Zeus (*Od*. 9.270-71). A well-known example comes from Herodotus, who attributes the fall of Troy in the Trojan War to the gods' displeasure with Paris's violation of the unwritten laws of hospitality. According to Herodotus, Paris transgressed the laws of hospitality and therefore angered the gods when he took Helen, his host's wife, back to his homeland of Troy (*Hist*. 2.113-15; 2.120).

Fourth, contractual hospitality, which Bolchazy associates with guest-friendship, was often motivated by personal advantages that accrued to both parties when they entered into a reciprocal relationship.[58] Hosts wanted to forge a relationship with guests so that when they were traveling, they could expect the same kind of blessings, provisions, and protection from their guests.[59] For instance, in Homer's writings, Telemachus and Peisistratus (*Od*. 15.195-98) as well as Glaucus and Diomedes (*Il*. 6.215-31) function within the contractual type of hospitality that is passed on from father to son. The benefits of provisions, protection, and gifts were simply presupposed. In addition, a host's reputation or honor within his own community was often bolstered when he lavished hospitality on strangers (e.g. *Od*. 3.346-55; 4.612-19; 11.338-41; 14.402; 18.223; 19.334).[60] The degree to which the host was lavish with his or her hospitality was an indication of his or her courage, wealth, power, and even morality (e.g. Diodorus 13.83).[61] For all of these reasons, hosts were sometimes motivated to offer hospitality to a traveler.

57. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity,* 14-16. See also Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 141.

58. Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 56. See also Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 141.

59. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 16-18.

60. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 273, 281 n. 21. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 143. Perhaps the most renowned account of Greco-Roman hospitality is found in Euripides, *Alc*. 475-860. Despite the fact that Admetus is grieving and in the midst of making preparations for his wife's funeral, he tells Hercules that a homeless woman has died. As a result, he convinces Hercules to enter his home and be his guest. At least in part, Admetus is motivated to play the role of host while suffering through his grief because he is concerned about his reputation as a host (553-56). Euripides, however, also informs us through the Chorus that Admetus is a 'god-reverer' (604 [Way, LCL]).

61. Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest and the Hostile Host', 19, 26.

Finally, Bolchazy argues that we should also discuss 'altruistic' hospitality. Here, the motivation was not the fear of strangers, the fear of the gods, the desire to please the gods, nor the desire for personal gain. Instead, this type of hospitality was primarily motivated by one's love for one's fellow human being.[62] Admittedly, contemporary scholars may well caution us by pointing out that any claim for altruistic motives in the honor and shame culture of the ancient world is out of place, nevertheless, at times ancient authors clearly highlighted some examples of hospitality that were set apart by the host's extraordinary generosity. For example, in *Od.* 8.544-47 Alcinous's exemplary hospitality is distinct from his reverence for the gods, even though he does in fact revere the gods. Instead, Alcinous claims his motive for extending hospitality to Odysseus grows out of a love for the stranger.[63] In fact, within the *Odyssey* and among ancient Greeks, this type of other-centered hospitality served as an important distinguishing mark between civilized peoples and barbarians.[64] 'The Homeric society, which had for its ideal to view a stranger and a suppliant as a brother (*Od*. 8.546), and considered hospitality as an acid test of civilization (*Od*. 8.575; 9.266-71), was nevertheless very conscious of the xenophobic environment from which it had evolved.'[65]

In sum, in ancient Greece the custom of hospitality was a vital part of the society. We have seen that there were temporary and permanent forms of hospitality, that hospitality referred both to a relationship and a quality, that there were public and private forms of hospitality, and finally that hosts possessed an assortment of motives when offering hospitality to strangers. In general, however, private hospitality refers to the social convention of assisting a traveler.

Hospitality in Homer's Odyssey

Having provided an overarching definition of hospitality in ancient Greece, I will now take a closer look at the presence of private hospitality in Homer's *Odyssey*. By examining Homer's *Odyssey*, I will be able to illustrate and confirm the assertions that I have made about hospitality in the first portion of this chapter. Furthermore, we will see that Homer's works provide us with a valuable supplement for our reading of the New Testament.

62. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 18-20. See also Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 141.

63. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 18-20.

64. Schmitz and Wayte, '*Hospitium*', 977; and Roth, 'The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia*', 2.

65. Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 46.

First, Homer's *Odyssey* provides us with a clear picture of private hospitality in the Homeric period. Again, as noted above, I follow Finley and Donlan who argue that the social interactions in Homer's works reflect actual social practices from ancient Greece.[66] Furthermore, Homer's depictions of private hospitality are helpful if for no other reason than the sheer number of examples that he supplies in his works. In *The Stranger's Welcome*, Steve Reece argues that Homer constructed literary type-scenes that revolve around the topic of hospitality. While doing so, he contends that there are eighteen separate scenes in Homer's works that demonstrate Homer's view of hospitality.[67] Since Reece limits himself to making an argument for literary type-scenes, he actually neglects to mention a few of the hospitality relationships in Homer's writings (e.g. *Od*. 3.487-93; 15.185-91), but his argument illustrates the prominence of hospitality in Homer's writings nonetheless.

Second, Homer's works were still being actively read and studied as the writers of the New Testament were completing their documents. For instance, Ronald F. Hock, while drawing upon research from a variety of sources, emphasizes the importance of Homer's works in Greco-Roman education of the first century CE. He concludes:

> The Homeric epics, then, were part of the curriculum in all three stages of Greco-Roman education. Indeed, Homer's role in education was varied, continuous, and profound: names from Homer were some of the first words students ever learned, lines from Homer were some of the first sentences ever read, lengthy passages from Homer were the first they ever memorized and interpreted, events and themes from Homer were the ones they often treated in compositional exercises, and lines and metaphors from Homer were often used to adorn their speeches and to express their self-presentation. Indeed, for the rest of their lives, those who had been educated, πεπαιδευμένοι, were expected to have Homer on their lips for capturing and articulating the essence of a moment or the character of a person, even when half asleep.[68]

Thus, Homer's works are valuable for this study both because they reflect societal practices spanning Archaic and Classical Greece and

66. Moreover, it does not really matter in the context of this work whether Homer reflects Mycenaean society, Dark Age Greece, or the early years of the Archaic Period.

67. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 6. The scenes are: *Od*. 1.103-324; 3.4-485, 15.193-214; 4.1-624, 15.1-184; 5.55-148; 5.388–13.187; 9.105-564; 10.1-76; 10.80-132; 10.133–11.12, 12.1-152; 13.221–14.533, 15.301-494, 16.452–17.25, 17.182-203; 15.555–16.155; 17.204-23, 348, *Il*. 9.185-668; 11.769-82; 18.369–19.3; 24.334-694, *H. Dem*. 98-230, *H. Aphr*. 68-291.

68. Ronald F. Hock, 'Homer in Greco-Roman Education', in Dennis R. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2001), 56-77 (77).

because familiarity with Homer's works remained so pronounced in Roman times.

Therefore, I will now summarize a few of the many expressions of this custom in Homer's writings. Admittedly, I will not attempt to identify every reference to hospitality within Homer's works nor will I attempt to mention every aspect of hospitality even within the examples I do mention. Instead, I will cite some representative examples of hospitality in Homer's works in order to provide a typical sketch of this social convention in ancient Greece.

*Telemachus Hosts Athena (*Odyssey *1.102-324)*

Near the beginning of the *Odyssey*, the goddess Athena decides to pay a visit to Telemachus in Ithaca. As she does so, she disguises herself in the form of the man, Mentes. When Telemachus sees Athena standing at the outer gates, all he sees is a stranger (ξεῖνος) (1.120). Telemachus then goes to Mentes, grasps his right hand, takes his spear, and invites Mentes into his house (1.120-24). As Telemachus invites the stranger into his home, he says, 'Hail, stranger (χαῖρε, ξεῖνε); in our house you shall find entertainment, and then, when you have tasted food, you shall tell what you have need of' (Homer, *Od*. 1.123-24 [Murray/Dimock, LCL]).

Telemachus then provides Mentes with a chair and a footstool (1.130-31). Next, Telemachus has his servants prepare a meal for his guest, and after they wash their hands in a basin, they eat the meal (1.136-49). In addition, they enjoy the entertainment of a musician who plays a lyre and sings (1.150-55). After the guest's immediate needs have been met, it is now time for Telemachus to ask questions about the needs and the identity of his guest (1.169-77). Telemachus says, 'But come, tell me this, and declare it truly. Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city and where your parents? And tell me this…whether this is your first visit here, or whether you are indeed a friend (ξεῖνος) of my father's house?' Athena, disguised as a stranger, then informs Telemachus that she is Mentes (1.178-93). As Mentes, she explains, 'Friends (ξεῖνοι) of one another do we declare ourselves to be, just as our fathers were, friends from of old' (1.187-88). Thus, Telemachus learns that this stranger had been guest-friends (ξεῖνοι) with his father, Odysseus (1.187, 417).

Next, after Mentes encourages Telemachus to go on a journey for information about his father, Telemachus offers Mentes a bath and desires for Mentes to stay (ἐπιμένω) for a while in his home (1.309-10). Furthermore, Telemachus desires to give a costly gift to Mentes, the sort of thing that hosts (ξεῖνοι) give to their guests (φίλοι ξεῖνοι) (1.311-13). Yet, Mentes (Athena) refuses both. Mentes says, 'Keep me no longer, when I

am eager to be gone, and whatever gift your heart bids you give me, give it when I come back, to bear to my home' (1.315-18). Then, immediately Athena flies up into the sky like a bird (1.319-20), and Telemachus realizes the stranger was a god (1.322-24).

Despite the mythical nature of this passage, it nevertheless provides us with important information as I seek to establish the actual, historical components of the social convention of hospitality. First, this narrative unit illustrates for us the ancient belief that at times incognito gods visit humans and accept hospitality from them. Athena not only takes on a human form that prevents Telemachus from perceiving her divine identity, but Athena is even able to disguise herself as a particular human being. This belief is also apparent at other places in Homer's writings. For instance, Nausicaa acknowledges the possibility that the Phaeacians may deem Odysseus to be a god since he is a stranger (6.276-81). Likewise, after Athena briefly changes Odysseus's appearance back to his usual appearance so that Telemachus will believe that Odysseus is his father, Telemachus thinks that Odysseus, the guest, is a god (16.172-85). He says, 'Truly you are a god, one of those who hold broad heaven. Be gracious, then, that we may offer to you acceptable sacrifices and golden gifts, finely wrought; and spare us' (16.183-85).

Yet, perhaps the most straightforward statement in the *Odyssey* about a god taking the form of a stranger who then tests the hospitality of humans is found in 17.483-87. Even though all of Penelope's suitors are corrupt, Antinous is the worst. He mistreats and abuses the old beggar, who is actually Odysseus (even though no one recognizes Odysseus because Athena has disguised Odysseus's appearance). Antinous's inhospitable actions toward Odysseus reach a climax when he hits Odysseus with a footstool. At that point, even the other suitors are appalled. One of them says, 'Antinous, you did not do well to strike the unfortunate wanderer. Doomed man that you are, what if perchance he be some god come down from heaven? And the gods do, in the guise of strangers from afar, put on all manner of shapes, and visit the cities, beholding the violence and the righteousness of men' (17.483-87).

All three of the examples I have just cited correlate with Bolchazy's second category of theoxenic hospitality, the belief that the stranger may be a god. But, there are also numerous references in the *Odyssey* that indicate that hospitality was at times motivated by the desire to please the gods, as Bolchazy argued in his third category, which focused upon the right of the guest and the right of God. For instance, at numerous points we see the conviction that Zeus takes a personal interest in protecting the human traveler and overseeing the custom of hospitality, which in turn leads to kind extensions of hospitality. Nausicaa (6.207-10)

and Eumaeus (14.55-60) both articulate their conviction that all strangers and beggars are from Zeus. Both Eumaeus (14.389) and Odysseus (9.270-71; 14.283-84) refer to Zeus as the God of Strangers or the God of Hospitality. When Odysseus asks Polyphemus, the barbarian Cyclops, for hospitality, he urges him to think about Zeus (9.266-71). He says,

> we…have come as suppliants to your knees, in the hope that you will give us entertainment (ξεινήιον)…as is the due of strangers (ξεῖνοι). Do not deny us, good sir, but reverence the gods; we are your suppliants; and Zeus is the avenger of suppliants and strangers—Zeus, the stranger's god—who walks in the footsteps of reverend strangers.

Thus, Odysseus tests Polyphemus to see if he is civilized, and Odysseus believes that Polyphemus can please Zeus by offering hospitality to Odysseus. Furthermore, Eumaeus states his motivation for hosting Odysseus, whom he does not recognize, when he says, 'do not try to win my favor by lies, nor to cajole me in any way. It is not for this that I shall show you respect or kindness, but from fear of Zeus, the stranger's god, and from pity for yourself' (14.387-89). Therefore, as Bolchazy argues, Homer provides us with a variety of references to hosts who were or should have been motivated to treat travelers well out of fear for Zeus and out of a desire to make Zeus happy.

It is also interesting to note that Homer repeatedly associates inhospitality with a person who is unjust and hospitality with a person who fears the gods.[69] This contrast is first found in Odysseus's thoughts. When Odysseus wakes up in Phaeacia, he thinks to himself, 'Alas, to the land of what mortals have I now come? Are they cruel (ὑβρισταί), and wild (ἄγριοι) and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι)? or are they kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)?' (6.119-21; cf. 8.622).

Next, Odysseus articulates this same question in identical language at 9.175-76. Odysseus wonders about the behavior of the Cyclopes, 'whether they are cruel (ὑβρισταί), and wild (ἄγριοι), and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι), or whether they are kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)'. Odysseus then asks the same question a third time when he arrives at Ithaca because he thinks it is an unknown land. He asks, 'Alas, to the land of what mortals have I now come? Are they cruel (ὑβρισταί), and wild (ἄγριοι), and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι)? Or are they kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)?' (13.200-202). Of course, this last question is ironic because the suitors at his home are behaving like barbarians, like the Cyclopes rather than the Phaeacians. Finally, when Alcinous, the

69. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 149.

king of the Phaeacians, questions Odysseus about his identity and his story, Alcinous uses these same phrases once again to ask about the kinds of people that Odysseus has encountered while traveling (8.573-76). Thus, Homer links the gods with hospitality toward humans. It may therefore be best to merge Bolchazy's categories for a moment. In the *Odyssey*, what Bolchazy perhaps naively refers to as 'altruistic' hospitality actually overlaps with '*ius hospitii, ius dei*' ('right of the guest, right of god') hospitality.

Second, this narrative unit about Telemachus's reception of Athena also depicts the features of an ideal extension of hospitality in ancient Greece. Telemachus receives an unknown stranger. His reception involves leading the guest inside, seating him, and feeding him. Notably, Telemachus does not ask his guest any questions about his identity until after the initial reception. As we proceed, it will become apparent that, according to ancient Greek societal customs, the host was not supposed to inquire about the stranger's identity until after the stranger's most pressing needs were met.[70] In fact, Homer provides us with Nestor's rationale for why he has waited to question Telemachus. In 3.69-71, Nestor says, 'Now truly it is seemlier to ask and enquire of the strangers who they are, since now they have had their joy of food. Strangers, who are you?' Conversely, the Cyclops provides us with a counter example to this practice. As an uncivil barbarian, he gives no thought to standard courtesies. Instead, he asks the 'strangers' about their identity immediately when he sees them (9.252-55).

Finally, the story of Telemachus and Athena illustrates the nature of a guest-friendship. When Telemachus realizes that the stranger is an established guest-friend of his family, he knows he is expected to provide his guest with a costly gift. In addition, this interaction between Telemachus and Mentes also helps to illustrate how a permanent extension of hospitality functioned: it was passed from father to son. As noted above, there are also a variety of other Homeric passages that demonstrate the ongoing nature of a permanent hospitality relationship. For instance, in addition to Mentes, Telemachus enjoys the hospitality benefits of his father's ongoing, reciprocal relationships with both Nestor (*Od*. 3.4-485; 15.193-214) and Menelaus (*Od*. 4.1-624; 15.1-184; cf. *Iliad* 6.215-31).

*Nestor Hosts Telemachus (*Odyssey *3.4-485; 15.193-214)*

Due to space limitations, I will only discuss this passage briefly. In particular, I want to note the elements of hospitality narrated in this passage that were not narrated in the Telemachus/Mentes passage. Nestor

70. Nybakken, 'The Moral Basis of *Hospitium Privatum*', 248.

receives Telemachus in much the same way that Telemachus receives Mentes. Nestor and all of his comrades, who are gathered at Nestor's house for a celebration (3.5-8), come out to greet Telemachus and clasp his hand (3.34-35). Next, Nestor's son provides him with a seat and encourages him to eat (3.36-41). Then, Nestor asks his guest to join him and his comrades in pouring libations to Poseidon and the immortals (3.40-68). Afterward Nestor discovers that Telemachus is the son of Odysseus with whom he has a permanent guest-friend relationship (3.69-101). Consequently, over the next few hours Nestor provides Telemachus with a bed, a bath, and new clothes. Finally, the next day, Athena instructs Nestor to 'send (πέμπω) this man on his way with a chariot and with your son, since he has come to your house, and give him horses, the fleetest you have in running and the best in strength' (3.368-70). As a result, Nestor's son, Peisistratus, escorts Telemachus on his travels to Sparta using Nestor's horses, chariots, and provisions until he safely returns again to Nestor's home (3.325-27, 368-70, 475-86).

Thus, in this passage we see a variety of additional elements. First, similar to the relationship between Telemachus and Mentes, this passage is another example of the hereditary nature of permanent hospitality relationships. Nestor first treats Telemachus with kindness simply because he is a stranger. But once Nestor realizes that Telemachus is the son of his guest-friend, Odysseus, he begins to fulfill a variety of additional obligations.

Second, Nestor performs an action that was typical of guest-friends in ancient Greece. Nestor, as the host, 'sends the guest on' to his next destination. In ancient Greece, it was the host's responsibility to help the guest arrive at his next destination in part by supplying the guest with provisions. Yet, given the nature of the relationship between Nestor and Odysseus and given Athena's direct instructions, Nestor feels obligated to provide even more than simple provisions. Nestor provides Telemachus with provisions, transportation, and a guide. This behavior is then repeated throughout the *Odyssey*. For instance, Menelaus sends (πέμπω) Telemachus and Peisistratus off with gifts and provisions in 15.74-77, 99-132. Upon Odysseus's request (13.38-39), the Phaeacians send him on (πέμπω) in peace by providing him with gifts and escorting him to Ithaca by ship (13.47-53, 63-125). And finally, Circe sends (πέμπω) Odysseus home (10.484) by providing him with a cloak and tunic (10.542), a ram and ewe as provisions (10.571-73), and the North Wind to guide him (10.501-507).

*Diocles Hosts Telemachus and Peisistratus (*Odyssey *3.487-93; 15.185-91)*
In 3.487-93, as Telemachus and Peisistratus are traveling to Sparta, the sun begins to set. About that time, they arrive at the house of Diocles

in Pherae. Diocles extends hospitality (ξείνια) to them, and they spend the night. Then, as soon as dawn appears, they hitch the team and ride off. Similarly, in 15.184-91, Telemachus and Peisistratus are returning from Sparta when the sun begins to set. Again, they stop at the house of Diocles in Pherae, who 'before them…set the entertainment due to strangers' (15.188). As a result, they spend the night. Then, as soon as dawn appears, they hitch the horses and depart.

For my purposes, these two, brief passages are quite important. This social interaction illustrates simple, informal, or temporary hospitality as it was likely practiced in ancient Greece. There is no gift exchange or lengthy stay. The entire visit lasts only about one half of one day. By contrast, in 11.353-61, Odysseus is engaged in a more formal extension of hospitality. Even though he is eager to return home, he is willing to stay with his Phaeacian hosts for one year if his stay will result in a greater send off with greater gifts. In addition, Aeolus hosts Odysseus for one month (10.14), and even the poor swineherd, Eumaeus, hosts Odysseus for three days and three nights (17.515). With Diocles, however, the host is merely helping two travelers on their way, nothing more and nothing less.

*The Phaeacians Host Odysseus (*Odyssey *5.382–13.187)*

At least two noteworthy elements are present in the Phaeacians' hospitality. First, as I mentioned above, in this lengthy passage we see the prominence of men in the extension of hospitality in antiquity. Nausicaa, the king's daughter, first encounters Odysseus and directs him to the hospitality of the king. When she gives him directions, however, she tells him to make himself a suppliant of the queen (7.142-45), which he duly does. Arete, the queen, then attempts to maintain a prominent role even after Odysseus's initial supplication. For instance, after Odysseus has impressed his hosts, Arete refers to Odysseus as her guest (ξεῖνος) (11.338). In addition, Arete questions Odysseus about his identity and business in the area (7.236-39).

Yet, the male characters repeatedly minimize Arete's role as host.[71] Even though Odysseus grabs the knees of Arete, he actually directs most of his supplication to Alcinous and the elders (7.146-52).[72] In response to Arete's questions, Odysseus only tells her a small portion of his story (7.237-97). Conversely, when Alcinous, the king, questions Odysseus

71. Victoria Pedrick, 'The Hospitality of Noble Women in the *Odyssey*', *Helios* 15.2 (1988) 85-101 (87). Pedrick claims that both Nausicaa's and Arete's actions represent a breach of etiquette. Instead, the woman's role was generally limited to bathing the guest, making a bed for the guest, and giving him clothing (pp. 85-86).

72. Pedrick, 'The Hospitality of Noble Women', 87.

about his identity, Odysseus provides a far more complete answer (8.548-86; 9.1–11.332; 11.385–12.453). Furthermore, despite Arete's assertiveness, it is Alcinous who deems Odysseus to be worthy of the extensive gifts of friendship, which eventually include thirteen cloaks, tunics, and bars of gold (13.4-23), in addition to the gold cup that Alcinous gives him (8.430-32).[73] Finally, the king makes it clear that he has the primary responsibility for Odysseus's send off (πομπή) (11.347-53). Thus, Alcinous repeatedly overrides Arete's attempts to participate actively in the hospitality offered to Odysseus. Therefore, when we take the *Odyssey* as a guide, we must conclude that hospitality was primarily provided by the male, head of household in ancient Greece.[74]

Second, the Phaeacians demonstrate for us the prominence of the king in a formal extension of hospitality as we noted above.[75] For instance, the responsibility of giving gifts to the guest fell to all of the elders (8.541-45; 13.4-15), and they all share in the honor (τιμή) that is derived from hosting the guest (11.338). Yet, the king makes the decision about whom the Phaeacians will host and whether the guest is worthy of the Phaeacians' gifts.

*Eumaeus Hosts Odysseus (*Odyssey *14.1-533)*

Finally, I need to examine the manner in which Eumaeus, Odysseus's swineherd, unknowingly receives his master. Eumaeus, despite his acute poverty, extends exemplary hospitality to Odysseus whom Athena has disguised as a poor beggar. In many ways, Eumaeus is an ideal host. First, when Eumaeus's dogs are about to attack the stranger, Eumaeus protects him (14.21-22, 29-36). Next, upon Odysseus's arrival, Eumaeus slaughters two hogs for him to eat (14.72-82). Third, even though the guest recognizes his host's poverty and vows to stay only one night so as not to eat too much of the host's food, Eumaeus insists that the poor beggar stay with him longer (15.301-39; 17.515). Fourth, when his poor guest is cold at night, Eumaeus makes a bed for him near the fire and covers him with his own cloak (14.518-33). Furthermore, Eumaeus, who does not have any extra provisions, promises that when Telemachus arrives, his master will be able to provide the guest with a cloak, a tunic, and a send off (14.515-17). Thus, in the end, this portion of the *Odyssey*

73. Pedrick, 'The Hospitality of Noble Women', 86-87.

74. Cf. Pedrick, 'The Hospitality of Noble Women', 91, 93-97. Pedrick does indicate that the exception to this rule occurs when a woman is the head of her household. Yet, even then, Pedrick uses the word 'ambiguous' to describe Penelope's role as host. As Pedrick points out, Penelope struggles with the decision of whether to interact with the disguised Odysseus as a beggar or as a guest.

75. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 102.

illustrates that the king was not the only person who was expected to host the traveler in ancient Greece. Instead, even though the custom of hospitality was 'an overwhelmingly upper-class institution',[76] Homer appears to be encouraging all of his readers to do as much as they can.

And finally, Eumaeus's hospitality goes beyond the typical expression of hospitality in ancient Greece. Homer informs us through the words of Eumaeus that it was common in Homer's day to host respectable travelers in ancient Greece. For instance, Eumaeus criticizes Antinous for disregarding the poor beggar. He says,

> Who…of himself ever seeks out and invites a stranger (ξεῖνον καλεῖ) from abroad, unless it is one of those that are masters of some public craft, a prophet, or a healer of ills, or a builder, or perhaps a divine minstrel, who gives delight with his song? For these men are invited all over the boundless earth. Yet a beggar would no man invite to be a burden to himself. (*Od*. 17.382-87)

Thus, in the midst of Eumaeus's criticism, we likely see the historical reality of this social convention in ancient Greece. Homer, on the other hand, uses the character of Eumaeus to suggest that the Greeks should also be willing to host poor beggars who will likely never be able to reciprocate their hosts' kindness.

Summary

In a variety of ways Homer's *Odyssey* vividly demonstrates for us that the ancient Greeks were ideally expected to assist travelers through a series of helpful actions. Steve Reece, while examining Homeric hospitality and commenting on its diversity, claims that ancient Greek hospitality included all of the interactions between a stranger and a host. Anything that took place 'from the moment a visitor approaches someone's house until the moment he departs' can be considered to be an outgrowth of either hospitality or inhospitality.[77] Furthermore, as we have seen in the Homeric epics, the ancient Greeks measured both their own civility as well as the civility of other peoples based upon how they treated strangers. Those who engaged in a variety of kind actions to assist travelers were considered to be upright and pious people. Yet, those who sought to harm travelers or to ignore them callously were considered to be unjust and impious people.[78]

76. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 34, and 'Friendship, Ritualized', 291.
77. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 5.
78. Roth, 'The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia*', 2.

Describing Hospitality in the Hellenistic Age[79]

As I argued above, Homer's works provide us with valuable insights into the custom of hospitality in ancient Greece. Furthermore, I indicated that Homer's works were still being read, copied, and proliferated even in the first century CE. Therefore, even though it is not possible to argue that Homer reflects Greco-Roman life in the Hellenistic period, we know that Homer's works continued to shape the ethical expectations of Greeks and Romans in the Hellenistic period. Yet, in order to provide a more complete picture of hospitality during the time period that Luke penned his works, I will now attempt to bridge the temporal gap from the Homeric period to the Hellenistic period.

In general, the custom of private hospitality in a Greco-Roman context changed very little from the time period of archaic Greek civilizations to that of the early Roman Empire. For instance, Gabriel Herman argues that 'there are no good grounds to believe that guest-friendship underwent significant changes' during this transition.[80] Hermann Hager also builds a case for the continuity of the custom of hospitality between the archaic Greek world and the Roman society. For instance, Hager points out that 'the obligations which the tie of hospitality with a foreigner imposed upon a Roman were to receive into his house his *hospes* when traveling (Liv. xlii.1), and to protect and, in the case of need, to represent him as his patron in the courts of justice (Cic. *Div. in Caecil*. 20, 66)'.[81] We saw these same components when discussing ancient Greek hospitality. Furthermore, among the Romans 'Jupiter Hospitalis was thought to watch over the *jus hospitii*, as Zeus Xenios did with the Greeks (Cic. *in Verr*. iv. 22, 48; *pro Deiot*. 6, 18; *ad Q. Fr*. ii. 12), and the violation of it was a great crime and impiety at Rome as in Greece'.[82] And finally, 'among the Romans, as among the Greeks, the formal relation of hospitality was inaugurated by the interchange of gifts'.[83] For instance, in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Evander welcomes Aeneas because he is Anchises' son. Furthermore, Evander recounts how he and Anchises had forged a hospitality relationship by shaking hands and exchanging gifts (8.152-69).[84]

79. Simon Hornblower, 'Hellenization', in *OCD*, 678-79. Like Hornblower, I am using the phrase 'Hellenistic age' to refer to the period in which Hellenism impacted the Mediterranean world. Hence, I am not merely referring to the post-Alexander period that has traditionally been demarcated as 336–31 BCE. Instead, since Hellenism continued to have a vital impact on Mediterranean culture through the time period of Byzantine Christianity, I will use this phrase more comprehensively.

80. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 7.

81. Hager, '*Hospitium*', 981.

82. Hager, '*Hospitium*', 981.

83. Stock, 'Hospitality', 810.

84. Stock, 'Hospitality', 810.

Similarly, Evander then shakes Aeneas's hand and gives him gifts as well (8.210-30).

Yet, Hager also argues that there were a few minor changes in the custom of hospitality between the Homeric time period and Roman times. First, he contends that 'private hospitality with the Romans… seems to have been more accurately and legally defined than in Greece'. Second, he claims that 'we never find at Rome the indiscriminate and uninquiring hospitality of the heroic age of Greece'.[85] Instead, during the Roman period, hosts were more selective when they were deciding whether or not to extend hospitality to a traveler (e.g. Virgil, *Aen*. 8.145-71).

Additionally, when we move into the Roman period, it is helpful to compare the social convention of hospitality and the patron–client relationships of the Roman society since there is a 'tendency to confuse' the two.[86] In many respects, both private and political hospitality produce benefits that are similar to those associated with the patron–client relationships of the Roman world. As a result, Gabriel Herman includes both types of relationships under 'the wider category called in social studies ritualized personal relationships, or pseudo-kinship'.[87] For instance, both guest-friendships (or permanent hospitality relationships)[88] and patron–client relationships revolve around the idea of reciprocal exchanges, involve hereditary bonds, and include the granting of assistance and protection.[89] Furthermore, both guest-friendships and patron–client relationships are largely associated with members of the upper class.[90]

Despite these similarities, however, these two types of relationships are quite distinct. Whereas patron–client relationships consist of personal relationships that include 'the exchange of favours and benefits between individuals of unequal standing',[91] hospitality often takes place among those who can be described as equals. Hence, the patron–client relationship revolves around the concept that the patron always functions in a superior role while the client always functions in a dependent role.[92] Yet, in a hospitality relationship, the participants reverse roles when they change geographic locations. As a result, the dependency found in

85. Hager, '*Hospitium*', 981.
86. Nicholas Purcell, 'Patronage, Non-literary', in *OCD*, 1126.
87. Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 612.
88. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 128, 139. Mathews argues that 'guest-kinship' is a more descriptive term than 'guest-friendship'.
89. Cf. Purcell, 'Patronage, Non-literary'; Arnaldo Momigliano and Tim J. Cornell, '*Patronus*', in *OCD*, 1126-27, and, in the same volume, '*Cliens*', 348.
90. Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 613.
91. Momigliano and Cornell, '*Cliens*'. See also, Purcell, 'Patronage, Non-Literary'.
92. Purcell, 'Patronage, Non-Literary'.

guest-friendships is only temporary. Even 'the application of the term ξένος to both guest and host' in antiquity provides a profound illustration to the changing roles that arise in ancient hospitality relationships.[93] Moreover, the dependent person in a patron–client relationship serves and defers to the patron,[94] but the dependent guest in a hospitality relationship is served by the host.

Interestingly, Paul Roth has argued that the social institution from antiquity that most resembles hospitality is not the patron–client relationship, but the institution of marriage. In fact, he claims that 'marriage and *xenia* were parallel social institutions'.[95] He goes on to say that 'the basic function of each was to bring an outsider into the kin-group, and both forms of relationship entailed the exchanging of gifts and the formation of a hereditary bond imposing mutual obligations between families'.[96]

In sum, it is safe to say that there is an abundance of texts from the Hellenistic period that can be cited to demonstrate the continuity of this social convention between the time of Homer and the time period in which the New Testament documents were being composed. For instance, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (e.g. 1.125-244 and 8.618-724), the Greek novels, and Dio Chrysostom's *Seventh Oration* together provide evidence of the legacy of Homeric hospitality in the Hellenistic world through at least the second century of the Common Era.[97]

Hospitality in the Greek Novels[98]

The literary pieces commonly known as the Greek novels were written roughly between the second century BCE and the second century CE. Due to their date of composition, these documents can be quite beneficial to New Testament scholars. First, since they are roughly contemporary with the New Testament documents, they 'provide the reader with a remarkably detailed, comprehensive, and coherent account of the social,

93. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 138.

94. Momigliano and Cornell, '*Patronus*'.

95. Roth, 'The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia*', 3.

96. Roth, 'The Theme of Corrupted *Xenia*', 3. Cf. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 127-39.

97. In the second chapter of his *Hospitality in Antiquity: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force*, Bolchazy demonstrates the extent to which Livy discusses the custom of hospitality in his historical writings (e.g. 1.1.1; 1.45.1-2), thereby demonstrating the relevance of this custom in Roman contexts.

98. In this section I am relying heavily upon research that I previously published as 'The Ancient Custom of Hospitality, the Greek Novels, and Acts 10:1–11:18', *PRS* 29 (2002), 53-72.

economic, and religious institutions of the people and regions that witnessed the spread of Christianity into the Greek East of the early Roman Empire'.[99] In other words, these documents 'characterized life in the Greco-Roman world during the New Testament period'.[100]

Second, the Greek novels narrate numerous instances of Greco-Roman hospitality. The social interactions depicted in these romances reflect the tradition of hospitality as it was described in Homer's works. Finally, these novels, which were composed in the time period of the Roman Empire, are especially beneficial for my project since they were written in Greek. As a result, despite the fact that we will see considerable overlap with Homer's writings, the Greek novels will help us to compile a set of typical Greek terms and phrases that were used to describe hospitality in the Hellenistic period. Consequently, I will be able to compare the language used to describe hospitality in the Greek novels with the language used to describe hospitality in the New Testament. Altogether, I will examine hospitality encounters in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus's *An Ephesian Tale*, Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story*.[101]

Chariton[102]

For my purposes there are two noteworthy hospitality scenes in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* that are particularly helpful.

Scene 1 (1.12-14).[103] Theron has kidnapped Callirhoe and hopes to sell her as a slave in Ionia. Leonas immediately identifies Theron as a stranger (ξένος), yet he believes a god has brought Theron to him as a benefactor (1.12.6). Leonas hopes that by purchasing Callirhoe he can please his downcast master. So, Leonas invites Theron into his own quarters to be his friend and guest (ξένος) (1.12.10). In addition to lodging, Leonas

99. Ronald F. Hock, 'Why New Testament Scholars Should Read Ancient Novels', in Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins (eds.), *Ancient Christian Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (SBLSS, 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 121-38 (123).

100. Hock, 'Ancient Novels', 125.

101. I am drawing upon the English translation of Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, and the Greek texts found in the Loeb Classical Library unless otherwise noted.

102. Hock, 'Why New Testament Scholars Should Read Ancient Novels', 124. Hock dates Chariton's *Callirhoe* between the late first century BCE and the early second century CE.

103. I have arbitrarily labeled the hospitality scenes as Scene 1, Scene 2, etc. for the purpose of clarification.

provides Theron with food and drink. After shaking hands Theron departs to retrieve Callirhoe.

When Theron returns, he sends Callirhoe in first. Thus, she too arrives as a stranger. All of the people with Leonas assume she is a goddess. Theron, when he steps in, then instructs the dumbfounded Leonas to 'get up and see to receiving (ὑποδέχομαι) the woman' (1.14.2). Theron then takes Leonas by the hand, and Leonas declares, 'You are a friend of mine from now on'. After a second meal and after darkness falls, Theron leaves hurriedly before he can be found out.

This first scene includes patterns that we will see throughout our survey of the novels. In a variety of passages, the stranger is associated with a god, treated as a guest, granted lodging, and given food. Furthermore, the host twice states that he believes a god has led his guest to him.

Scene 2 (5.9; 8.3-4). The second hospitable interaction that I have selected in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* takes place between the king and queen of Persia and Callirhoe. The king entrusts Callirhoe to Queen Statira's care. The queen feels honored and encourages Callirhoe to rest. In addition, the king sends expensive gifts to Callirhoe (5.9.7).

After the war between the Persians and the Egyptians renders the queen of Persia a prisoner under Chaereas's care, Callirhoe reciprocates the hospitality that she received (8.3-4). Callirhoe lobbies Chaereas not to take Queen Statira as a servant because she is a queen and also because Statira had previously been Callirhoe's hostess (ξένη) and had kept her safe (8.3.2). After Chaereas agrees to send Statira back to Persia, Callirhoe embraces Statira and says that Statira is not an enemy, but a friend. In addition, Callirhoe gives the royal jewels to Statira, which Statira refuses to take. Callirhoe gives her hand to Statira and escorts her to the departing ship (8.4.7-8). The women keep on talking, weeping, and embracing until the orders to sail are given.

Here we see the creation of an ongoing, reciprocal relationship between two strangers. Both Queen Statira and Callirhoe provide hospitality, gifts, and protection for the other when it is their turn to function as the host. In addition, we can observe a fully developed farewell scene that includes an escort, gifts, and a farewell embrace.

Thus, in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* we can observe hospitality as a common custom. We read of hosts who extend food, drink, lodging, and protection to travelers. Furthermore, Chariton employs the notable semantic terms of ξένος and ὑποδέχομαι. Finally, three times in scene one, the stranger is associated with a god, goddess, or cosmic force.

Xenophon of Ephesus[104]
In *An Ephesian Tale*, Xenophon of Ephesus includes two scenes that clearly feature the custom of hospitality.

Scene 1 (1.12). As Habrocomes and Anthia disembark from their ship in Rhodes, the Rhodians gather to see them. Because of their beauty, some of the people think they are gods. Therefore, the people respond by offering them worship, adoration, and public prayers. In addition, the people celebrate Habrocomes' and Anthia's arrival with a festival. After touring the whole city and describing themselves as strangers (ξένος) (1.12.2), Habrocomes and Anthia worship the local deity, Helius, and stay (μένω) in Rhodes for a few days (1.12.3). Finally, upon their departure, the whole population of Rhodes gives them supplies and sees them off.

Scene 2 (5.1-2, 10). When Habrocomes enters Syracuse, he first walks around the island. Next, he approaches Aegialeus and takes lodging with Aegialeus. Aegialeus, an extremely poor fisherman, gladly takes Habrocomes in and treats him as a son. The two become great friends and tell their stories to each other.

Xenophon, like Chariton, provides us with some valuable examples of hospitality. First, we can see an example of a whole community granting hospitality to a couple (1.12.1). Second, it is not uncommon for guests to worship the local deities of their hosts (1.12.2). Third, we observe that a poor fisherman can provide generous and meritorious hospitality to the aristocratic Habrocomes (5.1-2). Thus, hospitality does not always take place between those who are considered social equals.[105] Fourth, in at least three places, the characters in this novel consider the stranger(s) to be either a god (1.12.1; 2.2.4) or the agent of a god (3.2.6). Finally, Xenophon employs the root words of ξένος and μένω within the context of hospitality.

Longus[106]
In Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*, I have singled out two scenes that employ standard hospitality elements.

Scene 1 (3.7-11). In this scene, the hosts are quite familiar with the guest. Chloe's family hosts Daphnis. Even though they live less than a mile

104. Hock, 'Ancient Novels', 124. Hock dates Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* to 'no later than the mid-second century' CE.

105. See also, Homer, *Od*. 8.629-35; 14.1-533, and Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.1-3, 10-20, 82-83.

106. Hock, 'Ancient Novels', 124. Hock dates Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe* to 'the late second century or early third century' CE.

away, Daphnis travels to Chloe's house during the dead of winter. When Chloe's father, Dryas, sees Daphnis he greets him in a loud voice, kisses him, takes his hand, and leads Daphnis into the house (ἦγεν ἔσω) (3.7).

After feeding Daphnis and providing him with something to drink, they ask him to stay with them overnight so he can join them in a sacrifice to Dionysus the next day. Daphnis agrees and gives gifts to his hosts. These gifts included honey cakes and birds, which he had caught. The hosts then begin to prepare Daphnis' gifts for their evening meal.

Following the evening meal, they tell some stories and sing songs before going to bed. The next day, after making an offering to Dionysus and eating, Chloe's family sends Daphnis on his way. They fill Daphnis' bag with meat and bread and give him pigeons. Finally, he departs after kissing his hosts.

Scene 2 (4.5-6). Eudromus, a messenger from the master and a fellow slave, arrives. Daphnis's family receives and entertains him with great kindness (ἐδεξιοῦντο πᾶσαν δεξίωσιν) (4.5). As Eudromus departs, Daphnis gives him a number of presents including cheese, a goat, and clothes. Eudromus responds positively, kisses Daphnis, and promises a good word to the master on Daphnis's behalf.

In *Daphnis and Chloe*, once again, we see the kind way to treat strangers in the Greek–Roman world. First, we see examples of hosts eagerly greeting the traveler and supplying provisions such as food, drink, and lodging even though they are very poor. Second, the hosts provide parting gifts that serve to assist the traveler (4.6), and the traveler may give gifts to the host out of gratitude (3.9; 4.6). Third, the exchange of stories often takes center stage during the visit (3.9). Fourth, we can again observe that the guest often participates in the host's religious observances (3.9-10). Finally, Longus employs the root word δέχομαι to refer to hospitality (4.5).

Achilles Tatius[107]

In Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon* there are two noteworthy hospitality scenes and a description of hospitality that are helpful for us to examine.

Scene 1 (3.14; 4.1). In this scene, an Egyptian general has just defeated the brigands who pounced upon a group of shipwreck victims. After hearing the stories of the victims, the general invites them to stay with him and incorporates them into his army. The general also invites Kleitophon

107. Hock, 'Ancient Novels', 124. Hock dates Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon* 'no later than the mid-second century' CE.

to be a companion at his table, inquires about Kleitophon's story, and assigns an Egyptian orderly to attend to Kleitophon's needs. After the rescue of Leukippe, the general also provides separate lodging for Leukippe and Kleitophon (4.1.1).

Scene 2 (8.4-7). The action of the narrative moves to the temple of Artemis. After Thersandros loses his fight with Kleitophon's teeth, the priest of Artemis cordially entertains Kleitophon, Leukippe, and Sostratos at dinnertime. While drinking together, the priest eventually asks Sostratos, whom the priest addresses as stranger (ξένος), to tell his tale (8.4.2). Sostratos does so and then asks Kleitophon to tell his story. Afterward, each of the priest's guests retires to the quarters prepared for him or her by the priest. Furthermore, Achilles Tatius points out to the reader that Kleitophon's friend, Kleinias, decided not to participate in the priest's hospitality for fear that his presence would strain the host (ξενοδόχος) (8.7.2).

Back in court, Thersandros mentions that the priest took (ὑποδέχομαι) these people in and shared a feast and a symposium with them (8.8.11). Thersandros is impugning the character of the host (the priest) based upon his perception of the character of the guests (Leukippe and Kleitophon).

After the trial and the tests of truthfulness, the priest entertains (ὑποδέχομαι) them again (8.15.2). After dinner, they tell the same stories as the day before and go to bed (8.18.5). Though Achilles Tatius does not narrate their departure, he does inform us that they remained (μένω) three more days for legal reasons (8.19.2).

Description of Hospitality (6.9). When Thersandros, whom Melite (Thersandros's wife) thought had been killed during a shipwreck, returns home and finds Kleitophon in his house, he responds with great violence. In order to pacify him, Melite lies about her relationship with Kleitophon. Melite starts by saying that Kleitophon was a shipwreck victim. Then she claims that she felt pity for him, remembered Thersandros, and offered hospitality to him (6.9.3-5). She claims that in reality she was paying honor to all shipwreck victims. In particular, by honoring Kleitophon, she was actually paying her respects to Thersandros.

In *Leucippe and Clitophon* we continue to see the presence of Homeric style hospitality. For instance, we continue to see the prominence of meals, story telling, and lodging in the cycle of hospitality. Second, when the priest is criticized for being the type of person who hosts 'immoral' guests in 8.8.10-12, it becomes clear that the character of the guest becomes intimately associated with the character of the host and vice

versa.[108] Third, Melite reveals that one motivation for showing hospitality to a traveler is to honor a third party who is also in need of hospitality (6.9.3-5).[109] Finally, we observe that Achilles Tatius employs the ξεν- stem to describe the custom of hospitality and the root words δέχομαι and μένω to describe the behavior of the hosts and guests in a hospitality relationship.

Heliodorus[110]

Despite the fact that he is writing at a later date, Heliodorus, who is imitating Homer's style,[111] includes a variety of hospitality scenes throughout *An Ethiopian Story* that are worthy of our attention. Due to space, however, I will limit my treatment of hospitality in Heliodorus to the home of Nausikles.

Scene 1 (2.21-23). The scene opens as Knemon greets the aged Kalasiris by a river. Next, both men ask the other to tell their stories or travels, but neither does so. Instead, Kalasiris suggests that they go to the village so they can exchange stories. He says, 'I cannot offer you hospitality of my own house, but I shall entertain you in the home of a good man who has given me sanctuary' (2.21.7).

When they reach the lodgings where the old man is staying, the master of the house (Nausikles) is not at home. They are, however, given the warmest of welcomes by Nausikles' daughter and by the serving women of the house. One washes Knemon's feet and cleans the dust from his lower legs. Another prepares the couch. A third brings a jug of water and lights a fire. And a fourth fills the table with bread and fruit. At that point, Knemon exclaims, 'We…have come to the court of Zeus, the God of Hospitality (ξενία)'. Kalasiris responds by saying that Knemon's host is not Zeus, but instead a scrupulous man who respects Zeus, the God of Hospitality (ξενία) and Supplication (2.22.2). Next, they make a libation to the gods of that region (2.22.5, 23.1). Afterward, they share food and drink. Finally, Kalasiris determines it is time to present a portion of his tale.

Scene 2 (5.12-16). Nausikles, the owner of the house, invites Kalasiris to join him in a sacrifice to Hermes whom Nausikles considers to be his

108. This dynamic can also be seen in the treatment of Jason in Thessalonica (Acts 17.5-9) and in 2 Jn 10–11.

109. Honoring a third party by showing hospitality to a second party has a potential parallel in Mt. 25.31-46.

110. It should be noted that Heliodorus is writing at a much later date than the other Greek novelists. See, e.g., Morgan, 'Heliodorus', 351-52.

111. Morgan, 'Heliodorus', 351.

patron god (5.12.3-13.1). Kalasiris agrees. During the sacrifice, Kalasiris gives Nausikles one of Charikleia's royal rings as payment for Charikleia's freedom, and Nausikles accepts it as a gift from the gods (5.15.2). After the sacrifice, Nausikles leads the way to a feast. At the feast, the guests experience food, wine, singing, and dancing. Nausikles also toasts Kalasiris and asks him to tell his story as a form of entertainment. Finally, Kalasiris agrees to tell his full story (5.16.3).

Scene 3 (6.6-8). When it becomes clear that Kalasiris and Charikleia will be leaving soon, Nausikles prepares an extraordinary banquet. At the banquet Nausikles informs his guests (ξένοι) that it is time for him to travel again. He asks his guests to decide whether they will stay (μένω) and live there forever as friends (φίλτατοι) rather than as guests (ξένοι), or whether they will move on (6.6.2).

After a brief interval, Kalasiris and Charikleia formally inform Nausikles of their intention to leave. Two days later when they are ready to set off, Nausikles offers them a pack animal and human assistance. The whole household walks with them until they are a half-mile outside of the village. They embrace, clasp right hands, and part (6.11.2).

We can learn a great deal about hospitality in antiquity from Heliodorus. First, we see a variety of traditional hospitality elements in Heliodorus's work, such as welcoming, washing the guest's feet, and feeding the guest. Second, the telling of the guests' personal stories is pivotal to the plot. These stories primarily consist of the host's trials and travels. Third, the guests often worship the god whom the host worships. Fourth, the guests themselves are associated with the gods. In particular, this is seen when Nausikles accepts the ring from Kalasiris as if it is a gift from the gods (5.15.2). This view becomes unmistakable when Kalasiris declares, 'when gods and spirits descend to earth or ascend from earth, they very occasionally assume the form of an animal, but generally they take on human shape: the resemblance to ourselves makes their theophany more accessible to us' (3.13.1). Thus, in *An Ethiopian Story* we again see that a possible motive for extending hospitality to a stranger is that the stranger may actually be a god, an agent of a god, or protected by a god (2.22.2; 5.15.2; 6.2.2). Fifth, in the departure scene, we see an especially elaborate feast, an exchange of blessings, the offer of travel gifts, and an escort for the guest. Finally, Heliodorus uses the ξεν-stem throughout his novel. He also employs the root word μένω in 6.6.2 to describe the guests' decision either to continue or to discontinue their hospitality.

Thus, the Greek romances provide valuable illustrations of Greco-Roman hospitality. As we read them, we can detect a variety of recurring hospitality elements and terminology. In general, the Greek novels,

which were composed in roughly the same time period as the New Testament documents, help us envision hospitality scenes in the New Testament as a Greek-speaking Mediterranean audience would have.

Hospitality in Dio Chrysostom's The Hunter

The writings of Dio Chrysostom also reflect perspectives on hospitality that were composed in roughly the same time period as the New Testament documents. Therefore, his writings will be useful to me as I attempt to reconstruct typical, Greco-Roman expectations about hospitality around the time that Luke was writing.

Dio of Prusa in Asia Minor was born around 40 CE, was banished from Italy in 82 CE and died about 120 CE.[112] In addition, for fourteen years of his adult life he was a wandering cynic. During this period, 'he wandered penniless from place to place'.[113] In his *Seventh Discourse*, sometimes called the *Euboean Discourse* or *The Hunter*, Dio reflects upon the reception that a poor hunter and his family gave to him after he was shipwrecked off the coast of Euboea (*Ven.* 7.1-3). Furthermore, altogether Dio makes five noteworthy references to hospitality in this work.

First, while wandering through unfamiliar territory, the hunter sees Dio and greets him as a stranger (ξένος) (7.5). And, after finding the deer he is hunting, the hunter invites (παρακαλέω) the stranger to come to his house to eat the venison with him (7.5) and rest for the night (7.6). In the meantime, the hunter asks Dio from where he came, how he landed at Euboea, and whether or not his boat was shipwrecked (7.6). After Dio answers these questions, the hunter replies, 'Come and have no fear. Today you shall rest after your trying experience, but to-morrow we shall do our best to get you out safely, now that we have come to know you' (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.7-8 [Cohoon, LCL]).

During the five mile trip back to the hunter's house, the hunter tells Dio about his family while referring to Dio as a stranger (ξένος) (7.10; cf. 7.71). As he describes his hut and his family, however, it becomes clear that the hunter had a humble upbringing and possesses only meager means even now (7.10-20). Yet, during this conversation Dio provides us with a clear understanding of the hunter's exemplary character. While walking and talking the hunter mentions three additional instances in which the hunter and his family had previously extended hospitality to other travelers.

112. *Dio Chrysostom* (trans. J.W. Cohoon; 5 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), ix-x.

113. *Dio Chrysostom*, x.

First, the hunter describes a time when a man who represented the city magistrates came to their country hut and demanded that the hunter and his family pay money for their use of what the magistrates considered public lands. The man from the city then insisted that the hunter travel with him into town to testify about his inability to pay these newly instituted fees and to address a variety of charges (7.21-53). Before following the man back to town, however, the hunter and his family entertained (ξενίζω) the man as best they could and gave him two deerskins (7.21-22).

Once the hunter arrives in town, he faces an angry crowd that accuses him of a variety of improprieties, one of which is that he has enriched himself as a result of the ships that break apart along the shore near his home. As the hunter defends himself against the accusations that he benefits monetarily from such events, the hunter does acknowledge that he often extends hospitality to shipwreck victims. As a result, when the hunter testifies to this fact, we now see the third reference to hospitality in Dio Chrysostom's *The Hunter*. The hunter says,

> Many is the time I have pitied shipwrecked travelers who have come to my door, taken (ὑποδέχομαι) them into my hut, given them to eat and to drink, helped them in any other way that I could, and accompanied them until they got out of the wilderness. Yet who of them is there who will testify for me now? And I never did that to win a testimonial or gratitude; why, I never knew where the men came from even. (7.52-53)

At that point, however, a dramatic turn of events takes place. One of the hunter's former guests happens to be in the crowd, and now he rises to verify that the hunter does not profit from the hospitality he shows to shipwreck victims (7.53-54). Consequently, Dio begins to narrate his fourth reference to this poor hunter's meritorious hospitality.

When the man in the crowd rises and speaks, he indicates that he was once a shipwreck victim (7.54-55). After being cast ashore, he and another fellow reached some huts and called inside (7.56). The hunter came out, brought them in (εἰσάγει ἡμᾶς), and made a low fire (7.56). First, the hunter and his wife rubbed their guests with tallow since they had no olive oil (7.56). Second, the hosts poured warm water on their guests to warm them up (7.56-57). Third, they made their guests recline (κατακλίνω) and provided them with wheat bread and wine, while they restricted themselves to millet porridge and water (7.57). Fourth, the hosts roasted venison in great abundance for their guests. Fifth, even though their guest wanted to leave the next morning, the hosts held their guests back for three days (7.57-58). Finally, when it was time for the guests to depart, the hosts escorted (προπέμπω) their guests 'down to the plains' and gave them meat and two 'very handsome' pelts. Furthermore,

because the hunter realized that his guest was still ill from the cold waters, the hunter clothed his guest with his daughter's tunic until they reached the village' (7.58).

By the time the hunter finishes telling these stories to Dio they have arrived back at the hunter's hut (7.64). (This takes us back to the first reference to hospitality in *The Hunter*.) Upon entering (εἰσέρχομαι) the hut, the hunter provides Dio with the same kind of courtesies for which the hunter is now known in spite of his severe poverty (7.64, 66, 81). First, the host, his wife, and his guest feast for the rest of the day while reclining (κατακλίνω) upon animal skins (7.65). His daughter 'of marriageable age' serves the food and wine, while the boys prepare the meat (7.65). In all, the hosts provide meat, apples, medlars, grapes, wheat bread, boiled eggs, and parched chickpeas (7.75-76). Second, Dio refers to the hunter as his host (ξένος) (7.68). Third, Dio inquires about whether the host intends to wed his daughter to the neighbor's son (7.69). When the hunter acknowledges that he intends to do so, Dio suggests that it is already time for the wedding (7.78). The mother-in-law-to-be then says, 'Our guest (ξένος) speaks well' (7.78). As a result, they all decide to have the wedding two days later, and they invite Dio to stay (προσμένω) with them (7.79-80), and Dio does so (προσμένω) (7.80).

When Dio reflects on the deep poverty of his hosts (7.81), it provides a platform for his fifth and perhaps most extensive reference to hospitality. Dio concludes that one does not have to be wealthy to extend ideal hospitality to strangers. Instead, the poor often turn out to be better hosts. Dio says,

> And really, when I consider Euripides' words and ask myself whether as a matter of fact the entertainment of strangers (ξένοι) is so difficult for them that they can never welcome (ὑποδέχομαι) or succour anyone in need, I find this by no means to be true of their hospitality (ξενία). They light a fire more promptly than the rich and guide one on the way without reluctance…and often they share what they have more readily. When will you find a rich man who will give the victim of a shipwreck his wife's or his daughter's purple gown or any article of clothing far cheaper than that… though he has thousands of them? (7.82)

Next, Dio provides a helpful link for us from Homeric hospitality to hospitality in the first and second centuries of the Common Era. Dio uses Eumaeus in Homer's *Odyssey* as another example of a poor person who extends praiseworthy hospitality to his guest. Dio writes, 'Homer too illustrates this, for in Eumaeus he has given us a slave and a poor man who can still welcome (ὑποδέχομαι) Odysseus generously with food and a bed, while the suitors in their wealth and insolence share with him but grudgingly (7.83)'.

Furthermore, Dio goes on to demonstrate that the poor Eumaeus actually hosted Odysseus better than either Penelope or Telemachus did (7.84-87). In fact, Dio notices that Eumaeus was not surprised when Telemachus instructed him to send Odysseus on his way. He says,

> the swineherd feels no surprise at the treatment and its inhumanity, as though it were the regular procedure to deal with needy strangers (ξένοι) thus strictly and meanly and to welcome open-heartedly with gifts and presents (ὑποδέχεσθαι φιλοφρόνως ξενίοις καὶ δώροις) only the rich, from whom, of course, the host expected a like return, very much as the present custom is in selecting the recipients of our kindly treatment (φιλανθρωπία) and preferment; for what seem to be acts of kindliness and favours turn out, when examined rightly, to be nothing more or less than accommodations and loans, and that too at a high rate of interest as a usual thing. (7.88-89)

Dio then goes on to mention an exception to his observations from Homer's *Odyssey*. The Phaeacians were wealthy, yet they also displayed generosity (φιλανθρωπία) (7.90). They were simply motivated to be 'open-handed and splendid' (7.90).

He then concludes his excursus on wealth and hospitality. He says, 'It is certainly clear that wealth does no great service to its owners as regards the entertainment of strangers (ξένοι) and otherwise. On the contrary, it is more likely to make them stingy and parsimonious, generally speaking, than poverty is' (7.91). Instead, a poor man with strong character is enabled 'to give acceptable gifts (ξένια) to strangers (ξένοι) when they come—gifts willingly given that do not arouse the recipient's suspicion or give him offense' (7.92-93).

Summary of Greco-Roman Hospitality

In short, private hospitality in Greco-Roman antiquity is best described as an extensive set of behavioral conventions that govern the host and guest relationship. Essentially, anything that takes place 'from the moment a visitor approaches someone's house until the moment he departs' or even reaches his next destination is considered to be an outgrowth of either hospitality or inhospitality.[114] Though the individual manifestations differ, hospitality takes place where a host welcomes a traveler by providing for the needs of the traveler and helping the traveler on his or her way.

Yet despite the natural diversity that is present in human relationships, I have been able to compile a list of traditional expectations that accompanied private hospitality interactions in ancient Greco-Roman

114. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 5.

contexts. Furthermore, Greco-Roman authors often wrote about these relationships while using a consistent set of terms and phrases. First, based upon the texts we have examined, some of the typical behavioral elements of Greco-Roman hospitality include: a description of the host seeing the stranger from a distance (Homer, *Od*. 1.120; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5); at times the host approaches and greets the stranger (Homer, *Od*. 1.123; 3.34-35; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5); the host routinely takes the stranger by the hand when greeting him or her (Homer, *Od*. 1.120-24; 3.34-35; Longus 3.7; Virgil, *Aen*. 8.152-69); more often strangers take the initiative and request hospitality (Homer, *Od*. 7.142-45; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.218-19; 8.628-35; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.52); the guest is often associated with Zeus or the other gods (Homer, *Od*. 1.102-324; 6.207-10; 6.276-81; 9.266-71; 14.55-60; 14.283-84, 389; 16.172-85; 17.483-87; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.1; 2.2.4; 3.2.6; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.212-15; 8.688-90; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.2; 5.15.2; 6.2.2); and the host may worship the guest who is revealed to be divine (Ovid, *Metam*. 1.220-21; 8.626-27).

Other features include: the host and guest ratify their relationship when the guest is brought into the host's dwelling (Homer, *Od*. 1.120-24; Ovid, *Metam*. 8.636; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.56, 64); once inside, the host often seats the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.130-31; 3.36-41; Ovid, *Metam*. 8.640-60; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.57); the servants often bathe the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.309-10; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22); the host provides an extravagant meal (Homer, *Od*. 1.136-39; 3.36-41; 14.72-82; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.226-31; 8.677-78; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5, 52-53, 57, 65, 75-76, 83); the host generally asks the guest about his or her identity (Homer, *Od*. 1.169-77; 3.69-71; 7.236-39; 9.252-55; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.6); the host may provide the guest with new clothes (Homer, *Od*. 10.542; 13.4-23; 14.515-17; Longus 4.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.58, 82); the host may provide some type of entertainment for the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.150-55; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 5.15-16); the guest often joins with the host in worshipping the host's gods (Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.2; Longus 3.9-10; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.5-23.1; 5.12.3-13.1); and the host may pour libations or make a sacrifice to his or her god in honor of the guest (Homer, *Od*. 3.40-68; Ovid, *Metam*. 8.687-88).

In addition, the host generally provides overnight lodging (Homer, *Od*. 14.518-33; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.6, 79-80, 83); the guest may stay for one night (Homer, *Od*. 3.487-93; 15.184-91), multiple nights (Homer, *Od*. 17.515; Achilles Tatius 4.1.1; 8.19.2), or even for many weeks (Homer, *Od*. 10.14; 11.353-61; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.21-23; 5.12-16; 6.6-8); the host may persuade the guest to stay longer than the guest had originally planned (Homer, *Od*. 15.301-39; 17.515); the host protects the guest during his or her stay (Homer, *Od*. 14.21-22, 29-36; Chariton 8.3.2; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.52-53); once the relationship is established, it is

assumed that the guest can return at any point in the future and receive a hospitable reception (Homer, *Od*. 1.178-83); the host often escorts the guest out of town (Chariton 8.4.7-8; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.7-8, 52-53, 58; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.11); and the host may give provisions to the guest as the guest sets off (Homer, *Od*. 14.515-17; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.3; Longus 3.11; 4.6; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.11).

Finally, the host occasionally benefits from the reciprocal kindness of the guest in the initial visit. For instance, the guest occasionally rewards the host or assists the host while the guest is still in the host's home (Ovid, *Metam*. 8.690-724; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 5.15.2). Conversely, the host could generally anticipate a significant act of reciprocity in the future (Homer, *Od*. 3.4-485 and 15.193-214; 4.1-624; 15.1-184; Chariton 8.3-4; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.53-54). Furthermore, in Greco-Roman hospitality, the host often gives costly gifts to the guest that may require a substantial, financial sacrifice on the part of the host (Homer, *Od*. 1.311-18; 8.430-32; 13.4-23, 47-53; 15.74-77, 99-132, 536-38; 17.163-65; 19.309-11; Chariton 5.9.7; Longus 3.9; 4.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.21-22, 45, 57-58, 88-89, 93; Virgil, *Aen*. 8.152-69).

Second, my inquiry into Greco-Roman hospitality has demonstrated that a collection of Greek words or phrases was consistently employed by Greek and Roman writers who wrote about private hospitality. For instance, the Greek stem of ξεν-, due to its association with the stranger, becomes the most obvious Greek semantic marker for hospitality.[115] For instance, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, and φιλοξενία were used comprehensively to refer to hospitality or the offer of hospitality. This usage is well attested in Greco-Roman literature (Homer, *Od.* 3.487-93; 5.91; 6.119-21; 9.175-76, 266-71; 13.200-202; Herodotus, *Hist*. 1.69; 2.119; Xenophon, *Hell*. 6.1.3; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.22, 60, 82; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 2.22.2). On the other hand, the ξεν- stem could be used more specifically to refer to strangers (Homer, *Od.* 1.120; 3.34; 5.91; 9.266-71; 17.382-87; Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.114-15; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.2; Chariton 1.12.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.5, 10, 71, 82, 88, 91; Achilles Tatius 8.4.2), guests (Homer, *Od.* 1.187-88; 3.350; 11.338; Chariton 1.12.10; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.78; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.6.2), hosts (Homer, *Od.* 1.214; Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.114-15; Chariton 8.3.2; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.68; Achilles Tatius 8.7.2), and even the gifts or benefits that come within a hospitality relationship (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.88-89, 93).[116] Furthermore, φιλανθρωπία (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.88-89, 90) and φιλόφρων (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.88-89;

115. Stählin, 'ξένος', 1. See also, Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 100, and Herman, *Ritualised Friendship*, 10-11.

116. Stählin, 'ξένος', 2, and Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 71.

cf. Acts 28.7)[117] were sometimes used as modifiers of a ξεν- word when the author was describing hospitality that was marked by exceptional kindness.

In addition, ἀσπάζομαι can refer to the host's initial greeting of the stranger (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.67);[118] καλέω is occasionally employed to describe the host's invitation to the stranger (Homer, *Od*. 17.382-87; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5); δέχομαι and its cognates (Chariton 1.14.2; Longus 4.5; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.52, 82, 83, 88; Achilles Tatius 8.4.1; 8.8.11) are used to describe the action of welcoming or receiving a traveler; εἰς τὸν οἶκον, often in conjunction with the verbs ἄγω or ἔρχομαι, is the phrase that marks the ratification of the hospitality relationship (Chariton 1.12.10; Longus 3.7; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.56, 64); μένω and its cognates describe the guest's decision to stay or remain in a hospitable home (Homer, *Od*. 1.309-10; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.3; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.80; Achilles Tatius 8.19.2; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.6.2); καταλύω is used in conjunction with a traveler's actions of halting, finding lodging, or spending the night (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.79);[119] and κατακλίνω is occasionally employed when an author describes the host seating the guest (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.57, 63).

Finally, on the one hand, προπέμπω and its cognates are used comprehensively to describe the host's send off of the guest. Yet, on the other hand, προπέμπω can also be employed more specifically to describe either the host's act of escorting the guest to his or her next destination (Homer, *Od*. 3.325-27, 368-70, 475-86; 13.38-39; 15.74-77 and 99-132; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.58) or the host's act of providing the guest with provisions for his or her journey (Homer, *Od*. 3.368-70; 10.542, 71-573; 13.38-39; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.58).[120]

117. Walter Bauer *et al*., *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (rev. and ed. Frederick W. Danker; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000), 1060.

118. Cf. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1989), I, 454.

119. Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, I, 455.

120. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 96. Προπέμπω is also used in political contexts to refer to the host's protection of foreign envoys (e.g. 1 Esd. 4.47; 1 Macc. 12.4).

3

Jewish Hospitality in Antiquity

In this chapter, I will primarily discuss Jewish hospitality as it appears in the Jewish Scriptures,[1] the Old Testament Apocrypha, and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. I will, however, make references to the continuation of this social convention in rabbinic and Christian literature as well. Furthermore, I must clarify that I consider the earliest Christian hospitality to fall under the broader label of Jewish hospitality. Here, I am following Gabriele Boccaccini, who convincingly argues that Rabbinism and early Christianity were not normative systems until after the onset of the second century CE. Instead, 'prior to that they were only two of the many Judaisms of their time…'[2] Similarly, Alan Segal contends that the rabbinic movement and the early Christian movement were simply Jewish siblings that were birthed from the larger Jewish tradition in the same period of time.[3] Thus, while I realize that there are significant differences between these two Jewish movements, I will at times group them together under the umbrella of Jewish hospitality. On the other hand, I will also distinguish between the corpuses of early Christian writings and rabbinic writings as a way to acknowledge the growing geographical and cultural separation that begins to arise between the two groups. Hence, while I will primarily treat early Christian hospitality in the next chapter, I will at times refer to Christian documents in this chapter.

In addition, I will not attempt to make the case that private hospitality among the Jews is a different social custom than private hospitality among the Greeks and Romans, which I discussed in the previous chap-

1. I will intentionally employ the term 'Jewish Scriptures' rather than 'Hebrew Scriptures' at times in this chapter as a way of indicating when I am primarily discussing the Septuagint.

2. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 14.

3. Alan F. Segal, *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 1.

ter. Instead, I consider Judaism in the Hellenistic age to be a monotheistic subculture within the larger Mediterranean world. As a result, I consider Jewish hospitality to be one manifestation of a broader Mediterranean social convention. Hence, I fully acknowledge the Hellenistic influence upon many of the expressions of Jewish hospitality that I will treat in the chapter. In my mind, what separates Jewish culture in the Hellenistic age from non-Jewish culture is a monotheistic belief system and a loyalty to the Jewish Scriptures.

Furthermore, when I treat Christian hospitality briefly in this chapter and more fully in the next chapter, I will assume that Christian hospitality played out according to the expectations of the dominant subculture in the geographical region of the host. For instance, I will assume that Jewish Christian hosts in Judea followed the protocol of Jewish hospitality whereas Gentile Christian hosts in Rome followed the protocol of Greco-Roman hospitality. Again, with Christian hospitality, I will not attempt to separate it as a custom from either Greco-Roman or Jewish hospitality. Instead, I will argue that most of the distinctive characteristics of Christian hospitality are related to the Christian loyalty to monotheism, the Jewish Scriptures, and the person and teachings of Jesus Christ.

Finally, as I describe the manner in which this social convention plays out in Jewish documents, I will continue my task of compiling a Greek vocabulary that was typically used when ancient writers wrote about hospitality.[4] Thus, when I treat the Jewish Scriptures, I will also cite noteworthy examples of the Greek vocabulary that the translators of the Septuagint chose. Consequently, once I move to Luke's writings, I will be able to draw upon both a set of typical behaviors and a Greek, semantic range that was employed in the ancient world when writers described an extension of hospitality. Hence, a list of standard hospitality protocols and a list of standard Greek terminology for hospitality will aid me when I determine whether the custom of hospitality is present in Acts 10–11.

An Overview of Jewish Hospitality

The practice of hospitality has a long heritage as a valued custom not only among the Greeks, but also among the Jews.[5] For example, in the Jewish Scriptures, the Israelites are commanded to extend generous

4. For discussions of the Hebrew vocabulary associated with Jewish hospitality see, Stählin, 'ξένος', 8-10, and Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 75-80.

5. John Koenig, 'Hospitality', in *ABD*, III, 299-301; and *New Testament Hospitality*, 16, 45.

hospitality to the stranger or sojourner in 'the Covenant code in Exodus (Exod. 22.21; 23.9), the priestly laws of Leviticus (Lev. 19.33-34), and the deuteronomic law code (Deut. 16.14; 26.12)'.[6] Therefore, given the diverse settings and authorship of these passages of Scripture, it can be deduced that hospitality was an important custom throughout a significant portion of ancient Israel's history.

Furthermore, as I mentioned above, there are many commonalities between Greco-Roman and Jewish hospitality thereby substantiating the argument that they are two expressions of the same Mediterranean social convention. First, at its core, Jewish hospitality was the kind reception of a stranger or traveler,[7] just as we saw with Greco-Roman hospitality. Second, just as we saw with Greek and Roman hosts, the Jewish host was primarily expected to provide both provisions and protection (e.g. Gen. 19.1-23; Judg. 19.14-28). For instance, John Koenig contends that Jewish hospitality grew out of 'Bedouin traditions having to do with a resident's obligation to nourish and protect travelers who find themselves in hostile environments'.[8]

Third, as we saw with Greco-Roman hospitality, the Israelite host and guest often forged a long-term, reciprocal relationship in which both parties presumed the other's assistance in the future (e.g. Josh. 2.1-21; 9.6, 11, 15, 18-21). For instance, once relationships were forged, the guests typically returned to their host's house and hospitality whenever they were in the same region at a later time (e.g. Judg. 4.17; 2 Kgs 4.10-36). Fourth, it is occasionally helpful to distinguish between public (e.g. 1 Macc. 12.1-18) and private forms of hospitality within a Jewish context as we did within a Greco-Roman setting.[9] Finally, the Jews, like the Greeks and Romans, attended to the traveler's physical appearance and comfort. For instance, whereas Greek and Roman hosts bathed their guests, Hebrew hosts generally provided their guests with water so they could wash their own feet.[10] Over time, however, more and more examples of Jewish hosts washing their guests' feet can be seen.

6. Dennis T. Olson, 'The Book of Judges: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, II, 721-888 (876).

7. See, e.g., Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 8; Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 33-34, and Julius H. Greenstone, 'Hospitality', in Isidore Singer *et al*. (eds.), *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (12 vols.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1904), VI, 480-81 (480).

8. Koenig, 'Hospitality', 299.

9. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 11-12. See also Stählin, 'ξένος', 17-19.

10. Greenstone, 'Hospitality', 480.

Yet, Jewish hospitality can also be distinguished from Greco-Roman hospitality in a variety of ways. First, the Jews operated with a different foundational meta-narrative, which is found in the Jewish Scriptures. For instance, in the Jewish culture, the story of Abraham functioned as the ideal picture of hospitality (Gen. 18.1-33) rather than Homer's writings.[11] And, as I will demonstrate below, Abraham continued to serve as the ideal host of travelers at least through the rabbinic and early Christian eras. Beyond Abraham, however, 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 (Job 31.32; cf. *T. Job* 10.1-3; 25.5; 53.3) are often mentioned as notable Jewish hosts within the Jewish Scriptures.[12]

Second, Greco-Roman hospitality often resulted in an extended stay by the guests (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 5.382–13.187; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.21-23; 5.12-16; 6.6-8). Conversely, in Hebraic and Jewish hospitality, the guests generally stayed for shorter lengths of time, often only for a meal (e.g. Gen. 18.1-33). Third, Greco-Roman hospitality carried with it the expectation that the host should make substantial sacrifices in order to provide the guests with expensive or valuable gifts (e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.45, 57-58). Conversely, Hebraic and Jewish hosts were obligated to provide a meal, but much less emphasis was placed upon giving expensive gifts to the guests (e.g. Gen. 18.1-33). Fourth, Jewish hospitality in the time of Jesus was particularly linked with the synagogue and with 'traveling pairs of Palestinian teachers'.[13] In the Middle Jewish time period, the synagogue was the place where Jewish travelers generally began their search for hospitality. In fact, 'it appears that at least some of the synagogues in our period were equipped with guest rooms to accommodate overnight visitors'.[14] In addition, Jewish teachers, who traveled in pairs, often exchanged their wisdom for provisions.[15] We see no such parallel in Greco-Roman hospitality. Finally, as distinct from the inclusivity of Greco-Roman hospitality, Jewish hospitality was often limited to traveling Jews.[16]

11. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 15, and Koenig, 'Hospitality', 300.
12. Greenstone, 'Hospitality', 480.
13. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 16.
14. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 46.
15. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 16-17. See Josephus, *Ant*. 1.246-55.
16. Stählin, 'ξένος', 11-14.

Abraham's Hospitality among Jewish and Early Christian Writers[17]

In order for us to understand Jewish hospitality better, and even early Christian hospitality, it is important to understand the paradigmatic role that Abraham's hospitality played within these contexts.[18] The story of Abraham's extension of hospitality to the three messengers of Yahweh in Gen. 18.1-16 takes on a life of its own in later Jewish and early Christian contexts. For instance, by the time of Christ, the retelling of this story functioned descriptively by informing later Jews about the importance of this social custom in ancient Israel. Moreover, at the same time the retelling of this story functioned prescriptively for the later generations. Retelling the story of Abraham's hospitality taught the later generations about the virtuous quality of assisting travelers and provided the later generations with a model for their own hospitality. As a result, it is advantageous for us to sketch the tradition history of Abraham's extension of hospitality to the three strangers as originally recorded in Gen. 18.1-16.

Hebrew Scriptures

First, in the Hebrew Scriptures Abraham's extension of hospitality to the three strangers (Gen. 18.1-16) primarily functions as the occasion for Yahweh's announcement of Isaac's birth (18.9-15).[19] In 18.1, the Lord (Yahweh) appears while Abraham is sitting at the door of his tent.[20] Upon lifting his eyes, Abraham sees three men standing opposite him, runs to meet them, and bows down before them. Abraham then offers them a little water so they can wash their own feet,[21] a piece of bread,

17. In this section I am relying heavily upon research that I previously published as 'Abraham's Hospitality among Jewish and Early Christian Writers: A Tradition History of Genesis 18:1-16 and its Relevance for the Study of the New Testament', *PRS* 30 (2003), 359-76.

18. Koenig, 'Hospitality', 300.

19. Cf. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 16–50* (WBC, 2; Dallas: Word Books, 1994), 40.

20. Terence E. Fretheim, 'The Book of Genesis', in *NIB*, I, 319-674 (462). He contends that 'From the narrator's point of view, Yahweh appears to Abraham at his home (v. 1). From Abraham's point of view, however, three men stand near him (v. 2).' See also E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (AB, 1; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964), 328; Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (trans. John H. Marks; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 204-205, and J.A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions* (CBET, 1; Kampen: Kok, 1990), 18. Loader asserts that v. 1 is the introduction that explains how the rest of the chapter should be interpreted. While characterizing Gen. 18, on p. 205 Gerhard von Rad adds, 'Actually we have here one of those narratives, widespread throughout the world, which tells of the visit of divine creatures to men'.

21. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18–50* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 8.

and reassurance that he will not detain them after they have eaten and rested (18.2-5).

Yet once the travelers accept his offer of hospitality, Abraham begins to provide for them in a much more extravagant manner than he originally promised. Claus Westermann contends that Abraham's understatement about the provisions he will provide for his guests is best described as 'the language of politeness; it is meant to minimize the exhausting work of entertainment'.[22] Furthermore, Abraham acts with great haste (18.6-8). In all, the author employs 'haste language' five times.[23] Abraham also instructs Sarah to make bread cakes using three measures of fine flour,[24] selects a tender and good calf from the herd, has a servant prepare the calf, and provides curds and milk for his guests. Furthermore, Abraham, Sarah, and the servant all hurry or move quickly while preparing this meal. Then, as his guests eat, Abraham stands near them.

Once the men have eaten and refreshed themselves, they vow to return again to Abraham's house (18.10, 14). More significantly, however, they climactically inform Abraham that Sarah will have a son (18.10). This announcement resolves Sarah's barrenness and fulfills God's promise, which was first introduced in Gen. 15.1-4 (cf. 12.1-3). Finally, Abraham escorts them out of his region by walking with the three strangers (18.16).

Septuagint

When the translators of the Septuagint translate Gen. 18.1-16, they only make a few alterations and embellishments to the story of Abraham's hospitality. First, the Septuagint translators choose to inform the reader that God (Θεός), rather than Yahweh,[25] appears as Abraham sits by the door of his tent (σκῆνος) (18.1).[26] Second, after Abraham lifts up his eyes, sees the three men, runs to meet them, and bows down to the ground (προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν) (18.2), Abraham suggests that his servants wash the feet of his guests (18.4). Thus, the translators have altered the tradition. Now, it is implied that Abraham's servant will wash their feet instead of the travelers washing their own feet. Here, the translators

22. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12–36: A Commentary* (trans. J. J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1985), 278.

23. Fretheim, 'The Book of Genesis', 463.

24. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 11. Hamilton notes, 'Sarah's three seahs is a large amount, which will yield much more bread than the three visitors, Sarah, and Abraham can possibly eat'.

25. Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; repr., Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997 [1901]), 194.

26. In this section I am drawing upon the Greek text compiled by C.L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986).

appear to contextualize the story for their more Hellenized readers. For example, in the Hebrew Scriptures the host typically provides the guest with water to wash his own feet (e.g. Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; 1 Sam. 25.41; 2 Sam. 11.8).[27] Yet, in more Hellenistic contexts the servants wash the guest's feet (e.g. *Jos. Asen.* 7.1; 20.4).

Third, as Abraham and his household tend to their guests, the Septuagint translators capture the speed with which Abraham's household moves and accentuate the lavishness of his feast. Abraham runs (προστρέχω) to meet the men. He hurries (σπεύδω) to his tent and tells Sarah to hurry (σπεύδω) and make not only three measures of fine flour but also cakes (ἐγκρυφίας) (18.6).[28] Then, while Sarah hurries to make bread and cakes, Abraham runs to the cows (εἰς τὰς βόας ἔδραμεν) to get a young calf, and he gives it to his servant, who hurries (ταχύνω) to prepare (ποιέω) it (18.7). Finally, after the three men eat butter, milk, bread and meat (18.8), Abraham sends (συμπροπέμπω) them on their journey (18.16).

Philo

Years later, Philo's (c. 10 BCE to 45 CE[29]) writings reflect significant alterations and embellishments to the story of Abraham's hospitality in *De Abrahamo* 107-18. First, Philo emphasizes the way in which Abraham's hospitality as first told in Genesis 18 demonstrates Abraham's virtuousness, which was Philo's stated goal for this entire treatise (48-55).[30] For instance, Philo informs his readers that Abraham's hospitality (φιλοξενία) is 'a by-product of a greater virtue', which he then identifies as piety (θεοσέβεια) (114-15). In this section, he even goes on to say that piety 'is quite clearly seen in this story, even if we think of the strangers as men' (114). Thus, even though Philo primarily focuses upon this story as a visitation from God in his allegorical section (e.g. 119, 142-46),[31] Philo also refers to the visitors as angels in his literal interpretation and acknowledges others who interpret this passage as exclusively referring

27. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 8.

28. Samuel Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature* (New York: Ktav, aug. edn, 1971), 181. Sandmel contends that the translators of the Septuagint add 'cakes' even though the 'Masoretic Text provides no basis' for it.

29. Peder Borgen, 'Philo of Alexandria', in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 233-82 (233). Throughout this section I will generally footnote one prominent scholar's opinion about the dating of each of the documents. I do this in order to show a temporal progression, though clearly, the dating of these documents is still debated.

30. Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 106, 120, 134.

31. Loader, *Two Cities*, 87.

to humans. During his allegorical section (119-32), however, he makes it clear that the three men are an extension of God (cf. 119, 121). As a result, Philo notably contends that Abraham's actions are a demonstration of reverence for God or piety, and Philo's retelling of the story of Abraham's hospitality is primarily a story about how humans should welcome God.

Second, Philo goes to much greater lengths to elaborate on Abraham's perception of the three men. For instance, Philo adds to the tradition the explanation that Abraham initially sees the three travelers as men (ἄνδρες) because their divine nature (θεῖος) was not apparent to him (107).[32] By adding this comment, Philo has heightened the similarities between the Abraham story and the stories about the pagan gods who secretly visit humans. Thus, he has again contextualized this story for his Hellenistic readers.

Third, as a result of Philo's stress upon piety, Philo introduces the story of Abraham's hospitality as a contrast to the inhospitality (ἄξενος) that the Egyptians have previously shown Abraham in *De Abrahamo* 107. Thus, while the Septuagint contrasts Abraham and the Sodomites (e.g. Gen. 19.1-9), Philo contrasts Abraham and the Egyptians,[33] which is not surprising given Philo's context in Alexandria. Consequently, Philo also freely edits the story of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt as recorded in Gen. 12.10-20. For instance, whereas the Genesis account appears to emphasize Abraham's fearfulness, Philo emphasizes the Egyptian's inhospitality.[34] According to Philo, the Egyptian officials send for the beautiful Sarah while disregarding the common courtesies extended to strangers (ξένοι) (93-94), thereby rendering Abraham powerless to protect his wife (95). As a result, God has to take in the strangers (λαβὼν δὲ τῶν ξένων) and protect them (96). Therefore, Philo completely omits Abraham's false representation of Sarah as his sister when he tells the story. Consequently, Philo has reframed Abraham's hospitality as told in Genesis to be the primary counterpart of Egyptian inhospitality rather than Sodomite inhospitality.

Fourth, Philo accentuates Abraham's haste even more than his predecessors did (e.g. *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin* 4.8). For instance, once Abraham sees the three men, he runs to them and earnestly begs them

32. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 193. Gunkel compares Yahweh's incognito appearance to Abraham in Gen. 18 with the Greco-Roman tales of the gods visiting humans while disguised as humans (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 17.485-87; Ovid, *Meta.* 1.211-15; 8.616-724). See also John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 203.

33. Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 119.

34. *Contra* Hamilton, *Genesis*, 8.

not to pass by his tent (ἱκέτευε λιπαρῶς μὴ παρελθεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν σκηνήν) but to enter and partake of his hospitality (εἰσεληλυθότας ξενίων μετασχεῖν). Next, Abraham instructs Sarah to hurry while baking three measures of cakes. In the meantime, Abraham also hurries to the stalls to take with all speed a tender and well-fed calf (ἁπαλὸν καὶ εὔσαρκον ἀγαγὼν μόσχον).[35] Then, Philo provides an explanatory aside about Abraham's quick actions. He either writes or quotes a proverb when he says, 'For in a wise man's house (ἐν σοφοῦ οἴκῳ) no one is slow in showing kindness (φιλανθρωπία); but women and men, slaves and free, are full of zeal to do service to their guests (πρὸς τὰς τῶν ξενιζομένων ὑπηρεσίας)' (109). Thus, Philo has embellished the tradition in a variety of ways. First, Philo accentuates Abraham's haste as more proof of Abraham's wisdom and ultimately his piety. Second, while discussing Abraham's haste, Philo contextualizes the scene. Even though Philo still says Abraham lived in a *tent*, he refers to the *house* where a wise man entertains his guests. Finally, Philo chooses to embellish the merits of the calf by describing it as well fed rather than simply good.

Fifth, Philo develops Abraham's emotions and inner thoughts. He clarifies that the three men perceive Abraham's intense feelings and therefore know that Abraham is being sincere and truthful (107). Then, once the three men accept Abraham's invitation, Abraham is filled with joy (χαρά) as he thinks about hosting the men. Philo is clearly communicating to his readers that Abraham does not extend hospitality to the three men out of a sense of obligation. Abraham is not begrudgingly carrying out a required task (108). Instead, Philo here clarifies that Abraham enjoyed extending hospitality to strangers; he did not perceive hospitality to be a burden, but a blessing.

Sixth, Philo makes explicit what was only implicit in the Hebrew Scriptures, if it was present at all. Philo characterizes the pronouncement of Isaac's birth as a reward to Abraham for his hospitality.[36] Referring to Abraham's kindness, Philo asserts that 'on this example of a great and unbounded generosity, they presented him with a reward surpassing his hopes' (110). Thus, according to Philo, the reader may deduce that the three men would not have pronounced the birth of Isaac to Abraham and Sarah if Abraham had not shown hospitality to these travelers. Here, Philo appears to build upon an understanding of Mediterranean hospitality that features the guest reciprocating the host's generosity by

35. In *QG* 4.10, Philo goes on to assert that Abraham himself serves the three guests rather than his 318 servants. See also Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 119 n. 69.

36. Jacques Cazeaux, 'Mystique et sagesse: le repas des trois anges et d'Abraham à Mambré vu par Philon d'Alexandrie', in *Prière, mystique et judaïsme: colloque de Strasbourg, 10–12 septembre 1984* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1987), 21-41 (27).

rewarding the host with immediate, material gifts as opposed to restricting the reciprocity only to future lodging opportunities. Furthermore, the manifestation of financial or material reciprocity appears to be more prominent among Hellenistic writers. For example, we saw that in Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story*, Kalasiris gives an expensive ring to his host, Nausikles, as a form of reward for Nausikles' hospitality and his recovery of the kidnapped Charikleia (5.15.2). Thus, when Philo explains Isaac's birth as a reward, we can once again see that 'Philo's Abraham is consistently clothed in Hellenistic wardrobe'.[37]

Seventh, unlike the Genesis account, Philo adds to the tradition by narrating the moment that Abraham and Sarah become aware that the three men are not mere mortals. In *De Abrahamo* 113, just after the three men have pronounced Isaac's birth as a reward for Abraham's hospitality, Philo points out, 'It was then, I think, that she first saw in the strangers before her a different and grander aspect, that of the prophets or angels, transformed from their spiritual and soul-like nature into human shape' (cf. *QG* 4.16-17). Thus, by pinpointing the moment in which Sarah recognizes the divine nature of the three men, Philo highlights the fact that prior to that moment Abraham and Sarah had extended elaborate and joyful hospitality to three strangers whom they considered to be ordinary travelers. Abraham was 'disinterested' in the identity of his guests.[38] In other words, Abraham and Sarah were not motivated to host the three men because they thought they were God's representatives. Instead, their piety led them to receive the travelers.

Eighth, Philo contends that the three angels, as well as subsequent wise (σοφός) men, could perceive the blessedness of Abraham and Sarah's souls when they first encountered them. In other words, the strangers perceived their blessedness prior to their acceptance of hospitality. As a result, we can infer that if the angels had not perceived the blessedness of their souls, the angels would not have halted nor requested hospitality from them (115). Philo goes so far along these lines that he says the angels perceived that Abraham was their kinsman (συγγενής) and fellow-servant (116).[39]

To summarize, Philo's inclusion of the story of Abraham's hospitality to the three men is noteworthy because it embodies Abraham's piety and wisdom. Philo treats the patriarchs as archetypes who function as living laws (νόμοι). Abraham's life is an unwritten law (ἀγράφῳ τῇ νομοθεσίᾳ)

37. Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 107.

38. Loader, *Two Cities*, 87.

39. In Jewish hospitality it was common to seek hospitality from one's kinspeople (e.g. Gen. 24.15-27; Tob. 5.6; 6.11; 9.5).

prior to the written law of Moses (5).[40] Thus, by narrating Abraham's hospitality as enacted law, Philo has simultaneously commanded his readers to extend hospitality to travelers as an act of piety toward God. In addition, if Philo's readers live out the law that Abraham demonstrated, then Philo's readers may also experience the rewards that come from unknowingly extending hospitality to angels or God in disguise. Finally, Philo Hellenizes Abraham's hospitality for his Hellenistic Jewish context when he makes the story resemble the Greco-Roman gods who visit humans, and when he describes the announcement of Isaac's birth as a reward for Abraham's hospitality.

Josephus

In his *Antiquities of the Jews* (93–94 CE[41]), Josephus has a much briefer treatment of Abraham's hospitality than Philo does (1.191-98). Prior to narrating this story, Josephus reframes it as the catalyst for the announcement of the birth of Isaac (1.191) and, like the Septuagint, as the antithesis to Sodom's impious response to the Divine.[42] Most notably, however, Josephus alters the tradition by locating the story of Abraham's hospitality after God has already pronounced 'doom upon the Sodomites' (1.196). The real issue for Josephus is Sodom's inhospitality.[43]

Beyond the reconstructed framework, Josephus only alters and embellishes the Septuagint slightly. First, Josephus still has Abraham sitting beside the oak at Mamre, but now Abraham is in front of the door of his courtyard (αὐλή) instead of his tent.[44] Thus, by placing the story in the context of a courtyard, Josephus has altered the tradition to make it more relevant for his contemporary readers. Second, Josephus informs his readers from the start that the three men were angels. He explains that Abraham, 'espied three angels (ἄγγελοι), and, taking them for strangers (ξένοι), arose and saluted (ἀσπάζομαι) them and invited them to lodge with him and partake of his hospitality (ξενίων μεταλαβεῖν)' (1.196). In addition, the three angels straightforwardly announce to Abraham that they are in fact messengers sent by God (1.198).

As a result, Josephus avoids the ambiguity that is present in the Hebrew Scriptures, the Septuagint, and even in Philo when he clarifies

40. Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 107.

41. H.St.J. Thackeray, 'Introduction', in *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (trans. H.St.J. Thackeray *et al.*; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935), x.

42. Loader, *Two Cities*, 100.

43. Loader, *Two Cities*, 100.

44. Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. III. *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (ed. S. Mason; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), 74.

the identity of the three men. According to Josephus, God's angels appeared to Abraham, but God did not. Here, however, Josephus not only resolves the exegetical problem about the identity of the guest(s) in Genesis 18, but Josephus simultaneously 'emphasizes Abraham's hospitality by stating that he took them for mere strangers'.[45] Josephus clarifies that Abraham did not realize the three travelers were angels until after he had extended hospitality to them.

Furthermore, in 1.197, 'Josephus enhances Abraham's hospitality by having Abram himself sacrifice and cook the calf, whereas in Gen. 18.7 he gives it to his servant to prepare it'.[46] Thus, Josephus portrays Abraham as being even more active than previous writers did.

1 Clement

Clement, the early Christian author of *1 Clement* (75–110 CE[47]), does not narrate Abraham's extension of hospitality to the three travelers. He does, however, use Abraham as a model, which he exhorts the Corinthians to emulate. He lifts up Abraham (*1 Clem.* 10.7), Lot (11.1), and Rahab (12.1) as hospitable hosts who were therefore rewarded for their actions. For instance, Clement claims that *because* of Abraham's 'faith and hospitality (φιλοξενία) a son was given to him in his old age' (10.7). Thus, *1 Clement* follows on the heels of Philo by inserting the concept of reward into the tradition.[48]

Testament of Abraham

The writer of the *Testament of Abraham* (c. 100 CE[49]) puts an interesting twist on the story of Abraham's hospitality from Genesis 18.[50] The initial scene in the *Testament of Abraham* inaugurates the sequel to Genesis 18. The basic storyline of Abraham and Sarah entertaining three angels is repeated in the *Testament of Abraham*, but this time the scene provides the framework, not for the birth of Isaac, but for the pronouncement of the

45. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 74.

46. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 74.

47. Kirsopp Lake, 'The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians', in *The Apostolic Fathers* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912 [repr. 1977]), 1-122 (5).

48. For examples of later Christian interpretations of Abraham's hospitality, see *Apocalypse of Paul* 27, Origen's fourth homily on Genesis, and John Chrysostom's forty-first homily on Genesis.

49. See E.P. Sanders, 'Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction', in *OTP*, I, 871-902 (875). Unless otherwise noted, when I cite the English translations of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, I am citing the translations found in Charlesworth's *OTP*.

50. Loader, *Two Cities*, 83.

death of Abraham. The scene in the *Testament of Abraham* so closely mimics the scene from Genesis 18 that it is worthwhile to examine the alterations and embellishments that its Hellenistic Jewish author incorporates.

First, the author of the *Testament of Abraham* closely links the righteousness of Abraham with his willingness to extend hospitality to strangers as we saw with Philo and others. For instance, in 1.1, the author writes, 'All the years of his life he lived in quietness, gentleness, and righteousness, and the righteous man was very hospitable (φιλόξενος)'. Then again, in 1.6, the author provides a summary statement about Abraham. He writes, 'But above all others he is righteous in all goodness, (having been) hospitable (φιλόξενος) and loving until the end of his life'.

Second, the opening scene is the same; Abraham is at the oak of Mamre. The author, however, emphasizes at the onset that Abraham's hospitality as recorded in Genesis 18 was a typical, rather than an atypical, response by Abraham to travelers. He writes, 'He welcomed (ὑποδέχομαι) everyone—rich and poor, kings and rulers, the crippled and the helpless, friends and strangers (ξένοι), neighbors and passersby (παρόδιος)—all on equal terms did the pious, entirely holy, righteous, and hospitable (φιλόξενος) Abraham welcome (ὑποδέχομαι)' (1.2). Thus, the author asserts that Abraham typically responded to travelers as he did to the three men in Genesis 18. Furthermore, the author implies, like Philo, that extending hospitality to travelers is a pious and righteous act, which the readers should therefore imitate (1.2, 5).

Third, beginning in 2.1, the Lord sends Michael, the highest ranking angel, to Abraham while Abraham is in the field near the oak at Mamre (2.1). Abraham's response to the stranger follows the typical pattern that we have already seen. Once Abraham sees him from afar, he rises, greets, and welcomes (ὑποδέχομαι) the stranger, whom he considers to be a 'handsome soldier' (2.2). Then, after a brief visit to Abraham's field, they 'came near to Abraham's house (οἶκος) and sat in the courtyard (αὐλή)' (3.5). Here, similar to Josephus's version, Abraham no longer lives in a tent (Gen. 18.1). Instead, he has a house, which includes a courtyard. Furthermore, this author greatly enhances Abraham's facilities. For instance, Abraham instructs Isaac to prepare the guest room for their guest (4.1). The guest room is fully equipped with a dining couch, linens, a lamp stand, incense, plants, and a table, which has an abundance of food placed upon it (4.2). This could be an attempt either to incorporate a component into his version that had already grown up in the tradition (cf. Josephus), or it could represent an independent attempt to apply the story to the author's contemporary audience.

Fourth, in this story, Isaac is the one that is struck by the beauty of the angel's face. He then comments to Sarah about it, runs to the angel, and bows before him (3.5). Yet, even then, the members of Abraham's family do not yet conclude that this traveler with the beautiful face is an angel. Even later, when the visitor's tears turn into stones, thereby astonishing Abraham, Abraham still does not conclude that the visitor is an angel (3.11-12). Then, finally, in *Testament of Abraham* (6.1), Sarah realizes that the speaker is 'an angel of the Lord' and therefore informs Abraham of her insight. Hence, when Sarah recognizes the guests as angels, this author shares a common tradition with Philo (*Abr.* 113; *QG* 4.16-17).

At that point, Sarah recalls the events from Genesis 18 as a way to prove to Abraham that their current guest is also an angel (6.1-4). As Sarah does so, she refers to a variety of elements from that story, some of which are greatly embellished. For instance, she mentions the three heavenly men, the tent, the table, and the unblemished calf, which, after they had already eaten, 'got up again and exultantly suckled its mother' (6.4-5). Finally, Sarah concludes that Michael is one of those original three holy men (6.5). In the end, Sarah's argument once again reinforces how Abraham typically extended hospitality to strangers. These two instances in which Abraham entertained angels were not the only two instances in which Abraham had extended hospitality to travelers. Otherwise, Abraham would have immediately recognized the angel.

Fifth, the author of the *Testament of Abraham* speaks of Abraham washing the strangers' feet (3.7-9). Even though this detail is missing in Philo and Josephus, we can trace an evolution from the Hebrew Scriptures to the Septuagint to the *Testament of Abraham*. We have moved from the guests washing their own feet, to a servant washing the guests' feet, and finally to Abraham washing their feet.

Sixth, in this work Michael repeatedly pauses to ascend into heaven in order to dialogue with God before he returns to Abraham's house (e.g. 4.5). In one of these heavenly dialogues, God instructs the angel to eat whatever Abraham eats (καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν ἐσθίῃ, ἔσθιε καὶ σὺ μετ' αὐτοῦ) (4.7). Michael then protests by saying, 'Lord, all the heavenly spirits are incorporeal, and they neither eat nor drink' (4.9). To which the Lord responds, 'I shall send upon you an all-devouring spirit…' This spirit then enables Michael to eat what Abraham sets before him (4.10).

Finally, the author of the *Testament of Abraham* implores his readers, 'Let us too, my beloved brothers, imitate the hospitality of the patriarch Abraham' (20.15). Hence, this author applies the hospitality of Abraham to the entirety of his life and even to his death. Abraham, for this author, is the supreme example of hospitality, and he is a model that all Jews should emulate.

The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan

In *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan*[51] 7.1-2 (late third century CE[52]), Rabbi Nathan comments upon Joseph ben Johanan of Jerusalem's instruction to 'Let thy house be opened wide, and let the poor be members of thy household'. As he exegetes the statement, Rabbi Nathan chooses to differentiate between Abraham and Job even though they were both well known for their hospitality. Here Rabbi Nathan asserts that Job sat and wasted time by allowing wayfarers to come to him. Furthermore, Job fed people what they were used to eating (7.3). Conversely, Rabbi Nathan greatly embellishes the Abraham tradition in a positive manner. He contends that Abraham 'would go forth and make the rounds everywhere' in order to find his guests. In addition, Abraham would provide his poor guests with extravagant and expensive foods and drinks to which they were not accustomed, as opposed to the foods and drinks that were commonplace for them.

Rabbi Nathan goes on to inform his students that Abraham 'built stately mansions on the highways and left there food and drink' (7.4). For Rabbi Nathan, however, Abraham's motive behind his hospitality was the conversion of his guests. For instance, Rabbi Nathan informs his readers that Abraham built shelters beside the road 'and left there food and drink, and every passerby ate and drank and blessed Heaven. That is why delight of spirit was vouchsafed to him' (7.5-6). Jacob Neusner translates the same passage to say that Abraham built road-side way stations, 'so that whoever came and entered could eat and drink, and then say a blessing to Heaven. Therefore, he got his satisfaction.'[53] Since Abraham's hospitality results in his guests saying a blessing to Heaven and his own state of satisfaction, Samuel Sandmel contends that one of Rabbi Nathan's interests in Abraham's hospitality is as a means of conversion. Sandmel goes on to claim that Abraham is the great missionary in rabbinic literature. Thus, at least in Sandmel's opinion, Abraham's hospitality functions as a model within the rabbinic materials for how to convert pagans to Judaism.[54]

Genesis Rabbah

The portrayal of Abraham's hospitality as a means of conversion, or at the very least a coercive influence, is even more explicit in *Genesis Rabbah*

51. *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan* (trans. Judah Goldin; YJS, 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).

52. Craig A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 127.

53. *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan: An Analytical Translation and Explanation* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 59-60.

54. Sandmel, *Philo's Place*, 104 n. 9.

(c. 400 CE[55]) than it is in *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan*. For instance, in *Parashah* 43.7.1, Rabbi Isaac says, 'Abraham would receive passersby and once they had eaten and drunk, he would say to them, "Say a blessing". They would say to him, 'What should we say?' He would say to them, "Blessed is the God of the world, of whose food we have eaten".' This same teaching is repeated in *Parashah* 49.4.2 when Rabbi Azariah speaks in the name of Rabbi Judah. But here, Rabbi Azariah goes on to claim that, 'If he agreed to say a blessing, the traveler would eat and drink and go his way. But if not, he would say to him, "Pay me what you owe me". And the other would say to him, "What do I owe you?" ' Then Abraham would inform the traveler that the traveler owed him a large sum of money. 'Now since the guest saw that he was trapped, he would say, "Blessed be the God of the world…" '.

Then, in *Parashah* 48, the author of *Genesis Rabbah* relates a conversation between the Lord and Abraham. In the midst of the conversation, the two reflect directly upon Gen. 18.1-16. In 48.8, God praises Abraham for his repeated extension of hospitality to strangers. The Lord says, 'You indeed opened a good door for passersby. You opened a good door for proselytes.' Then, in 48.9.1, the Lord praises Abraham because he had repeatedly extended hospitality to travelers even before he was circumcised. As a result of Abraham's exemplary actions, the Lord chose to reward him by appearing to him as recorded in Genesis 18.

Summary

To sum up this survey of the tradition history of Abraham's hospitality, it becomes clear that Abraham's actions in Genesis 18 function as a paradigm for meritorious hospitality beginning with ancient Israel and continuing well past Luke's authorship of the book of Acts. As a result, a survey of the tradition of Abraham's hospitality among Jewish writers helps to demonstrate for us that hospitality was a highly valued social convention in the ancient world that was also considered to be a religious duty. Meritorious hosts were expected to welcome complete strangers into their homes. In fact, Philo goes so far as to lift up Abraham's hospitable actions as a living law for later Jews. Furthermore, the story of Abraham entertaining the three travelers links together the diverse writings that I am treating in this chapter. This survey demonstrates that it would be very difficult to separate Jewish and Christian hospitality in any substantive way, and it illustrates the degree to which Jewish and Greco-Roman hospitality shaped each other.

55. Jacob Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis, A New American Translation* (2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), II, x.

Finally, this survey contributes to the collection of the standard protocol for hospitality in antiquity as well as to a Greek semantic domain that was employed by ancient people when they talked about or described hospitality. Again, the standard protocol and the typical vocabulary will help us identify references to hospitality in the ancient texts. For instance, the various authors I have just cited expect meritorious hosts to proactively and persuasively compel travelers to stay in their house. Furthermore, these authors expect meritorious hosts to move swiftly, wash the guests' feet, provide extravagant feasts, and serve their guests dutifully.

On the other hand, this survey has demonstrated that a collection of Greek words was consistently employed as the writers wrote about Abraham's hospitality. For instance ξένος (Philo, *Abr.* 93-94, 96; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196; *T. Ab.* 1.2) and its cognates are associated with the participants, while ξενία (Philo, *Abr.* 107, 109; *QG* 4.8; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196) and φιλοξενία (Philo, *Abr.* 109, 114; *T. Ab.* 1.1, 2, 6; *1 Clem.* 10.7) are associated with the custom itself. Furthermore, Philo associates hospitality with wisdom (σοφία) (*Abr.* 109, 116) and piety toward God (θεοσέβεια) (*Abr.* 115).

In addition, the Septuagint informs us that Abraham runs (προστρέχω) to meet the men and then bows down (προσκυνέω) before them (Gen. 18.2). Philo employs λαμβάνω when he describes the action of receiving a traveler and he speaks of hospitality as something that takes place among kinsmen (συγγενής) (*Abr.* 116). Similarly, Josephus describes the host's initial greeting with ἀσπάζομαι (*Ant.* 1.196), and the author of the *Testament of Abraham* employs the word ὑποδέχομαι when referring to Abraham's reception of the three travelers (1.2; 2.2). Finally, the Septuagint employs συμπροπέμπω to describe Abraham's accompaniment of his guests out of the region (Gen. 18.16).

Additional Examples of Hospitality in the Jewish Scriptures

Even though Abraham's hospitality in Genesis 18 functions as the formative model of hospitality for Jews and Christians, Abraham is by no means the only person that extended noteworthy hospitality to his guests within a Jewish context. Therefore, I will now cite additional examples of hospitality from the Jewish Scriptures, the Old Testament Apocrypha, and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Furthermore, while citing examples of hospitality from the Jewish Scriptures, I will continue to build upon the list of typical actions associated with this Mediterranean custom within Jewish contexts. In addition, even though I will be working with the Jewish Scriptures, I will cite the Greek vocabulary used in the Septuagint at the places where that vocabulary helps us build a

Greek, semantic domain for hospitality in antiquity. As a result, the choices made by the translators of the Septuagint will help us envision how Hellenistic interpreters (e.g. Luke) read these Scriptures.

Examples in the Pentateuch

Genesis 19.1-23. In Gen. 19.1-3 Lot grants hospitality to two of Yahweh's angels.[56] As he does so, Lot's actions parallel those of Abraham in 18.1-16.[57] Furthermore, Sodom's corrupt inhospitality (19.4-11)[58] then serves as a stark contrast to Abraham's (18.1-16) and Lot's (19.1-3) exemplary hospitality.[59] As the scene begins, Lot, 'who was sitting in the gateway (πύλη) of Sodom',[60] sees the two travelers, rises, and runs out to meet them (19.1). Then, after bowing down to the ground (προσεκύνησε τῷ προσώπῳ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν), he pleads with them twice to turn aside into his house (ἐκκλίνατε εἰς τὸν οἶκον) where he also invites them to spend the night (καταλύω) and wash their feet. Furthermore, Lot promises not to delay his potential guests on their travels (19.2-3; cf. 18.5). Up to this point, Abraham and Lot's actions mirror one another completely. It should also be noted that ideal hosts do not detain their guests longer than their guests wish to stay in Hebraic and Jewish hospitality. Thus, Lot's actions are praiseworthy.

Having accepted Lot's hospitality, the wayfarers enter Lot's house (εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον). It is at this juncture that the strangers have become guests. Lot shelters his guests, prepares a feast for them (ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς πότον), and attempts to protect them (19.3-8).[61] In the end, however, we see the angelic guests protect their host when their host is not able to protect himself or his guests from the Sodomites (19.9-23). Thus, once again we see the reciprocity that is at play in Hebraic and Jewish hospitality. On the one hand, Abraham was rewarded for his hospitality with the announcement of Isaac's birth.[62] On the other hand, the angels

56. John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1930 [repr. 1994]), 306-307.

57. Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (IBC; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 164; Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, 40-41, 54-55; and Rudolf Kilian, *Die vorpriestlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen* (BBB, 24; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1966), 150-52.

58. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 298.

59. Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, 53.

60. All English quotations of the Hebrew Scriptures are taken from the NRSV unless noted otherwise. All references to the Septuagint are taken from Lancelot C.L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986).

61. Skinner, *Genesis*, 307. Skinner writes, 'Lot's readiness to sacrifice the honour of his daughters…shows him as a courageous champion of the obligations of hospitality' (p. 307).

62. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 274.

reward Lot with protection from his neighbors because he received them.

Briefly, it is important to note that ancient Jewish authors, who were interpreting the Jewish Scriptures, also considered the interaction between Lot and the angels to be that of a hospitality relationship. For instance, Josephus claims that Lot invited Yahweh's messengers to be guests (ξενίαν παρεκάλει). In addition, he goes on to say that Lot was very kind to those strangers (περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλάνθρωπος) (*Ant*. 1.200-201).[63] Similarly, the author of *1 Clement* praises Lot for his hospitality (*1 Clem*. 11.1).

Genesis 24.10-61. Next, in Gen. 24.10-61, Abraham has commissioned his servant to travel back to Haran to find a wife for Isaac from among Abraham's kinfolk (24.1-9). Once he arrives in Haran (24.10), Abraham's traveling servant stops at a well and asks Rebekah for a drink of water (24.17). Rebekah grants his request and gives water to both the servant and his camels (24.18-20). In response, the servant gives gifts of jewelry to Rebekah, questions her about her identity, and asks for lodging (24.22-23). Finally, Rebekah identifies herself and affirms that Abraham's servant, who has not yet identified himself, will be granted lodging (24.24-25). Here again, we see an element of Hebraic and Jewish hospitality that will occur repeatedly. When possible, a Hebraic or Jewish traveler sought lodging from his or her kinfolk, even if the two parties had never actually met (24.27). Furthermore, it was appropriate for a traveler to take the initiative and ask for lodging (24.23).

Yet, despite the fact that Rebekah is able to affirm for the traveler that he will find lodging in her home (24.24-25), it is Laban, Rebekah's brother, who officially ratifies the extension of hospitality as the head of the household.[64] Laban first prepares the house (ἡτοίμασα τὴν οἰκίαν) and a place for the camels. Then, he runs out to greet the servant, invites him into his house (εἰσῆλθε…εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν), tends and feeds his camels, supplies water to him so that he can wash his feet, and feeds him (Gen. 24.28-31). Thus, even though Rebekah is able to assure the servant of lodging, Laban is the one who actually invites the traveler into his house, establishes the hospitality relationship, and oversees the reception. In Hebraic and Jewish hospitality we see that the head of the household

63. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 76. Feldman thinks that Josephus's characterization of Lot as φιλάνθρωπος was an answer 'to those who called the Jews misanthropic'.

64. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 388. Westermann extrapolates from 24.28 that Rebekah's father has died, thereby explaining Laban's role as head of the household (24.31). See also Skinner, *Genesis*, 344-45, and Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, 145.

was the person primarily responsible for establishing a hospitality relationship; however, we will see a variety of counter examples in Jewish and early Christian writings.

Once inside the house, but before Laban asks the servant about his identity, the servant identifies himself as Abraham's servant (24.34). This sequence seems odd. For instance, the host generally does not ask the guest about his or her identity until after the guest has eaten.[65] Yet, in this case, the servant wants to make it clear that he is Abraham's representative. Thus, Laban has forged a hospitality relationship not so much with the servant, but with the servant's master. This dynamic has some correlation to Greco-Roman hospitality. For instance, in a private hospitality context Nestor welcomes Odysseus's son because he is a stranger. But, Nestor treats Telemachus exceptionally well because he is Odysseus's son (*Od*. 3.4-485; 15.193-214). Moreover, Greco-Roman public hospitality is based upon this dynamic. A state would welcome ambassadors or emissaries from another region as if they were welcoming the king of that region. We will see this pattern of extending hospitality to a person's emissaries again in the early Christian writings.

Furthermore, the interaction between Laban's household and Abraham's servant once again features the element of reciprocity. The ongoing reciprocal element in the hospitality relationship between Laban's and Abraham's household manifests itself when Laban gives Rebekah to be Isaac's wife (24.50-51). Thus, the marriage between members of the two families assures a long-term alliance. We will see this reciprocal gesture of giving a daughter to the guest as a wife repeatedly in our survey of hospitality. Abraham's servant then responds by giving even more gifts to Rebekah as well as gifts to Laban's household. In the end, after a one night stay, the servant asks his host to send him back home (ἐκπέμπω) (24.54, 59). Hence, up to this point in our survey, no guest in the Jewish Scriptures has stayed longer than one night.

At this point, it is again prudent to point out that Jewish exegetes interpret this text to mean that Laban's household extended hospitality to Abraham's servant. For example, Josephus retells this story from Genesis 24 just as he did with Genesis 19. While recounting Rebekah and Laban's reception of Abraham's servant, Josephus refers to the host's actions as hospitality (φιλοξενία) (*Ant*. 1.250). Then Josephus goes on to characterize the hospitality as being a benevolent (φιλανθρωπία) type of welcome (*Ant*. 1.250-51). Also, Josephus indicates that the servant's initial gift of jewelry to Rebekah served as a reward for her gift of water (*Ant*. 1.249). Furthermore, according to Josephus, Abraham's servant, as a responsible guest, offers to pay for the family's hospitality. Yet, as an

65. Cf. Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, 146.

ideal host, Rebekah indicates that her family would never take money in exchange for entertaining guests. Instead, all costs would be free to the stranger (*Ant*. 1.250-51).[66] In addition, on the one hand, in Josephus's version Rebekah clearly needs to consult with Laban before she can extend the offer of hospitality. On the other hand, in Josephus's version, as opposed to Gen. 24.31, Rebekah is the one who brings the stranger into the house rather than Laban (*Ant*. 1.251-52).[67] Finally, when Josephus tells the story, the servant waits until the dinner is over to reveal his identity (*Ant*. 1.252). At this point, Josephus has brought the servant's actions more in line with traditional Mediterranean hospitality.[68]

Genesis 43.16-34. In Gen. 43.16-34, Joseph extends hospitality to his own, traveling brothers. Despite his initial inhospitality in Gen. 42.7-25, Joseph treats his brothers hospitably upon their second visit to Egypt even though his brothers do not yet recognize him. When he does so, Joseph orders the steward of his house to bring them into his house (εἰσάγαγε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) and kill and prepare (ἑτοιμάζω) an animal (43.16-17). Furthermore, the steward gives them water for washing their feet and provides their donkeys with fodder (43.24). Once Joseph arrives at his house, his Hebrew brothers give him gifts (τὰ δῶρα) and bow with their face to the ground (προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν) before the one whom they only know as the governor of Egypt (43.26).[69] Then, food and drink are brought to Joseph's brothers (43.34) despite the fact that Joseph, his servants, and his guests all eat in separate rooms since eating with Hebrews was an abomination (βδέλυγμα) to the Egyptians (43.32).[70]

Exodus 2.15-22. Next, in Exod. 2.15-22, Reuel's (or possibly Jethro's)[71] reception of Moses fits the pattern of hospitality that we have already

66. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 99. Feldman notes that 'Eliezar's offer to pay for his lodging is Josephus' addition, unparalleled in rabbinic tradition'.

67. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 99.

68. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 99.

69. I am mentioning the act of bowing down as an action within a hospitality encounter. Walter Brueggemann (*Genesis*, 388), however, reminds us that the brothers' act of bowing down also has a greater significance within the narrative. Joseph's original dream was that his brothers would bow down to him. The dream is then fulfilled in Gen. 42.6; 43.28, and 44.14.

70. Skinner, *Genesis*, 482. Skinner attributes Joseph's actions to 'an Egyptian exclusiveness in intercourse with strangers'.

71. The identity of Moses' host is debated. See, e.g., John I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC, 3; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 22. Moses' father-in-law is variously referred to as Reuel (2.18; cf. Num. 10.29), Jethro (3.1; 4.18; 18.1-2), Jether (4.18), and Hobab (Num. 10.29; Judg. 4.11). Some scholars consider Reuel and Jethro to be the same person;

been able to compile. The relationship begins when Moses sits down at the well in Midian where the priest of Midian's seven daughters draw water (2.15-16).[72] Hence, we have begun to see that the Hebraic peoples often found hosts in rural areas by waiting at a well. Then, after Moses drives away some shepherds who were harassing the priest's daughters, the daughters inform Reuel about the stranger (2.17-19). Reuel responds by asking the daughters why they left him and by instructing them to invite 'him to break bread' (καλέσατε οὖν αὐτόν, ὅπως φάγῃ ἄρτον) (2.20). Moses, in turn, agrees 'to stay with the man' (2.21).

Next, after the initial reception, Reuel gives Moses 'his daughter Zipporah in marriage' (2.21), thereby integrating 'an "outsider" into the community'.[73] And, after Moses had lived in Midian at least long enough for him and Zipporah to have a child, Moses names his child 'Gershom; for he says, "I have been an alien resident in a foreign land" (παροικός εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ)' (2.22). In the spirit of reciprocity, Moses then spends his days tending the flocks of Jethro (3.1). Finally, at the appropriate time, Moses asks his father-in-law, Jethro, to allow him to return to Egypt. And Jethro says to Moses, 'Go in peace' (4.18-19).

Summary

After a brief survey of hospitality scenes in the Pentateuch, we are now beginning to see a variety of patterns. Once again, a woman can invite a man to take shelter with her family, but the hospitality relationship is primarily forged between the guest and the head of the household. In addition, we continue to see the reciprocal nature of hospitality relationships in ancient Israel. Moses, as a guest, not only receives benefits from the relationship, but he also assists his host with the sheep. And, finally, we continue to see the giving of gifts or rewards in ancient Israelite hospitality. While the giving of gifts does not appear to be as ritualized as we saw in ancient Greece, the giving of gifts has a place of prominence in these stories. For instance, we have seen the host give a woman

others consider Reuel to be the father of Jethro. See Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 28 and 31, as an example of the former, as well as the notes of B.M. Metzger and R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), HB 71, as an example of the later.

72. Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1991), 12. Sarna writes, 'Wells in the ancient Near East served as meeting places for shepherds, wayfarers, and townsfolk. It was the natural thing for a newcomer to gravitate toward them.' See also, Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 31.

73. Terence E. Fretheim, *Exodus* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1991), 44.

in his household to the guest as a bride on two separate occasions. Both Isaac and Moses, as guests, are given wives. Conversely, we also have seen four hosts receive some benefit from their guests. Abraham's guests rewarded him with the promise of a child, Lot's guests protected him, Abraham's servant gave gifts of jewelry to Laban's household, and Joseph's brothers gave him a gift.

Examples from the Prophets and the Writings

Joshua 2.1-22. In addition to the Pentateuch, there are a variety of other noteworthy hosts in the Jewish Scriptures. In the book of Joshua, Rahab extends shelter, bedding, and protection to the Israelite spies in return for her own future protection. The author tells us that the spies enter Rahab's house (εἰσήλθοσαν εἰς οἰκίαν) and spend the night (καταλύω) there (2.1). The threat to the spies then arises when the king of Jericho orders Rahab to 'bring out the men who have come to you, who entered your house (τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς εἰσπεπορευμένους εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου)' (2.3). Rahab, however, as a good host, chooses to protect her guests by hiding them and helping them to escape (2.4-21).[74] In the end, she sends them away (ἐξαποστέλλω) safely (2.21).

Of course, reciprocity is a crucial component in Rahab's relationship with these spies. She protects the spies, but in return she asks the spies to ensure the protection of her family when the Israelites invade Jericho (2.9-14). Rahab's hospitality will continue to be lauded through the early Christian period, thereby indicating to us that ancient readers also recognized the custom of hospitality in the second chapter of Joshua. For instance, the authors of Hebrews, James, and *1 Clement* all lift up Rahab as an exemplary host in a hospitality relationship (Heb. 11.31; Jas 2.25; *1 Clem*. 12.1-3).

Judges 4.17-22. The book of Judges is replete with hospitality encounters between a host and a traveler. For instance, Jael, in Judg. 4.17-22 and 5.24-27, extends hospitality to Sisera, King Jabin of Canaan's military commander, only to kill him while he sleeps.[75] At the beginning, however, we read about the ongoing peace relationship between Jael's husband, Heber the Kenite, and King Jabin of Hazor. Hence, this example of hospitality is closer to the public hospitality involving political alliances that we saw among the cities of ancient Greece. Both the host and the guest are agents of their superiors. It should be noted, however, that while the primary hospitality relationship takes place between King

74. Cf. Trent C. Butler, *Joshua* (WBC, 7; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 28.

75. George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895 [repr. 1976]), 123-24.

Jabin and Heber the Kenite, Jael is an example of a woman who functions as a host of hospitality.[76]

When Sisera arrives at Jael's tent, Jael comes out to meet him and beseeches him to enter her tent. She says, 'Turn aside, my lord, turn aside to me (ἔκκλινον, κύριέ μου, ἔκκλινον πρὸς μέ); have no fear' (4.18). So, he turns aside (ἐκκλίνω), enters her tent, requests water from his host, and asks her to deceive his pursuers if they pass by that way (4.18-20). She, in turn, provides him with milk, covers him with a blanket, and leads Sisera to believe that she will protect him from his pursuers (4.18-20). Yet, rather than protecting him, as Sisera thought his host would do, Jael kills Sisera while he sleeps (4.21). Then, despite the fact that she subverts the custom of hospitality, Deborah and Barak praise Jael in song (5.1, 24-27).[77]

Judges 13.1-23. Next, in Judg. 13.1-23, Manoah, the father of Samson, unknowingly extends hospitality to the angel of the Lord (13.16). When Manoah asks the Lord for the opportunity to speak with the man of God who has informed his barren wife that she will have a baby, God listens.[78] As a result, the angel of God comes again to the woman as she sits in the field (13.9). Then, after Manoah comes and asks questions of this man whom he does not yet realize is an angel, Manoah says, 'Allow us to detain (κατέχω) you, and prepare a kid for you' (13.15). The angel declines the food, but suggests to Manoah that he offer a burnt offering to the Lord (13.16). At this point, as was proper, Manoah feels free to ask the man's name even though the man declines to provide it (13.17-18). Finally, as Manoah offers grain and the kid as an offering, the angel ascends along with the flame toward heaven (13.19-20). As a result, Manoah now realizes that the man was in fact an angel of the Lord (13.21).

Here, we again see a human host unknowingly extending hospitality to the representative of a divine being. Furthermore, we continue to see that standard hospitality protocol mandated a host wait until after a guest had been fed before he or she could ask the guest his or her name. Finally, we again see the host offering food to the stranger.

76. Cf. Tammi J. Schneider, *Judges* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 75-77. Schneider portrays Jael as one of the many prominent women in the book of Judges.

77. Cf. Schneider, *Judges*, 277. Schneider argues that 'the roles of women in this story are another signal of the downward spiral since women and their actions were no longer defined by their husbands, and men no longer cared for their women'.

78. John Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 323-24. Here Gray perceives 'the motif of the birth of a hero to a hitherto barren woman who is the recipient of special revelation' (p. 323).

When Josephus treats this passage in his *The Antiquities of the Jews*, he indicates that Manoah invites the man to stay (μένω) and partake of hospitality (ξενίων μετασχεῖν) (5.282). And, even though the angel declines to stay overnight or even for a meal, Manoah is able to convince the man to remain (ἐπιμένω) with him long enough for Manoah to give the angel a gift or token of hospitality (ξενία) (5.282). Furthermore, Josephus indicates that Manoah offers his gift as a response to the announcement of his wife's pregnancy (5.281-82). Yet, as we see in Judg. 13.1-23, the angel redirects Manoah's offer of a gift into a sacrifice to God.

Judges 19.1-10. In Judg. 19.1-10 the Levite receives a hospitable reception at the home of the father of the Levite's runaway concubine. Four months earlier she had left the Levite at his home in Ephraim to return to her father's house in Bethlehem because she was angry with him (19.1-2). Now, the Levite, along with his servant and a couple of donkeys, has set out on a journey and a mission to woo her back (19.3a). When he reaches her father's house, the concubine's father sees him and hurries to meet him (19.3b). Next, the Levite is brought into the house (εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον).[79] At that point, the father-in-law compels him to stay (κατέχω) in his house, where the Levite will stay for three days (ἐκάθισε μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας). As a good host, the father-in-law provides his guest with food, drink, and lodging (αὐλίζομαι) during the Levite's stay (19.4).

But then the lines between a good host and a bad host become blurred. On the fourth day, the father-in-law delays the Levite's departure to the extent that the Levite decides to stay for a fourth night. In the Septuagint, even after the father-in-law tries to convince him to stay, the man still stands up to depart, but the father-in-law restrains (βιάζω) him, with the result that the Levite stays and lodges (αὐλίζομαι) there a fourth night. Then, once again, on the fifth day, the father-in-law delays the Levite's departure until it was almost evening. And, despite the father-in-law's attempts to convince him to lodge (αὐλίζομαι) there for a fifth night, the Levite gets up and departs late in the day (Judg. 19.5-10). At this point, even though the host appears gracious on the surface, he has repeatedly delayed his guest. Unlike both Abraham (Gen. 18.5) and Lot (Gen. 19.2) who promised not to delay their guests, the father-in-law is

79. In the NRSV Judg. 19.3 reads, 'the girl's father saw him and came with joy to meet him'. The NASV, 'So she brought him into her father's house, and when the girl's father saw him, he was glad to meet him'. The Septuagint follows the latter interpretation, that it was the daughter who brought him into the house. All three translations, however, agree that it was the father, who detained the Levite and hosted him for four days. See also Moore, *Judges*, 409, who interprets the text to mean that the concubine meets and brings the Levite inside the house.

attempting to impose his own will upon his guest rather than accommodate his guest's wishes.

Judges 19.10-14. Next, the Levite, his concubine, his servant, and the donkeys are traveling away from Bethlehem back toward Ephraim (19.10-14). When it gets late in the day, the servant suggests that they 'turn aside to the city (ἐκκλίνωμεν εἰς πόλιν) of the Jebusites, and spend the night (αὐλίζομαι) in it' (19.11). The Levite, however, refuses to seek lodging among the Jebusites. He says, 'We will not turn aside into a city of foreigners, who do not belong to the people of Israel; but we will continue on to Gibeah' (19.12). Hence, in Israelite hospitality we again see the reluctance on the part of the Israelites to accept hospitality or spend the night in a non-Israelite community. Instead, the Levite waits until he can find lodging in an Israelite city (Josephus, *Ant*. 5.140).

Judges 19.14-28. Once the Levite and his companions arrive in 'Gibeah, which belongs to Benjamin', they turn aside and begin to seek lodging (ἐξέκλιναν ἐκεῖ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν αὐλισθῆναι ἐν Γαβαα) by sitting down in the city square (τῇ πλατείᾳ τῆς πόλεως) (19.14-15). Thus, it should be noted that when a traveler sits down in a city-square, the traveler is apparently indicating that he is seeking a potential host for the evening (19.15). This may remind us that Lot also met his guests at the city gate[80] and that Lot's two angelic visitors planned to spend the night in the city-square (Gen. 19.1-3). Hence, we can deduce that, in urban areas, if an ancient traveler did not have a relative or someone they knew in a particular region from whom they could request hospitality, they generally went to the city-square to find a potential host or to spend the night there. Conversely, in rural areas, if an ancient traveler did not have a relative or someone they knew in a particular region from whom they could request hospitality, they generally went to a well to find a potential host.

Yet, despite the Levite's appearance in the city–square, the townspeople of this Benjaminite city fail to take the Levite and his companions in for the night (οὐκ ἦν ἀνὴρ συνάγων αὐτοὺς εἰς οἰκίαν αὐλισθῆναι) (19.18). Finally, an old Ephraimite, who happened to be living in Gibeah, takes them in and extends hospitality to them. As the old man returns from

80. See Stuart Lasine, 'Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World', *JSOT* 29 (1984) 37-59 (38-41). Lasine discusses the parallels between Gen. 19 and Judg. 19. Furthermore, Lasine provides a helpful survey of scholarship on the relationship between these two passages. In addition, see Victor H. Matthews, 'Hospitality and Hostility in Genesis 19 and Judges 19', *BTB* 22 (1992) 3-12. Matthews also traces multiple parallels between the two passages, and he also argues that Judg. 19.11-30 is dependent upon the Gen. 19 story (p. 3).

the field, he looks up and sees 'the wayfarer in the open square of the city' and he asks him, 'Where are you going and where do you come from?' (19.16-18). This questioning of the guest, which generally takes place after the traveler has received food and drink, seems premature. Nevertheless, the Levite responds both by revealing his identity and noting that he has provisions to care for himself, his concubine, his servant, and his donkeys (19.19). Hence, the Levite is indicating that the old man does not need to worry about providing the Levite and his companions with food as a host was typically expected to do.

Ultimately, however, the host extends a peace greeting (εἰρήνη σοι) to the traveler and a promise to care for all of his wants (19.20a). In addition, the old man clearly does not want the Levite to spend the night (αὐλίζομαι) in the square (19.20b), once again reminding us of Lot's reception of the two angels in Genesis 19. As a result, the old man brings the Levite into his house (εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ), feeds the donkeys, allows the guests to wash their feet, and provides them with food and drink (19.21).

Then, as the night wears on, the old host is faced with the duty of protecting his guests. Similar to the incident in Sodom (Gen. 19.4-5), the men of Gibeah want to abuse the old man's guest (τὸν ἄνδρα ὃς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου) sexually (19.22). In response, the old man goes outside and attempts to convince the townspeople not to harm his guest because the traveler has already entered into his house (μετὰ τὸ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν μου) (19.23). He even offers to send out his own daughter as well as the Levite's concubine to the mob (19.24). Despite his plea, the men of the city do not listen. In desperation the Levite throws his concubine outside of the house to the angry mob.[81] Thus, in the end, the guest protects himself by throwing out his concubine because the host has failed to protect his guest adequately.

In addition to what the host fails to do, the host also takes a step that appears to fall well outside the lines of ideal hospitality when he offers the mob his guest's concubine.[82] On top of that, the host ultimately protects his own household while failing to protect his guest and his guest's companion. In the end, the old man does not throw his own daughter outside to the sexually charged mob. Instead, he is content to watch the Levite throw his own concubine outside to the crowd (19.24-25a). The concubine then experiences a horrific night of rape and death.[83] After a one night stay, as we might expect, the Levite gets up the next morning and departs (19.27-28).

81. Schneider, *Judges*, 262.
82. Lasine, 'Guest and Host in Judges 19', 39.
83. Moore, *Judges*, 419.

Josephus confirms for us once again that ancient readers interpreted this story in light of the custom of hospitality (ξενόω) (*Ant.* 5.140; see also 5.141-43, 147). Josephus reminds his readers that no one in the market place was hospitable (ξένιος) toward the stranger (5.141). Furthermore, Josephus is more explicit when he explains that the old man took the Levite as a guest (αὐτὸν ξενισθησόμενον ἦγε) to his home (5.142) because they were kinspeople (συγγενής) (5.144)—they were both from the tribe of Ephraim (5.142, 144). In addition, Josephus repeatedly employs the word 'guest' (ξένος) when he describes both the Levite (5.145) and his 'wife' (5.143, 145, 146). Hence, Josephus does not limit the 'guest' status to the man. He also refers to the old man as a host (ξένος), the old man's house as a house of lodging or hospitality (ξένος), and the old man's guests as 'the ones whom he has received' (ὑποδέχομαι) (5.145). Finally, it should be noted that in Josephus's interpretation the townspeople desire to have the Levite's concubine from the beginning (5.143), and they are the ones who forcibly take the woman. The old man and the Levite appear to have no role in either suggesting that the townspeople take the woman or handing her over to the mob. Thus, according to Josephus, neither the old man nor the Levite transgresses the bounds of praise-worthy hospitality.

When considering the hospitality scenes in Judges one should use caution, however. The social convention of hospitality is clearly present in these passages, and therefore these passages are helpful to us as we seek to compile a list of the typical actions of ancient Israelite hospitality and a list of Greek semantic markers for Jewish and early Christian hospitality. In all of the hospitality scenes in Judges some aspect of ideal hospitality seems to be missing. In fact, the author of the book of Judges may be narrating the perversion of what on the surface appear to be ideal hospitality encounters. For instance, Jael kills her guest (Judg. 4),[84] the father-in-law attempts to delay his guest longer than the guest wishes to stay (Judg. 19), and the Levite has to protect himself from the men of Gibeah because his host is inadequate (Judg. 19).[85] These three instances may simply serve as examples in the book of Judges of how everyone is doing what is right in his or her own eyes,[86] thereby illustrating the

84. Victor H. Matthews, 'Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4', *BTB* 21 (1991) 13-21 (15-20). Matthews describes a series of 'violations of the hospitality code' in this passage (p. 15). While I do not agree that there are as many violations as Matthews cites, I do, nevertheless, agree with his overarching thesis that this passage represents the perversion of hospitality.

85. Lasine, 'Guest and Host in Judges 19', 40-41. Lasine argues that human selfishness has inverted proper hospitality in Judg. 19.16-28.

86. Lasine, 'Guest and Host in Judges 19', 41.

perversion of the Israelites and the need for a king (Judg. 21.25). We saw a similar dynamic in Homer's *Odyssey*. In the *Odyssey*, one way of demonstrating that a group of people was barbaric or uncivilized was to show them being either inhospitable or at least to show that they did not completely carry out the duties of hospitality (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 6.119-21; 9.175-76; 13.200-202; cf. 9.161-505).

1 Samuel 9.18-27. In the Jewish Scriptures that chronicle the Israelite monarchy we again see noteworthy examples of hospitality. For instance, in 1 Sam. 9.18-27 Samuel welcomes Saul as a guest;[87] Saul has been on a journey to find his father's lost donkeys (9.3). Saul's servant boy suggests to Saul that he consult the seer or prophet in the land of Zuph for direction about the donkeys (9.5-6). Saul agrees, and they go to the town where the man of God is (9.10). At this point the story takes on a familiar overtone. Just as with Abraham's servant (Gen. 24.10-33) and Moses (Exod. 15–21), Saul encounters some young women drawing water who then direct him to a place of hospitality (1 Sam. 9.11-13).

Meanwhile the Lord had revealed to Samuel on the previous day that Saul would be coming (9.15-16). When Saul arrives, the Lord reveals to Samuel that Saul is the man about whom the Lord had spoken. As a result, once Saul enters through Samuel's gate and asks for directions to the seer's house, Samuel is prepared to act (9.17-18). First, Samuel identifies himself. Second, Samuel invites Saul and his servant to attend the shrine with him and to eat with him. Finally, Samuel vows to let him travel on (ἐξαποστελῶ) in the morning (9.19). Hence, Samuel promises not to detain his guest for a long period of time.

Once Saul identifies himself, Samuel takes Saul and his servant into the hall,[88] gives them the seat of honor at the banquet, and has the cook bring the choice portion of food to Saul (9.21-24). Hence, this passage reaffirms for us that the host generally provides the guest with his best provisions.[89] Finally, after departing the shrine, Samuel provides Saul with a bed on top of his roof (9.25). At dawn, as he had promised, Samuel

87. Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898 [repr. 1977]), 63-65. Smith applies the terms 'host' and 'guest' to Samuel and Saul respectively in this section.

88. The Septuagint indicates that Samuel brought them into the inn (εἰσήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ κατάλυμα).

89. Matthews, 'Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4', 15. See also Smith, *The Books of Samuel*, 65. Smith claims that it was 'customary to set aside a choice portion for an honoured guest'. For an alternative view, see Kyle P. McCarter, Jr, *1 Samuel* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 180. McCarter, on the other hand, claims that when Saul is given the best portion of food, he 'is being treated as if he were a priest!'

wakes Saul and declares that he plans to send him on his way (ἐξαποστέλλω) (9.26). As he does so, Samuel walks with Saul into the street (9.26). Here, we continue to see that 'sending a guest on' often entailed escorting the guest away from the house (cf. Gen. 18.16).

Josephus again reinforces our reading of this passage as a hospitality encounter. Josephus indicates that Saul is a stranger (ξένος) when he arrives at Samuel's house (*Ant*. 6.51). Furthermore, even though Samuel has seventy guests at his home for a feast, when night falls all of the others guests return to their homes. Only Saul and his servant spend the night in Samuel's home (6.52). Likewise, according to Josephus, Samuel was expecting a young man to arrive about the time of the day that Saul does because the Lord has told him a young man would be coming. As a result, Samuel had been waiting in expectation of this stranger on top of his house (6.49; cf. Acts 10.9-23). Finally, Josephus makes it clear that when it is time for Saul to leave, Samuel escorts Saul out of the city (προύπεμπε…ἔξω τῆς πόλεως) (6.53).

1 Kings 17.8-24. 1 Kings 17.8-24 tells us about Elijah's visit to Zarephath. Elijah, following the Lord's guidance, has traveled from his hometown of Tishbe in Gilead (17.1) to Zarephath (17.10). Upon his arrival Elijah goes to the gate of the city (εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως) in order to find a host (17.10). When he sees a widow, he asks her for a drink of water in a vessel and a piece of bread (17.10-11). The widow, even though she fears she has too few supplies even to sustain her own life or that of her son, let alone host Elijah, feeds Elijah for many days by means of a miraculously multiplying supply of flour and oil (17.12-16).[90] In the meantime, Elijah lodges in the widow's upper room (ὑπερῷον) (17.19).[91]

This passage also provides us with another example of reciprocity in hospitality relationships. To some degree, Elijah's host is rewarded by his presence. She and her son benefit because they are also able to eat from this miraculous supply of food. Yet, even more pronounced, when the widow's son dies, Elijah cries out to the Lord on behalf of the widow with whom he was staying (ἐγὼ κατοικῶ μετ' αὐτῆς)[92] and the boy is

90. Simon J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (WBC, 12; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 217. DeVries makes the case that widows were 'the poorest of all society'. See also, Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings* (AB, 10; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 427.

91. Cogan, *1 Kings*, 429. Cogan compares the widow's hospitality and Elijah's accommodations with the Shunammite's hospitality and Elisha accommodations in 2 Kgs 4.8-36.

92. According to Josephus, Elijah, while addressing God in prayer, objects that God has not done well in rewarding the woman who had received (ὑποδέχομαι) him (*Ant*. 8.326).

revived (17.17-24). Thus, Elijah has healed his host's son as a response to the kindness of his host.[93]

It should also be noted that the widow of Zarephath is a prominent female host in the Jewish Scriptures. So far, Rahab, Jael, and this widow have all served as the sole host of a hospitable interaction. Finally, while Israelite guests typically stayed for short periods of time in hospitable contexts,[94] this passage provides us with a second exception. Like Moses (Exod. 2.21-25), Elijah stays for many days.

2 Kings 4.8-36

Another noteworthy example of hospitality is described in 2 Kgs 4.8-36.[95] As Elisha passes through Shunem, a wealthy Shunammite woman persuades him to stop and to eat at her house, thereby establishing an ongoing hospitality relationship with him. As a result, whenever Elisha passed through that region he would stop for a meal at her house (4.8). Consequently, the Shunammite woman, in conjunction with her husband, decides to build a guestroom on her rooftop (ὑπερῷον) for Elisha. Furthermore, she equips the room with a bed, a table, a chair, and a lamp (4.9-10). Later, Elisha asks the Shunammite woman what he can do to reciprocate her generosity (4.13). And, when Elisha learns that she does not have a son, Elisha announces to her that she will soon (4.14-17). Finally, in an event that is similar to the one narrated above, when the woman's son dies, Elisha lies upon the child and revives him (4.18-37).

This hospitality exchange is noteworthy for a variety of reasons. First, once again, we see a woman taking an active and authoritative role in the extension of hospitality.[96] And, despite the fact that she is married, the primary relationship appears to be forged between the Shunammite woman and Elisha. Thus, whereas in ancient Greece only men took prominent roles in this social convention, at times in ancient Israel

93. James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings* (ed. Henry Snyder Gehman; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950 [repr. 1986]), 295. Montgomery writes, 'The story of the revival of the lifeless child has its parallel in numerous folk-tales concerning the gratitude of divine persons for hospitality rendered them, especially by poor people'.

94. Matthews, 'Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4', 14. Matthews writes, 'Generally an invitation to share the hospitality of a home involves a short visit'. Matthews appears to be correct when he makes this statement; however, his next statement appears to be incorrect. He writes, 'No example in the biblical text exceeds four days'.

95. Montgomery, *The Book of Kings*, 366-67. Montgomery sees this story as a 'parallel to…Elijah's sojourn at the home of the Sarephthite widow, and his resuscitation of her son' (1 Kgs 17.8-24).

96. T. Raymond Hobbs, 'Man, Woman, and Hospitality—2 Kings 4.8-36', *BTB* 23 (1993) 91-100 (92-95).

women were major participants. Second, in many respects, Elisha's announcement of a son resembles the angels' announcement in Genesis 18 that Sarah would give birth to a son.[97] In both cases, the glad tidings arrive as a reward for the hospitality the guests have experienced. And third, this passage provides us with a detailed description of the ideal accommodations of a guestroom in ancient Israel.

Additional References in the Jewish Scriptures

Other notable references to hospitality in the Jewish Scriptures are found in Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, and Job. For instance, Moses commands the Israelites to love and protect the stranger (προσήλυτος) in Lev. 19.33-34 and Deut. 10.18-19. Furthermore, in 2 Sam. 12.4 Nathan tells the parable of the corrupt man who feeds his traveling guest (πάροδος and τῷ ξένῳ ὁδοιπόρῳ) the poor man's lamb instead of a sheep from his own flock. In addition, both the author of Job as well as later writers tell us that Job was faithful to open his doors to travelers and strangers (ξένοι) (Job 31.32; cf. *T. Job* 10.1-3; 25.5; 53.3).

Perhaps even more striking, the authors of the Jewish Scriptures at times characterize Yahweh as the ideal host. For instance, the Deuteronomist informs us that Yahweh provides food and clothes for strangers (Deut. 10.18). Furthermore, in Ps. 23.5-6 the psalmist praises the hospitality of Yahweh.[98] When discussing this passage, James Crenshaw writes, 'The psalmist envisions Yahweh as a host who has invited an endangered foreigner to the inner refuge and has prepared a lavish feast, as Abraham entertained three strangers in Gen. 18.1-8'.[99] As a result, the endangered foreigner can rest assured because 'the host is obliged to protect his guest from all enemies, at all costs'.[100] Thus, in Ps. 23.5-6 we once again see the twin duties of supplying provisions and protection.

Additional Examples of Hospitality outside of the Jewish Scriptures

Outside of the Jewish Scriptures we find considerable evidence that the social convention of hospitality continued to be held as a meritorious Jewish custom through the first century CE (e.g. Tob. 5.1-22; 6.11–10.11; Wis. 19.14-17; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.246-55; cf. Sir. 29.22-27), afterward in the

97. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 275.

98. Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 58.

99. James L. Crenshaw, *The Psalms: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 62.

100. Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906 [repr. 1976]), I, 210.

Mishnah (*Pe'ah* 1.1) and the Talmud (*b. Ber*. 63b; *b. Shab*. 127a; *b. Qidd*. 39b), and even later in *Genesis Rabbah* (38.23).[101] While it is not possible here to offer a substantial treatment of the later rabbinic texts, I will demonstrate a continuation of this convention throughout the time period in which Luke is writing. Therefore, I will provide a few examples of or at least references to Jewish hospitality from the intertestamental literature in order to demonstrate the continuity of the social convention in antiquity.

Old Testament Apocrypha

Tobit. For instance, in Tob. 6.10–10.11 Tobias and Raphael, the incognito angel who is accompanying Tobias on his journey, arrive in Media. Upon their arrival Raphael says to Tobias, 'We must stay this night in the home of Raguel. He is your relative (συγγενής)' (6.11). Thus, we continue to see that, if possible, ancient Jews stayed with relatives when they were traveling.

Furthermore, once Tobias and Raphael arrive at Raguel's house, they find Raguel sitting beside the courtyard door (7.1). First, Raguel responds by saying, 'Joyous greetings, brothers; welcome and good health!' Next, he brings them into the house (εἰσήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) (7.1). At that point, the wife asks Tobias about his identity (7.2-3). After realizing that they are related, Raguel embraces his guest, slaughters a ram, and receives (ὑποδέχομαι) them warmly (7.5-9). Furthermore, the host provides the guests with the opportunity to bathe themselves, to eat, and to drink (7.10, 14). In addition, Raguel gives his daughter to Tobias, his relative and guest, as a bride (7.11), thereby forging a more intimate and perhaps a longer lasting relationship.

Then, as evening sets, the host's wife prepares a bedroom for Tobias and his new bride (7.15–8.1). The next day, Raguel asks his wife to bake bread while he goes out to the herd and brings back two steers and four rams for preparation (8.19). After doing so, Raguel swears an oath to his guest and new son-in-law that he will give Tobias his possessions (8.20-21). In response, Tobias agrees to stay (μένω) in his host's home for fourteen days as a wedding celebration (8.20–9.4). Finally, at the end of the fourteen days Tobias asks his host and father-in-law to send him back (ἐξαποστέλλω, 10.7-9). As a result, Raguel not only gives his daughter as a bride to his guest, but he also gives his guest half of his possessions. Then he sees his guests off (10.10-11). As they part, Raguel embraces Tobias and says 'Farewell' (10.11). Here we see the host not only escorting his guest away from the host's house, but also providing the guest with financial gifts.

101. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 16, 46.

The Wisdom of Solomon. The books collected in the Old Testament Apocrypha are also helpful because they document for us that the ancient Israelites did not always practice hospitality faithfully. It is clear that while Abraham's hospitality may have represented the ideal execution of the custom, not all Israelites were as willing as Abraham to serve as a host and not all hosts were as gracious as Abraham. For instance, in the Wisdom of Solomon (19.14-17), the author makes some pointed comments about inhospitality. The author contends that sinners have suffered because they either 'refused to receive (δέχομαι) strangers when they came to them', or they initially received them as guests (ξένοι) only to make them slaves in the end (19.14). Either way, both offenders will be punished because they received strangers (προσεδέχοντο τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους) with hostility (19.15).

Sirach. Similarly, in Sir. 29.22-27 the author discusses the shortcomings of some Jewish hosts. More accurately, the author discusses the 'miserable life' that guests (ἀλλότριος, 29.22; and πάροικος, 29.23) often encountered while relying upon the custom of hospitality in antiquity. Instead of experiencing the ideal hospitality like Abraham provided for his guests, guests were often forced to go from house to house to find a reception (29.24). In addition, hosts (ξενίζω, 29.25) often expected their guests to function as their personal servants, and hosts often insulted their guests in the meantime (29.25-26). Finally, hosts routinely expelled their guests (πάροικος) when they needed the guestroom for someone else (29.27).

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

Joseph and Aseneth. In addition to my previous discussion of the *Testament of Abraham* and my references to the *Testament of Job*, we find significant manifestations of the custom of hospitality in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. For instance, the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* tells us about Joseph's visits as a guest in the home of Pentephres, the priest of Heliopolis. When Joseph, who was commissioned by Pharaoh to travel throughout Egypt, enters the territory, he sends twelve men ahead of him to convey a message to Pentephres. Joseph says, 'I will lodge (καταλύω) with you because it is the hour of noon and the time of lunch, and the heat of the sun is great, and (I desire) that I may refresh myself under the shadow of your house' (3.1-3).[102] Here again, as we saw with Yahweh's messengers in Genesis 18, we see that in Jewish hospitality the traveler sometimes requested shade and refreshment during the middle of the day as a way to avoid the heat.

102. The translation was made by C. Burchard in *OTP*, II, 177-247 (205). In addition, for the Greek text see M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).

When Pentephres hears the message he is filled with great joy. Now, in this instance we cannot assume that Pentephres is filled with joy simply because he has an opportunity to host a traveler as we saw in the tradition of Abraham's hospitality. Instead, Pentephres clearly knows about Joseph's power and authority as the governor of Egypt who has been appointed by Pharaoh (3.3-4; 4.7). Next, in addition to being filled with joy, Pentephres directs his servant to 'Hurry and make my house ready and prepare a great dinner, because Joseph, the Powerful One of God, is coming to us today' (3.4). Furthermore, Pentephres wants to give his daughter, Aseneth, to Joseph as a bride (4.8). At first, however, Aseneth objects, in part because Joseph is an alien (4.9). Here we continue to see the striking association between hospitality and the betrothal of the guest to the host's daughter in the ancient descriptions of Jewish hospitality.

When Joseph arrives he stands at the doors of the courtyard (5.1). As a result, 'Pentephres and his wife and his whole family' go out to meet Joseph as the gates are opened and Joseph enters (5.3-4). Aseneth is the only family member missing. Instead of greeting Joseph at the gate, she runs to her room in anger. Yet, even then, she watches out the window 'to see Joseph entering her father's house (τὸν ἐρχομένον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς)' (5.2-3; cf. 6.1-2). Here, despite the growing role of women in the Jewish examples of hospitality, it is quite clear that the hospitality relationship is primarily forged between Joseph and Pentephres upon Joseph's entry into the house. The women, in this instance, play only a secondary role.

Once Joseph is inside the gate, 'Pentephres and his wife and his whole family, except their daughter Aseneth' go out and prostrate themselves 'face down to the ground before Joseph' (5.6-7). While the act of bowing down to the ground is not found in all the examples of Jewish hospitality that we have surveyed, it is noticeably present here as well as in Gen. 18.2, 19.2, and 43.26. Joseph, in turn, descends from his chariot and greets them with his right hand (5.7). Then, after Joseph enters Pentephres' home (εἰσῆλθεν Ἰωσὴφ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πεντεφρῆ) and sits upon the throne, Pentephres' servants wash Joseph's feet and set a private table before him (7.1). Here, unlike the dynamics between Joseph and the Egyptians in Gen. 43.32, Joseph eats separately from his Egyptian counterparts because eating with the Egyptians would have been an abomination (βδέλυγμα) to Joseph (7.1). Then, after eating and drinking, Joseph declares it is time to depart (9.1-3). Pentephres, on the other hand, asks Joseph to lodge in his home and depart the next day. Joseph, however, declines the invitation and departs the same day he arrives (9.5).

Eight days later, Joseph sends a forerunner to Pentephres' house to announce that Joseph will again stop at his house (ἔρχεται σήμερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς) (18.1). Thus, Joseph's actions demonstrate once again the pattern of how guests generally returned to their host's home whenever they were in the same region. This time, however, Aseneth, who has since converted to the worship of the Lord and whose acceptance by the Lord has been announced to her by an angel of the Lord (10.2-16), functions as the primary host (18.1-3) in her father's absence.

When Aseneth hears the report of Joseph's coming, she directs the steward of the house, saying, 'Hurry and make the house ready and prepare a good dinner, because Joseph the Powerful One of God is coming to us today (ἔρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς)' (18.2). In the meantime, Aseneth dresses in bridal clothes as the angel had instructed her (18.5-11). Then, once a boy announces to Aseneth that Joseph is 'standing at the doors of our court', Aseneth hurries out and stands in the entrance of the house (19.1-2). As a result, Joseph enters the court (19.3). At that point, Aseneth goes out to meet Joseph (19.4), who is astounded by her beauty, and they embrace (19.4–20.1). Finally, Aseneth officially invites Joseph into her house. She says, 'Come, my Lord, and enter [my house] (εἴσελθε εἰς τὸν οἰκόν μου) because I have prepared our house and made a great dinner' (20.1). As she does so, she grasps his hand (ἐκράτησε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιάν) (20.1), leads him into her house (εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῆς) (20.1), seats him on Pentephres' throne, and washes his feet (20.2-4). Hence, we can detect a growing trend in Jewish hospitality toward the host washing the guest's feet for him rather than simply providing the guest with water so he can wash his own feet.

When Aseneth's parents arrive at the house, they all eat and drink (20.6-7). Furthermore, Pentephres can now offer his daughter Aseneth to Joseph as his bride (20.8-9). As a result, Joseph stays (μένω) that day with Pentephres (20.8–21.1). Thus, Aseneth takes the lead hospitality role in the absence of her father, but once Pentephres returns the storyline shifts back to emphasizing primarily the relationship between Joseph and Aseneth's father. Finally, at daybreak, Joseph departs, travels to see Pharaoh, and asks for permission to marry Aseneth (21.1-3).

Summary of Jewish Hospitality

As we have seen, Jewish hospitality differs very little from the Greco-Roman hospitality, which I discussed in the previous chapter. Within a Jewish context there appears to have been a standard protocol for the interaction between the host and the guest. Furthermore, ancient Jewish authors often wrote about these relationships while using a consistent set

of terms and phrases. First, based upon the texts we have examined, some of the consistent behavioral commonalities of Hebraic, Israelite, and Jewish hospitality include the following aspects: the stranger often seeks hospitality from a distant relative or kinsmen (Gen. 24.15-27; Tob. 5.6; 6.11; 9.5; Philo, *Abr.* 116; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.144), or at least from a fellow Israelite (Judg. 19.12); a traveler commonly hopes to find a host at a well or source of water while in a rural area (Gen. 24.17; Exod. 2.15; 1 Sam. 9.11-13), or at the city gate or the city-square in an urban area (Gen. 19.1; Judg. 19.14-15; 1 Kgs 17.10); authors often describe the host seeing the stranger from a distance (Gen. 18.2; 19.1; 43.16; Judg. 19.3, 17; *T. Ab.* 1.2); the host often runs out to greet the stranger (Gen. 18.2; 19.1; 24.29); authors often portray the guests as either passing by (Gen. 18.3; 2 Kgs 4.8; Philo, *Abr.* 107) or as requesting hospitality (Gen. 24.17, 23; Josh. 9.6; Tob. 7.1; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.246; *Jos. Asen.* 3.3); the host may withhold hospitality unless the stranger is a kinsperson (Tob. 5.4-9); the host may promise not to delay the guest (Gen. 18.5; 19.2); the guest is often associated with Yahweh or Yahweh's angels (Gen. 18.1-16; 19.1-23; Judg. 13.16; *T. Ab.* 113; cf. Philo, *QG* 4.16-17; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196; Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 4.1); the guest may be a representative of another more prominent person (Gen. 24.34); and either the host or the guest may bow down before his or her counterpart (Gen. 18.2; 19.2; 43.6; *Jos. Asen.* 5.6-7; *T. Ab.* 3.5).

Other features include: hospitality appears to be ratified when the guest is brought into the host's dwelling (e.g. Gen. 19.3; 24.29; 43.17; Josh. 2.1; Judg. 19.21); the ideal host moves quickly (Gen. 18.6-8; 24.29; Judg. 19.3; *Jos. Asen.* 3.4; 18.2; 19.1-2; Philo, *Abr.* 109; Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 4.1); the host provides water so that the guests may wash their feet or bath themselves (Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; 1 Sam. 25.41; 2 Sam. 11.18; Tob. 7.9; *T. Ab.* 1.3), so that servants can wash their feet (LXX Gen. 18.4; *Jos. Asen.* 7.1; 20.4; *Sifre Deut.*, Piska 355), or so that the host can wash their feet (*Jos. Asen.* 20.2-4; *T. Ab.* 3.7-9; Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 4.2); the host anoints the head of the guest with oil (Ps. 23.5) and cares for the guest's animals (Gen. 24.19, 32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.252); the host provides food, which is often more extravagant than originally promised (Gen. 18.5-7; 19.3; 24.33; 43.34; Judg. 13.15; 19.6, 21; 1 Sam. 9.24; 10.4; 2 Sam. 12.4; 1 Kgs 17.13-16; 2 Kgs 4.8; Ps. 23.5-6; Tob. 7.9; *Jos. Asen.* 7.1; 20.6-7; Philo, *Abr.* 108; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.252); in Middle Jewish and Early Christian times, the host may personally prepare the food (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.197; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 8); the host may provide lodging (Gen. 19.2; 24.25; Josh. 2.8; Judg. 19.4, 21; 1 Sam. 9.25; 1 Kgs 17.19; 2 Kgs 4.10; Tob. 6.11; *Jos. Asen.* 21.1); the host may put the guest up in a guestroom (2 Kgs 4.10; *T. Ab.* 4.1); the host generally asks

the guest about his or her identity, normally only after the guest has partaken of refreshments (Gen. 24.34; Judg. 13.17-18; 19.16-18; Tob. 7.2-3; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.252); the host protects the guests during their stay from abuse by the host's fellow citizens and/or the guests' enemies (Gen. 19.3-8; Josh. 2.4-21; Judg. 19.23; Ps. 23.5; cf. Judg. 4.17-22; Jer. 14.8); the guest generally stays for a short period of time (Gen. 18.1-33; 24.54, 59; Judg. 19.27-28; 1 Sam. 9.19, 26; *Jos. Asen*. 9.5); once the relationship is established, it is assumed that the guest can return at any point in the future and receive a hospitable reception (Gen. 18.10, 14; Judg. 4.17; 2 Kgs 4.8-36; *Jos. Asen*. 18.1); and the host may escort the guest out of town (Gen. 18.16; 1 Sam. 9.26-27; Tob. 10.10-11).

In addition, while an Israelite host could expect some degree of future reciprocity (e.g. Josh. 2.21; 9.5, 11, 15, 18-21; Judg. 4.17) similar to what we saw in Greco-Roman hospitality, reciprocity primarily shows up during the initial visit in Hebraic, Israelite, and Jewish hospitality. For instance, the guest often rewards the host or assists the host while the guest is still in the host's home (e.g. Gen. 18.10; 19.9-23; 24.50-51; 43.26; Exod. 3.4; 1 Kgs 17.17-24; 2 Kgs 4.13-17; cf. Philo, *Abr*. 110; *1 Clem*. 10.7; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 7; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.249). Furthermore, in Hebraic, Israelite, and Jewish hospitality, the host seldom gives gifts to their guests as we saw in Greco-Roman hospitality (e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.45, 57-58).[103] The most pronounced exception to this statement, however, is the host's gift of his daughter to the guest as a bride. In Greco-Roman hospitality, the giving of a gift to the guest represented the move into a permanent relationship. Furthermore, the gift was most often a valuable object, though occasionally the gift was the host's daughter as a bride for the guest (e.g. Nausikles gives his daughter to Knemon to be his bride in Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.8; cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.69-80). In Jewish texts, however, it is more common for hosts to give their daughter or sister to the guest as a bride (Gen. 24.50-51; Exod. 2.21; Tob. 7.11; *Jos. Asen*. 4.8; 21.1-3). Once a Jewish host gave a guest his daughter as a bride, his gift created a kinship bond that insured the permanence of the relationship between the host and the guest.

Second, my discussion of Jewish hospitality has demonstrated that a collection of Greek words or phrases was consistently employed by Jewish writers who wrote about hospitality. For instance ξένος and its cognates are associated with the participants in a hospitality relationship (2 Sam. 12.4; Job 31.32; 2 Macc. 6.2; Sir. 19.25; Wis. 19.14; Philo, *Abr.* 93-94, 96, 107; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.196, 200, 201; 5.143, 145, 146; 6.51; *T. Ab*. 1.2; *T. Job* 10.1-3; 11.1; 53.3). Similarly, ξενία (Sir. 29.27; Philo, *Abr.* 107,

103. Expressions of gift-giving can be seen in Hellenistic Jewish texts (e.g. Tob. 10.10-11; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.281-82).

109, *QG* 4.8; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.196; 5.140, 141-43, 147, 282) and φιλοξενία (Philo, *Abr.* 109, 114; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.250; *T. Ab*. 1.1, 2, 6; *1 Clem.* 10.7; 11.1) are associated with the custom itself, while ἀξενία (Philo, *Abr*. 107) describes the opposite of hospitality. Furthermore, πάροικος can refer to the guest who takes up residence in a region as a resident alien (Exod. 2.22; Sir. 29.23, 27; *T. Ab*. 1.1).

In addition, συγγενής is often used to describe a kinsman from whom a traveler would seek hospitality (Tob. 6.11; Philo, *Abr.* 116; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.144); ἀσπάζομαι can refer to the host's initial greeting of the stranger (Josephus, *Ant*. 1.196); the phrase ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς was sometimes used by a guest who was informing his previous host that he or she would soon be coming again for another visit (*Jos. Asen*. 18.1, 2); προσκυνέω is generally employed to describe either guests or hosts bowing down before their counterparts whom they perceive to be greater than themselves (Gen. 18.2; 19.2; 43.26; *Jos. Asen*. 5.6-7); λαμβάνω (Philo, *Abr*. 96) as well as δέχομαι and its cognates (Tob. 7.8; Wis. 19.14; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.145; 8.326; *T. Ab*. 1.2; 2.2) are used to describe the action of receiving a traveler; εἰς τὸν οἶκον, often in conjunction with the verbs ἄγω or ἔρχομαι, is the phrase that marks the ratification of the hospitality relationship (Gen. 19.2-3; 24.32; 43.16-17; Josh. 2.21; Judg. 19.3, 18, 22, 23; Tob. 7.1; *Jos. Asen*. 5.2-3; 7.1; 20.1); ἑτοιμάζω describes the host's actions of preparation for his or her guest (Gen. 18.3; 24.28; 43.16; *Jos. Asen*. 3.4; 18.2); μένω describes the guest's decision to stay or remain in a hospitable home (Tob. 8.20; *Jos. Asen*. 20.8; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.282); αὐλίζομαι can refer to a guests decision to spend the night in a host's home (Judg. 19.7, 9, 15, 18, 20); καταλύω refers to a traveler's actions of halting and finding lodging (Gen. 19.3; 24.23; Josh. 2.1; Josephus, *Ant*. 3.1); ὑπερῷον can refer to a guest room (1 Kgs 17.19; 2 Kgs 4.10); προπέμπω and its cognates (Gen. 18.16; 24.54, 59; 1 Sam. 9.53) and ἐξαποστέλλω (Josh. 2.21; 1 Sam. 9.19, 26; Tob. 10.8) describe the host's send off of his or her guest.

4

Early Christian Hospitality

The custom of hospitality clearly played a prominent role in the life of the early Church. As one would expect, Christian hospitality largely functioned as the continuation of either Greco-Roman hospitality within a Greco-Roman context or Jewish hospitality within a Jewish context. Thus, for the most part, early Christian hospitality was in continuity with the broader Mediterranean social convention of hospitality. Just as we saw in both Greco-Roman and Jewish contexts, hospitality continued to be treated as a moral imperative and a prized custom in a variety of places in the early Christian documents.[1]

For instance, Paul (Rom. 12.13), the author of Hebrews (13.2), the author of 1 Peter (4.9), and Hermas (*Mand*. 8.10) all exhort Christians to provide hospitality (φιλοξενία) to others (cf. *Did*. 12). The author of the Pastoral Epistles mandates that bishops be hospitable (φιλόξενος) people (1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8). The author of *1 Clement* praises those who have extended hospitality (φιλοξενία) to others (*1 Clem*. 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.1, 3). Matthew, moreover, lists hospitality toward Christian strangers (ξένος) as a non-negotiable requirement for the nations because their response to Christ's disciples is their response to Christ himself (Mt. 25.35, 38, 43, 44).[2]

Furthermore, the actions that accompany a hospitality relationship in Christian writings closely mirror the actions that we have seen throughout our survey of this Mediterranean practice. At times the host initiates hospitality (e.g. Lk. 7.36; 10.38; Acts 10.22, 23; 16.15, 34; 28.7), while at other times the guest requests hospitality (e.g. Lk. 19.5; Acts 21.4, 7, 8; Rom. 15.22-23, 32). Second, we continue to see the standard elements of food (e.g. Lk. 7.36; 10.40; Acts 16.34; *Gos. Thom*. 14, 61, 64; *Acts Pil*. 14.2; 15.3, 4; 16.4) and lodging (e.g. Acts 10.6, 23; *Acts Pil*. 15.3). Third, Jesus

1. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 168.
2. Sherman W. Gray, *The Least of My Brothers: Matthew 25.31-46, A History of Interpretation* (SBLDS, 114; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 358-59.

criticizes his host for not providing him with water so he can wash his feet (Lk. 7.44). And fourth, Christian hosts routinely escort their guests to their next destination (e.g. Acts 17.14-15; 21.5, 16; *Acts Pil*. 14.3; 15.4), provide them with provisions for their journey (e.g. Acts 28.10; *Gos. Thom*. 88; *Acts Pil*. 14.3), and send them on in peace (e.g. *Acts Pil*. 14.3).

In addition, early Christians extended hospitality to travelers while possessing motives that were similar to those we discussed in the chapter on Greco-Roman hospitality. For instance, Ladislaus Bolchazy identifies five separate motivations behind Greco-Roman hospitality when he discusses hospitality in antiquity.[3] And, to a large extent, it is possible to find vestiges of these broader Mediterranean motivations in Christian hospitality.[4]

For example, Bolchazy discusses theoxenic hospitality. Here, as we have seen, the motive grew out of the belief that the gods or their representatives often visited humans in the form of beggars or strangers. Since that was the case, many hosts were subsequently motivated to treat all strangers with kindness.[5] This same motivation appears to be present in references to hospitality in the New Testament as well. For instance, in Heb. 13.2, the author instructs his readers and listeners not to neglect hospitality (φιλοξενία) to strangers because some humans have unknowingly entertained (ξενίζω) incognito angels (ἄγγελοι). This same motivation may be at least partially present in references to hospitality in Mt. 25.31-46, Acts 28.1-10, and Gal. 4.14.

In addition, Bolchazy classifies two more types of hospitality as *ius hospitii, ius dei* (or 'right of the guest, right of god') hospitality and contractual hospitality. With the former, a host shows kindness and enters into a hospitality relationship with his fellow human being because he believes the gods will be pleased by such actions.[6] With the latter, a host enters into a hospitality relationship in part because the host expects to benefit from his guest's reciprocity.[7] Once again, these motivations appear in early Christian writings. On the one hand, in *1 Clem.* 10.7

3. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 5-20. Cf. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 140-65. Mathews makes an argument for three motives for hospitality in antiquity, but he then uses subcategories so that in the end he comments on the same five topics as Bolchazy does.

4. I am assuming that, in reality, most Mediterranean hosts had a mixture of motives when they extended hospitality to a guest.

5. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 11-14. See also Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 142, 146; Kampling, 'Fremde und Fremdsein', 228.

6. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 14-16. Cf. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 148-50.

7. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 16-18. Cf. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 145-46.

Clement claims that God rewarded Abraham with Isaac's birth in part because of Abraham's hospitality (φιλοξενία). Likewise, in *1 Clem.* 11.1 Clement claims that God saved Lot in part because of his hospitality (φιλοξενία). Thus, in both instances, while Abraham and Lot may not have been motivated by the promise of a reward, Clement appears to be motivating his own readers with the hope of divine reward for human hospitality.[8] Alternatively, Clement lifts up Rahab as a model for hospitality as well. In Rahab's case, however, she benefits more from a contractual or reciprocal relationship with the Israelites. Rahab serves as an example of one who entered into a hospitality relationship (φιλοξενία) with the Israelite spies (*1 Clem*. 12.1, 3) so that her guests would repay her kindness by sparing her life (*1 Clem*. 12.5-7).

Finally, Bolchazy claims that some ancient hosts possessed an altruistic motive when they extended hospitality to travelers.[9] Likewise, the case can be made that altruism is present in references to hospitality in the Christian texts. For example, it is reasonable to assert that Paul is speaking about hospitality (φιλοξενία) motivated by and characterized by love in Rom. 12.13 when he mentions a variety of actions associated with love in Rom. 12.9-13.[10] Thus, in many respects, early Christian hospitality was very similar in its practices and its motivations to other forms of Mediterranean hospitality.

Conversely, in comparison to other Mediterranean hosts, early Christians also adapted this social custom for their own purposes. For instance, in Acts, when Paul arrives in a new community, he specifically seeks out believers whenever possible so that he can request hospitality from them (Acts 16.13; 21.4, 7, 8; 28.14). Here Luke gives the impression that whenever early Christians traveled they first attempted to locate fellow believers in a particular region in order to request hospitality from them. This behavior appears to be an adaptation of the Jewish practice of seeking out one's kinspeople in order to request hospitality.

Second, prominent recipients of Christian hospitality were often the poor (Hermas, *Sim*. 9.27.2), widows (Hermas, *Sim*. 9.27.2), and especially traveling missionaries (e.g. Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; 3 Jn 5–8; *Did*. 11-12; Ignatius, *Eph*. 7.1; 9.1; Hermas, *Mand*. 11.12; *Gos. Thom*. 88). Third, women

8. J.B. Lightfoot (ed. and trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp: Revised Texts with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*. II. 1. *Clement* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1889–90 [repr. 1981]), 45. Lightfoot writes, 'The stress laid on this virtue seems to point to a failing in the Corinthian Church'.

9. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 18-20.

10. David Alan Black, 'The Pauline Love Command: Structure, Style, and Ethics in Romans 12.9-21', *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 2 (1989) 3-22 (6-7).

(e.g. Lk. 10.38-42; Acts 16.14-15), widows (e.g. 1 Tim. 5.10), and especially bishops (e.g. 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8, Hermas, *Sim*. 9.27.2) became prominent hosts of early Christian hospitality.[11] Hence, while women sometimes played prominent roles in Jewish hospitality, they appear to play an increasingly more prominent role in early Christian hospitality. Thus, while early Christian hospitality was predominantly an outgrowth of the broader Mediterranean social convention, it does take on its own distinctive characteristics.

Regarding hospitality terminology in the early Christian writings, we continue to see a significant overlap of terminology between Christian authors and authors within the larger Mediterranean culture when they are referring to or describing hospitality. In particular, we continue to see the prominent use of the ξεν- stem among Christian writers due to its association with the stranger.[12] For instance, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, and φιλοξενία continue to be used comprehensively to refer either to the custom of hospitality or to the offer of hospitality (e.g. Acts 21.6; 28.7; Rom. 12.13; Heb. 13.2; *1 Clem*. 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.1; Hermas, *Mand*. 8.10; *Sim*. 9.27.2). Furthermore, the ξεν- stem was employed more specifically to refer to strangers (e.g. Mt. 25.35) or hosts (e.g. Rom. 16.23) just as we have seen in the two previous chapters.[13]

Beyond the ξεν- stem, early Christian writers also use many of the other root words and phrases that Greco-Roman and Jewish authors employ. For example, it is not surprising to see early Christian writers continue to use ἀσπάζομαι, δέχομαι, λαμβάνω, εἰσέρχομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκον, μένω, καταλύω, and προπέμτω when referring to the custom of hospitality. In addition, the phrase ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ('I come to you') is sometimes associated with either a former guest's anticipation of a hospitable reception from an established host (e.g. 1 Cor. 16.12; 2 Cor. 1.16; 12.14; 13.1; cf. *Jos. Asen*. 18.1, 2) or with the arrival of a traveler who is seeking hospitality (e.g. Mt. 7.15; Rom. 1.10, 13; 15.22, 23, 29, 32; Col. 4.10; 2 Jn 10). Furthermore, συνίστημι ('I recommend') is commonly found in Christian texts that discuss hospitality. While it is often used in conjunction with the recommendation of ambassadors and traveling missionaries (e.g. Epictetus, *Diatr*. 3.23.22),[14] we also see it used more generally when a person was recommending or commending a traveler to a potential host (e.g. Rom. 16.1-2).

11. Donald Wayne Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission', *JBL* 57 (1938) 141-54 (143-45).
12. Stählin, 'ξένος', 1.
13. Stählin, 'ξένος', 2; Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 71.
14. Bauer *et al*., *A Greek–English Lexicon*, 972-73.

Hospitality and Traveling Missionaries

Before turning to examples of hospitality from early Christian literature, it is prudent first to discuss more fully the association between traveling missionaries and hospitality in early Christianity. For instance, the Synoptic Gospels refer to Jesus sending out the twelve apostles and the seventy disciples on journeys in order to carry the message of the kingdom of God (Mt. 10.5-42; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18). Jesus' followers then travel to various communities while being dependent upon receptive hosts in those communities for lodging and provisions since Jesus instructed them to carry no provisions of their own. As a result, beginning in the time of Jesus, early Christian missionaries spread the gospel message while being dependent upon the custom of hospitality.

These instances in which Jesus commissioned his disciples to carry the message of the kingdom of God while depending upon the custom of hospitality for provisions was not, however, restricted to Jesus' first disciples. Instead, Jesus' instructions appear to function as a paradigm for later Christian missionaries. As a result, we will see many references to traveling missionaries in the early Christian literature. Consequently, both Donald Wayne Riddle and Helga Rusche are able to claim that traveling missionaries become the most prominent recipients of early Christian hospitality and the most productive means of Christian evangelism (e.g. Acts 16.14-15; Rom. 15.22-25; 1 Cor. 9.14; Gal. 4.14; 3 Jn 5–8; *Did*. 11-12; Ignatius, *Eph*. 7.1; 9.1; Hermas, *Mand*. 11.12).[15]

Perhaps Paul himself is the most revealing example of an early Christian missionary who both requested and depended upon the hospitality of others. For example, in 1 Corinthians 9, when Paul defends his apostleship, he asserts that traveling missionaries have the right not to work (9.6). Paul reasons that the ones who sow spiritual seeds should be able to reap material benefits (9.11). Thus, according to Paul, Christian missionaries have the right to expect hospitality from those whom they visit. Furthermore, Paul clarifies that Jesus was the one who instituted this policy (9.14).

This phenomenon of extending hospitality to traveling missionaries, however, brought both benefits and hardships with it. Hospitality shown to traveling missionaries greatly facilitated a rapid spread of beliefs about Jesus Christ. At the same time, however, at least two major problems are associated with these traveling missionaries. First, these missionaries were dependent upon the congregations for lodging, protection, and

15. Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality', 143-45, 151-54; Rusche, 'Gastfreundschaft und Mission in Apostelgeschichte und Apostelbriefen', 254.

provisions (e.g. Mt. 10.5-42; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; *Did.* 11). This created the potential for local congregations to become overloaded with financial burdens, and it created an opportunity for travelers to take advantage of their hosts' goodwill.[16] Second, these traveling missionaries were just as capable of spreading heresy as they were of spreading the more approved teachings about Jesus Christ.

Letters of Recommendation

Letters of recommendation, letters in which a trusted friend or acquaintance vouched for the character of a potential guest, were quite common in antiquity.[17] These letters are also quite relevant for our discussion of ancient hospitality because they were often used to assist both potential hosts as well as vulnerable travelers. For example, on the one hand, these letters informed potential hosts that the traveler who carried the letter possessed high morals and therefore would not take advantage of his or her host. On the other hand, these letters helped travelers secure a kind reception in a potentially inhospitable region. In essence, the letter of recommendation asked the host to transfer the author's status with the host to the bearer of the letter.[18] In part, the letter writer hoped the host would forego any tests of worthiness that he or she typically employed when making judgments about traveling strangers.[19]

In addition, letters of recommendation were particularly common in public hospitality. For instance, a king or ruler might extend hospitality to foreign ambassadors. Then, upon their departure, the ruler might give the ambassadors a letter of recommendation ensuring their safety as they left the region (e.g. 1 Macc. 12.43; 1 Esd. 4.47).

In early Christianity, the letter of recommendation often functioned as a corrective against the abuses of immoral guests. Furthermore, early Christians often sent and received letters of recommendation in the hope that their use would prevent a host from accepting heretical teachers,

16. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 101.

17. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 102. See also Chan-Hie Kim, *Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation* (SBLDS, 4; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972). Kim analyzes eighty-three papyrus letters of recommendation. Also see Timothy M. Teeter, 'Christian Letters of Recommendation in the Papyrus Record', *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 9 (1990) 59-69.

18. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 101-102; Kim, *Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation*, 50.

19. Julian Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest and the Hostile Host', 13-15. Pitt-Rivers contends that the questioning of guests about their identity is one form among many in which the host evaluates strangers to determine the level of threat that they pose to the community.

especially those who were traveling missionaries (cf. 3 Jn 9).[20] These brief letters are both alluded to in Christian texts and are found within Christian texts. For example, when Paul commends (συνίστημι) Phoebe to the Roman Christians in Rom. 16.1-2, he demonstrates for us how a letter of recommendation worked.[21] While following the standard protocol for writing letters of recommendation,[22] Paul simply vouches for Phoebe's character and requests that the Romans welcome her in the Lord (αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ). Paul also uses συνίστημι in a similar manner in 2 Cor. 3.1 when he differentiates himself from the super apostles. After justifying his own ministry, Paul asks, 'Are we beginning to commend (συνίστημι) ourselves again? Or do we need, as some, letters of recommendation to you or from you?' Again in 2 Cor. 10.12 and 18, Paul criticizes his opponents for commending themselves (συνίστημι) to the Corinthians.

In sum, even before we begin our survey of hospitality in various Christian documents, I have tried to highlight the prominent role that traveling missionaries played within the early Christian expressions of hospitality. Furthermore, Christian missionaries had both a positive and negative impact upon early Christian hosts. On the one hand, the missionaries helped to spread the gospel. On the other hand, they often placed a heavy fiscal burden upon their Christian hosts, and they were capable of spreading heresy. As a result, we will see that early Christian leaders were eventually forced to place limits on the length of the guest's stay and on the type of provisions that the host was obligated to provide (cf. *Did*. 11-12). In addition, at some point Christian leaders were forced to implement theological tests for traveling missionaries as a way to prevent Christian hosts from entertaining unacceptable guests (cf. 2 Jn 9–10).

References to Hospitality in Paul's Letters

Paul himself often relies upon the custom of hospitality as he travels from community to community. As one might expect, he seeks lodging, protection, and resources from the Christians and the churches with whom he is familiar. Thus, while, Paul does not provide an extended treatment of this custom and its role within early Christianity, he does frequently make brief requests for hospitality either for himself or his

20. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 101-106. Malherbe argues that 3 Jn 9 not only refers to a letter of recommendation, but 3 John 'is itself a letter of recommendation' (p. 105).

21. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 103 n. 35.

22. Teeter, 'Christian Letters of Recommendation in the Papyrus Record', 60.

emissaries. Therefore, in this section I will briefly discuss Paul's requests for hospitality for himself, Paul's requests for hospitality for others, and references to hospitality in Paul's teachings.

Paul's Requests for Personal Hospitality

At times Paul, while being absent, mentions the upcoming need for hospitality from Christians with whom he has already established an ongoing host-guest relationship. Thus, once he had already established a relationship with them, he would call upon his former hosts whenever he was in the region.

1 Corinthians. The Mediterranean custom of hospitality provides the primary cultural context for Paul's words in 1 Cor. 16.5-12,[23] where he writes, 'I will visit you (Ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς) after passing through Macedonia—for I intend to pass through Macedonia—and perhaps I will stay (παραμένω) with you or even spend the winter, so that you may send me on my way (ἵνα ὑμεῖς με προπέμψητε) wherever I go'.[24] Thus, Paul alludes to the custom of hospitality in the travel plans section of 1 Corinthians.[25]

This conclusion is justified based upon both contextual and semantic evidence. Contextually, Paul is asking for the Corinthians to extend hospitality to him when he arrives in Corinth. Paul is clearly a traveler who is seeking accommodations. Furthermore, Paul not only fits our profile of hospitality because he is a traveler who hopes to find lodging, but also because he is a traveling missionary. As I noted above, Christian missionaries appear to have been the primary recipients of Christian hospitality (e.g. Mt. 10.5-42; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Acts 16.14-15; *Did.* 11.1-2; Hermas, *Sim.* 9.27.2).[26] And second, Paul employs terminology that was commonly associated with this social convention.[27] Thus, this passage exhibits both the contextual and semantic markers for the custom of hospitality in antiquity.

23. Graydon F. Snyder, *First Corinthians: A Faith Community Commentary* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 214. See also Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 96.

24. Here, I am quoting the English translation of the NRSV of the Bible along with the Greek text of Barbara Aland *et al.* (eds.), *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 4th rev. edn, 1998).

25. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SP, 7; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 591.

26. Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality', 143-45; Rusche, 'Gastfreundschaft und Mission in Apostelgeschichte und Apostelbriefen', 254.

27. In 1 Cor. 16.7-8 Paul employs the μένω cognate two more times (i.e. ἐπιμένω).

2 Corinthians. Paul makes a similar request for hospitality from the Corinthians in 2 Cor. 1.15-16. Here again Paul's request combines the context of a traveling missionary with terminology that is typically found when ancient writers referred to hospitality. He writes, 'Since I was sure of this, I wanted to come to you (πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν) first, so that you might have a double favor; I wanted to visit you on my way to Macedonia, and to come back to you from Macedonia and have you send me on (προπέμπω) to Judea'.

Galatians. Paul clearly benefited from the hospitality of the Galatians. In Gal. 4.13-14, as Paul recalls his initial visit to Galatia, he indicates that despite his physical infirmity, the Galatians 'did not despise me, but welcomed (δέχομαι) me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus'. Here, Paul not only employs δέχομαι, which we have repeatedly cited as a semantic term associated with hospitality, but he also straightforwardly refers to two even more striking elements of hospitality in the ancient world.

First, in Greco-Roman texts, we repeatedly read of instances in which human hosts unknowingly extend hospitality to the gods. Furthermore, in Jewish hospitality we repeatedly read of instances in which Abraham and other hosts extend hospitality to incognito angels. Thus, when Paul indicates that the Galatians welcomed him as an angel of God[28] or 'a divine messenger',[29] he is indicating that they hosted him in a meritorious fashion.

Second, Paul indicates that the Galatians welcomed him as if they were welcoming Jesus. As we will see, there is an intimate association in the New Testament between Jesus and his emissaries, who are dependent upon hospitable hosts as they seek to carry out their missions (e.g. Mt. 10; 25; Lk. 9–10).[30]

Philemon. When Paul writes to Philemon, he indicates that he plans to visit Philemon soon. As a result, Paul asks Philemon to prepare either 'hospitality' or a 'guestroom' (ἑτοίμαζέ μοι ξενίαν) for him (Phlm 22).[31]

28. Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), 242.

29. Charles B. Cousar, *Galatians* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1982), 99.

30. Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (SP, 9; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 160. See also, James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 235. Dunn contends that, 'the typical understanding of commissioning' is 'that the one sent is as the one sending' (p. 235). Dunn goes on to write that Paul 'may even have echoed, consciously or unconsciously, the words recalled as part of Jesus' own commissioning of his disciples for mission (particularly Matt. x.40…)'.

31. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 34C; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 122. Fitzmyer chooses to

While making this request, Paul uses at least two of the semantic terms associated with hospitality. For instance, we have often seen Mediterranean authors mention that the host prepares (ἑτοιμάζω) hospitality (e.g. Gen. 18.3; 24.28; 43.16; *Jos. Asen*. 3.4; 18.2). Far more certain, however, Paul employs the ξεν- root, thereby making his request for hospitality crystal clear (Phlm 22). For instance, Carolyn Osiek concludes, 'What Philemon is to prepare for Paul is a *xenia*, usually understood here as a lodging (as in Acts 28.23), but its meaning is broader: a hospitable reception with all the amenities that good hospitality entails'.[32]

Romans. Paul also requests hospitality from the Christians in Rome. The context, however, for Paul's request of hospitality in Romans is somewhat unusual. As we have seen from the survey above, most requests for hospitality in antiquity were done in person. Once a traveler arrived in a particular region, either the traveler requested hospitality from a local resident or the local resident offered hospitality to the traveler. Yet, Paul is requesting hospitality for himself from the Roman Christians without being in Rome.

Furthermore, Paul's repeated requests for hospitality in Romans are unusual not only due to his absent request, but also because he does not refer to a letter of recommendation from a third party on his own behalf. Because Paul does not refer to his references or to a letter of recommendation, some have argued that the theological argument of Romans functions as Paul's letter of recommendation.[33] Regardless of Paul's primary reason for writing Romans, the Roman Christians certainly would have been able to discern whether Paul and his message were worthy of their hospitality by reading Rom. 1.16 through 15.21 (cf. 2 Jn 9–11).[34] Still

translate ξενίαν as 'guest-room' despite the fact that literally the Greek reads 'prepare for me hospitality'. In this case, he argues that ξενίαν is 'an abstraction used for a concrete term'. For a similar conclusion see Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (ed. H. Koester; trans. W.R. Poehlmann and R.J. Karris; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971 [repr. 1975]), 206; Joachim Gnilka, *Der Philemonbrief* (HTKNT, 10; Freiburg: Herder, 1982), 89-90; and Markus Barth and Helmut Blanke, *The Letter to Philemon* (Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 493.

32. Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians; Philemon* (ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2000), 142.

33. James D.G. Dunn, 'The Formal and Theological Coherence of Romans', in Karl Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, rev. edn, 1991), 245-50 (246).

34. Harry Gamble, Jr, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism* (SD, 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 134-37. While Gamble acknowledges that Romans does introduce Paul on a secondary level, in the end he argues that Paul's primary purpose for writing Romans was to address a

others have argued that Paul's greetings to the many people named in Rom. 16.3-17 and 16.21-23 functioned as character references for Paul in the place of a letter of recommendation.[35] Again, this too would have obviously been true.

As we read Romans, we can clearly detect Paul's allusions to hospitality both in the context and in the vocabulary of these passages. Paul mentions his request for hospitality four times. These allusions are found in Rom. 1.10 and 1.15, 15.22-25, 15.28-29, and 15.32. Contextually, we can be confident of Paul's references to hospitality because his requests fit the profile that we have been compiling above. He clearly indicates that he is a stranger who plans to visit Rome (1.10, 13; 15.22-23). More precisely, he is planning a trip to Spain, and he hopes to stop in Rome on his way to Spain. When he stops he hopes to enjoy the company of the Roman Christians for a while, find refreshment (ἐμπίπλημι) among them, and be sent on (προπέμπω) to Spain (15.24). Furthermore, in Rom. 15.24, Paul stresses that he will only pass through Rome; he will not stay too long. Here, Paul is making a pledge to the Roman Christians that he will not overburden them with the responsibilities of hospitality; he will not take advantage of them.[36]

Finally, in Rom. 16.23, Paul refers to Gaius as his host, as well as the host of the whole church (ξένος). As noted above, ξένος is occasionally used to refer to the host in a hospitality exchange (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 1.214, *Il*. 15.532; Xenophon, *Anab*. 2, 4, 15; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 68). Gaius may have been known for extending private hospitality to many Christians, or he may have hosted a house church in his home.[37]

Paul's Requests for Hospitality for his Representatives

Paul not only requests hospitality for himself, but at times he also requests hospitality on behalf of his assistants or emissaries. In these instances, Paul hopes that his assistants will be given a hospitable reception due to Paul's own status among the Christians to whom he is writing. He hopes his status will be transferred to his emissaries, and he hopes the recipients of his letter will treat his emissaries as they would treat Paul.

particular situation in Rome. He therefore concludes that the letter 'is far more than an introduction, though at least that' (p. 134).

35. Peter Lampe, 'Roman Christians in Romans 16', in Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, 216-30 (218); Luke Timothy Johnson, *Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Reading the New Testament; New York: Crossroads, 1997), 217.

36. James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC, 38b; Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 872, 881.

37. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 64-65.

For instance, Margaret Mitchell has argued that Paul utilized Timothy and Titus in much the same way that rulers or officials utilized political ambassadors or emissaries. The foundation of her argument is that people in the Mediterranean world were expected to receive an emissary as if they were receiving the sender himself.[38] She easily supports her observation using references from a variety of ancient texts. Furthermore, this same dynamic is clearly in play when Jesus states that the response of a potential host to his disciples is the response of the potential hosts to Jesus himself (e.g. Mt. 10.5-42; 25.31-46; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18). Similarly, Paul claims that the Galatians received him as Christ himself (Gal. 4.14), and Ignatius writes, 'For everyone whom the master of the house sends to do his business ought we to receive (δέχομαι) as him who sent him' (*Eph.* 6.1). Thus, Mitchell's research supports the claim that Paul expected the various churches to receive his understudies as he expected the various churches to receive him.

1 Corinthians. In 1 Cor. 16.10-12, Paul, who is absent, requests hospitality for Timothy from the Corinthian congregation directly after he requests it for himself (1 Cor. 16.10-12). Paul writes, 'If Timothy comes, see that he has nothing to fear among you, for he is doing the work of the Lord just as I am; therefore let no one despise him. Send him on his way in peace (προπέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ)'. In Paul's plea for Timothy in his upcoming visit,[39] we can once again detect both contextual and semantic elements that are associated with the custom of hospitality. Contextually, Paul is requesting hospitality for Timothy, a traveler, from the Corinthian congregation while Paul remains in Ephesus. Moreover, it was not unusual for a former guest to request hospitality for their relatives, associates, or friends.[40] In fact, Paul's comments in 1 Cor. 16.10-11 resemble the familiar Mediterranean letter of recommendation.[41]

In addition, Paul's vocabulary bolsters the case that 1 Cor. 16.10-12 is Paul's request for hospitality on behalf of Timothy. First, in both vv. 10 and 11, variations of the ἔρχομαι phrase are used. Second, similar to 1 Cor. 16.6, Paul commands the Corinthians to send him on in peace

38. Margaret M. Mitchell, 'New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus', *JBL* 111 (1992) 641-62 (644).

39. C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 390.

40. Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (WUNT, 2/23; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1987), 109-10.

41. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 594-95; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1328.

(προπέμψατε αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ). Third, Paul clarifies that when Timothy returns to Ephesus, Paul himself will certainly receive (ἐκδέχομαι) Timothy and possibly any Corinthian Christians who return with Timothy.[42] Finally, Paul also asks the Corinthians not to despise (ἐξουθενέω) Timothy. In a similar context, when Paul describes the hospitality that the Galatians extended to him, he claims that despite his weakness the Galatians did not despise (ἐξουθενέω) him. Instead, they received (δέχομαι) him (Gal. 4.14).

Romans. Similarly, Paul recommends Phoebe to the Romans in Rom. 16.1-2, thereby requesting that the Romans extend hospitality to her as they would to him. Paul writes, 'I commend (συνίστημι) to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church of Cenchreae, so that you may welcome her in the Lord (προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ) as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you'. First, contextually, Phoebe is a traveler from a different region, and she appears to be a stranger to the Roman Christians. Second, Paul wants the Romans to welcome her in the Lord, thereby creating an association between the identity of Phoebe, a traveling believer (ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν), and Jesus (cf. Mt. 10.5-42; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Gal. 4.14).

Third, Phoebe, like Timothy and Titus, appears to be an emissary of Paul. What brings Phoebe to Rome is unclear. Many have suggested that she is actually carrying Paul's 'Letter to the Romans'.[43] Robert Jewett theorizes that Phoebe has committed to underwrite Paul's mission to Spain and is traveling to Rome ahead of Paul in order to lay the groundwork for the Spanish mission.[44] While these ideas cannot be confirmed, it is clear that Paul wants them to host her based upon his recommendation. And finally, when Paul commends (συνίστημι) Phoebe to the Roman Christians in Rom. 16.1-2, he composes a brief letter of recommendation for her.[45] While following the standard protocol for writing letters of recommendation, Paul simply vouches for Phoebe's character and requests that the Romans welcome her while using a δέχομαι compound (αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε).[46]

42. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 597.

43. For example, William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 13th edn, 1895 [repr. 1911]), 416.

44. Robert Jewett, 'Ecumenical Theology for the Sake of Mission: Romans 1.1-17 + 15.14–16.24', in David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson (eds.), *Pauline Theology*. III. *Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 89-108 (90).

45. Lampe, 'Roman Christians in Romans 16', 216; Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 103 n. 35.

46. Teeter, 'Christian Letters of Recommendation in the Papyrus Record', 62. In addition, Paul has identified himself earlier in the letter.

Deutero-Pauline Letters. In addition to 1 Corinthians and Romans, there are parallels to this type of request for hospitality on behalf of a subordinate in the deutero-Pauline passages of Col. 4.10 and Tit. 3.13. For instance, the author urges the Colossians to welcome (δέχομαι) Mark if he comes to them (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς) (4.10). Similarly, the author of Titus instructs Titus to 'make every effort to send Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way (προπέμπω), and see that they lack nothing' (3.13). Hence, in these instances 'Paul' is the established guest, who is asking his hosts to confer his guest status upon people who would have otherwise been classified as strangers.

Pauline Teaching about Hospitality

Finally, in Rom. 12.13b Paul instructs the Roman Christians to extend hospitality to others. In Romans 12, Paul turns from the body of his letter to the paraenesis of his letter. In vv. 9-13, Paul is providing a list of ethical directives that should be a part of the lives of the transformed Roman Christians.[47] Importantly, the directives in Rom. 12.9-13 are an elaboration on what love (ἀγάπη) should look like when it is lived out by the Roman Christians (12.9).[48] In conjunction with this theme, Paul directs the Roman Christians to pursue hospitality (φιλοξενία) (12.13b) as a manifestation of love just as Paul also wanted them to be devoted (φιλόστοργος) to one another in brotherly love (φιλαδελφία) (12.10).[49]

Semantically, as I noted above, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, and φιλοξενία are all standard terms for the custom of hospitality in general. Therefore, Paul's selection of the word φιλοξενία is certainly not unusual. The use of φιλοξενία is well attested in Christian literature (e.g. Heb. 13.2; 1 Pet. 4.9; 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8; Hermas, *Mand*. 8.10; *1 Clem*. 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.3, 11), as well as in the broader Mediterranean culture (e.g. Sir. 29.27; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.200, 250-51; 5.147; Philo, *Abr*. 114; *Mos*. 2.33; *QG*. 4.8; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.28.33).[50] Yet, in Rom. 12.13b Paul appears to use φιλοξενία to refer more precisely to hospitality that is motivated by and inundated with love.[51] John Koenig writes, 'Philoxenia is an intensification of the basic

47. For example, Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT, 8a; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973), 309; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), II, 628; Walter Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988), 444; Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 759.

48. For example, Black, 'The Pauline Love Command', 6; Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 351, 360; Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 737.

49. Black, 'The Pauline Love Command', 7.

50. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 168.

51. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 238.

noun that stresses the love of or attraction to hospitality'.[52] This may be true not only on a rhetorical level (e.g. creating verbal parallels using the φιλο- prefix to emphasize love), but also on a theological level. Thus, Paul may be specifically asking the Roman Christians to provide loving or altruistic hospitality as opposed to contractual hospitality.

Second, it is noteworthy on a semantic level that Paul employs the combination of διώκω ('pursue') with φιλοξενία ('hospitality') in Rom. 12.13. While διώκω (vv. 13 and 14) is used as a link word to connect the two units of 12.9-13 and 12.14-21,[53] it nevertheless dramatically characterizes the hospitality to which Paul is referring. This proactive stance towards hospitality suggests that hosts should go out seeking strangers to be their guest rather than simply waiting for the strangers to approach them. They 'should go out of their way and provide for visitors'.[54]

As I noted in the previous chapter, a proactive approach to hospitality is also noticeably present in both Philo and the *Testament of Abraham*'s reflections on Abraham's hospitality. Philo says Abraham ran out of his house and begged the strangers who were passing by his home to stay with him because he was so eager to extend hospitality to them (Philo, *Abr*. 107). 'For in a wise man's house no one is slow in showing kindness (φιλανθρωπία); but women and men, slaves and free, are full of zeal to do service to their guests (ξενίζω)' (Philo, *Abr*. 109). In the *Testament of Abraham*, the author tells us that Abraham pitched his tent at the crossroads of the oak of Mamre so that he could 'welcome everyone who passed by' (*T. Ab*. 1.1). Hence, Paul appears to be directing the Roman Christians to live out not only a loving hospitality but also a proactive hospitality, the kind of hospitality that Abraham provided.

Hospitality in the Deutero-Pauline Documents

As I have mentioned above, the author or authors of the Pastoral Epistles include a list of qualifications for Christian bishops (1 Tim. 3.1-7; Tit. 1.5-9). In both instances, the author lists being hospitable (φιλόξενος) as a required ethical trait for any person who aspires to be a leader in the Church (1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8). It should be noted, however, that the author of 1 Timothy does not list being hospitable as a required trait for those who aspire to be deacons (1 Tim. 3.8-13). As we will see, the link between bishops and the custom of hospitality becomes a growing trend in early Christian hospitality toward the end of the first and the beginning of the second century of the Common Era.

52. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 13 n. 7.

53. Charles H. Talbert, 'Tradition and Redaction in Romans 12.9-21', *NTS* 16 (1969–70) 83-93 (92).

54. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 780.

Examples of Hospitality in Matthew, Mark, and John

While perhaps the most noteworthy portrayals of hospitality in the New Testament are found in Luke and Acts, it would be a mistake to assume that Matthew, Mark, and John are not also well acquainted with this custom. For instance, there are noteworthy passages in all four of the canonical gospels that clearly exhibit an understanding of the custom of hospitality. As a result, in this section, I will provide one example of hospitality from Matthew, Mark, and John in an attempt to demonstrate that each of the gospel writers is familiar with this social convention.

Mark 14.12-26

When it is time for Jesus and his disciples to eat the Passover meal, Jesus sends two of his disciples on ahead of him to secure a location and to prepare a meal (14.12-13). As he sends them forth, Jesus instructs the disciples,

> Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him, and wherever he enters, say to the owner of the house, 'The Teacher asks, Where is my guest room (κατάλυμα) where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?' He will show you a large room upstairs, furnished and ready. Make preparations for us there. (14.13-15)

Upon securing a guestroom,[55] Jesus and his disciples are then able to eat and drink together before departing to Gethsemane that same evening (14.22-23, 32).

In this example of a hospitality encounter, we are told very little about the host. Regardless, we do see a variety of details that look similar to what we have seen before. First, we continue to see that at times hosts received emissaries on behalf of their superior. For instance, Jesus instructs his disciples to invoke his name when they seek a location for their meal. Thus, the owner of the house either assists or rejects the disciples based upon his disposition toward 'the Teacher'.

Second, even though the context is a Jewish, urban setting, Jesus instructs the disciples to approach a man carrying a pitcher of water when they enter the city. This man, possibly a servant, will then lead the disciples to a potential host. Jesus' instructions sound quite familiar. For instance, we have repeatedly seen in both Greco-Roman (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 6.110-322; 7.18-81; 10.103-11; 15.415-84; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 2.21-23)[56]

55. See Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 821-22; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8.27–16.20* (WBC, 34B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 374, for brief discussions on the use of κατάλυμα as a reference to a 'guest room'.

56. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 12.

and Jewish (e.g. Gen. 24.17; Exod. 2.15; 1 Sam 9.11-13; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.246-48) contexts that travelers often approached people who were drawing water as a way to locate potential hosts in a given community. Finally, we continue to see references to furnished guestrooms, especially in the Hellenistic age (e.g. 2 Kgs 4.9-10; Sir. 29.27; *T. Ab.* 4.1), along with the standard elements of food and drink.

Matthew 25.31-46

In the apocalyptic judgment scene of the nations in Mt. 25.31-46,[57] Jesus describes the separation of the sheep and the goats. As he does so, we can see that hospitality has a prominent role to play in the separation of these two groups. The king is happy with those who helped him when he was hungry, thirsty, a stranger (ξένος), naked, sick, and in prison (25.34-36, 37-39). Conversely, the king punishes those who did not help him when he was hungry, thirsty, a stranger (ξένος), naked, sick, and in prison (25.41-43, 44).

Of the six actions that are used to differentiate the two groups, we can see one explicit reference to the custom of hospitality; however, four of the remaining five actions also commonly take place within hospitality encounters. For instance, Jesus is clearly referring to the social convention of hospitality when he mentions the action of welcoming a stranger (ξένος ἤμην καὶ συνηγάγετέ με) (25.35; cf. 25.38, 43, 44). Yet, as we have seen in this survey of hospitality, meritorious hosts not only welcomed strangers, but they also provided them food and drink. Furthermore, we have seen hosts clothe their guests and care for them when they are sick (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 10.542; 13.4-23; 14.515-17; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.58, 82; cf. Gal. 4.14).

Regardless of the relationship of these latter four actions to the custom of hospitality in antiquity, one can conclude that the king rewards the members of the nations who have offered hospitality to 'one of the least

57. Even though some contemporary scholars have made a case for classifying Mt. 25.31-46 as a parable (e.g. Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 352; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 511; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 602), it does not yet appear that the general consensus has followed their lead. Instead of describing Mt. 25.31-46 as a parable, most scholars prefer to classify this material as a typical judgment scene as seen in Jewish apocalyptic literature (e.g. W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), III, 418; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1992), II, 367; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13* (WBC, 33A; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), I, 740; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP, 1; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 357; and David R. Catchpole, 'The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Reappraisal of Matthew XXV.31-46', *BJRL* 61 (1979) 355-97 (382).

of these brothers of mine' (ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων) in this parabolic story (25.40).[58] Furthermore, knowledge of the ancient custom of hospitality and its association with early Christian missionaries is virtually a prerequisite for reading this pericope as Matthew's authorial audience would have.

So, to interpret this passage appropriately, we first need to ask how Matthew's audience would have understood the phrase, 'the least of these brothers of mine'. Here I follow the work of Sherman Gray, who has convincingly demonstrated that Matthew's readers would have understood the term 'brothers' as a reference to the followers of Jesus[59] rather than as a reference to all human beings.[60] Gray's assertion can be supported by Matthew's uses of ἀδελφός throughout his Gospel. Repeatedly, Matthew uses ἀδελφός as a technical term for believers (e.g. Mt. 5.47; 12.49-50; 18.1, 15, 21, 35; 28.10). For instance, beginning with Mt. 18.15, the Matthean Jesus instructs believers about what to do when a 'brother' sins against his or her fellow believer.

Second, we need to ask whether Matthew's audience would have equated the acceptance or rejection of traveling missionaries who are dependent upon hospitality (cf. Mt. 10.1-42)[61] with the acceptance or rejection of 'one of the least of these brothers of mine' in 25.31-46. And, there are many reasons to suspect that Matthew's audience would have connected these two passages.[62] For instance, 10.1-42 and 25.31-46 share a variety of elements in common. First, in 10.5-13, Jesus commissions his disciples to go forth and carry out his ministry of teaching and healing, yet Jesus requires his disciples to depend upon whatever provisions are supplied by hospitable hosts (10.11-13). Similarly, in 25.34-36, the 'least

58. This is my own translation.

59. Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 358-59.

60. For example, Alfred Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London: Robert Scott, 1928), 350; Alexander Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986), 512-13; Frederick Dale Bruner, *Matthew*. II. *The Churchbook: Matthew 13–28* (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 915; Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, III, 422-23; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 378; Gundry, *Matthew*, 511; Hagner, *Matthew*, 742, 746; Catchpole, 'Poor on Earth', 389; and John R. Donahue, 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian Ethics (Matt 25.35-46)', *TS* 47.1 (1986) 3-31 (13, 16).

61. Again, I will treat Jesus' commissioning of the disciples more fully in the next chapter.

62. See, e.g., J. Ramsey Michaels, 'Apostolic Hardships and Righteous Gentiles: A Study of Matthew 25.31-46', *JBL* 84 (1965) 27-37 (28); David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Reading the New Testament Series; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 247-48; and Douglas R.A. Hare, *Matthew* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1993), 290. Hare, like many others, says this is a possibility, but he is unwilling conclusively to limit the passage in this way.

of the brothers' are also at the mercy of those who either supply or neglect to supply provisions (25.34-36). Second, in 10.14, Jesus gives his disciples instructions about what to do when people refuse to 'welcome you or listen to your words'. Similarly, the goats in 25.41-43 are those who refuse to help the needy 'brothers' (cf. 24.9 as well as 2.6; 5.19). Hence, in both passages, Jesus anticipates the rejection of his followers (10.14, 17-18, 22; 24.9; 25.41-43). Third, in both passages those who respond to Jesus' followers and their message with inhospitality will be punished 'on the day of judgment' (10.15; 25.46). Fourth, Jesus compares his followers to sheep in both chapters (10.16; 25.32-33).

Finally and perhaps most convincingly, Jesus intimately associates himself with his disciples repeatedly throughout this Gospel. For instance, in 10.40, Jesus states, 'Whoever welcomes you welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes the one who sent me…and whoever gives even a cup of cold water to one of these little ones in the name of a disciple—truly I tell you will not lose their reward' (10.40, 42). In this climactic statement, the Matthean Jesus praises those who supply provisions to his traveling missionaries, and he refers to his disciples as 'little ones', thereby creating a ear-catching parallel with 'the least' in 25.40 and 45.[63] A similar correspondence can be seen between the term 'little ones' and some of Jesus' unassuming disciples in 18.6 and 14.

It is therefore not a coincidence when the sheep and the goats in Mt. 25.31-46 do not even realize that they have seen 'the king' and either assisted or neglected him when they either assisted or neglected the 'least of these brothers of mine'. Yet, Jesus forcefully declares that the way the sheep or the goats treated the 'least of these brothers' was the way they treated 'the king' (25.40, 45).

In sum, given the parallels between Jesus' commissioning of his disciples in 10.1-42 and the judgment in 25.31-46, Matthew's audience would have most likely associated 'the least of these brothers of mine' with potentially overlooked or vulnerable disciples of Jesus who were engaged in spreading the good news of the kingdom of heaven.[64] As a

63. Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 247.

64. For example, D.L. Bartlett, 'An Exegesis of Matthew 25.31-46', *Foundations* 19 (1976) 211-13 (212); Lamar Cope, 'Matthew 25.31-46: "The Sheep and the Goats" Reinterpreted', *NovT* 11.1-2 (1969) 32-44 (39-41); J.M. Court, 'Right and Left: The Implications for Matthew 25.31-46', *NTS* 31 (1985) 223-33 (231); George E. Ladd, 'The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Recent Interpretation', in R. Longenecker and M. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 191-99 (197-99); Graham N. Stanton, 'Once More: Matthew 25.31-46', in *idem*, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992), 207-31 (231); Donahue, 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats', 25; Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 357; Gundry, *Matthew*, 514; Hagner, *Matthew*, 744-46; Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 357; and Keener, *Matthew*, 606.

result, at the judgment of the Gentiles or the nations (τὰ ἔθνη),[65] the Gentiles will be held accountable for their responses to both Jesus' messengers as well as Jesus' message.[66] If the Gentiles hospitably receive Jesus and his message by providing provisions and aid to even the least powerful and least impressive of his disciples, then the Son of Man will reward these Gentiles at the end of time. On the other hand, if the Gentiles reject Jesus and his message by denying provisions and aid to the least powerful and least impressive of his disciples, then the Son of Man will punish those Gentiles at the end of time.

John 4.3-43

In Jn 4.3-43 we read about an instance in which the Samaritans extend hospitality to Jesus. The encounter begins as Jesus is traveling through Samaria (4.4). Around noon time, Jesus sits down at a well (4.6). Subsequently, when a Samaritan woman comes out to the well to draw water, Jesus asks her for a drink (4.7).[67] Jesus' request, however, startles the Samaritan woman because Jesus is a Jew (4.9).[68]

Hence, right from the beginning, John provides his authorial audience with many details that would have helped them realize that Jesus is requesting hospitality from this Samaritan woman. First, Jesus is clearly portrayed as a stranger and a traveler.[69] This is not a new development. Instead, in the Gospel of John Jesus is repeatedly portrayed as a divine stranger who has come into the world (e.g. 1.10-14; 3.13, 19; 8.14, 23).[70] Yet, in 4.3-43 we see Jesus passing through a specific geographical region. Even as John informs his audience that Jesus is passing through

65. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 358-59.

66. Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 248.

67. For comments on the similarities and dissimilarities between Jn 4.3-43 and a handful of Old Testament scenes that takes place at a well, see, for example, Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (AB, 29-29A; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), I, 170; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972 [repr. 1981]), 179-80; and Gail R. O'Day, 'The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections', in *NIB*, IX, 491-865 (565).

68. For a discussion about relations between the Jews and the Samaritans, see, for example, Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; trans. T.A. Burkill *et al.*; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973), II, 17-19; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to John* (3 vols.; New York: Seabury, 1980), I, 425; and Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 177-78, 180-81.

69. Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare and J.K. Riches; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 181.

70. Wayne A. Meeks, 'The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism', *JBL* 91 (1972) 44-72 (60). Also, Lambros Kamperidis, 'Philoxenia and Hospitality', *Parab* 15 (1990) 4-13.

Samaria, John's audience may well have been reminded of Yahweh (Gen. 18.3), Elisha (2 Kgs 4.8), and Jesus (Lk. 19.4) who all were passing through an area prior to experiencing hospitality.

Second, in Jewish documents we have seen that it was somewhat common for a Jewish traveler to seek hospitality from a potential host during the heat of the day (Gen. 18.1) and at a source of water (Gen. 24.17; Exod. 2.15; 1 Sam. 9.11-13; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.246-48).[71] In fact, as we have seen, it was somewhat common for any Mediterranean traveler to seek hospitality from a potential host at a source of water (Homer, *Od.* 6.110-322; 7.18-81; 10.103-11; 15.415-84).[72] Likewise, the initial request for water from a potential host is also consistent with other expressions of hospitality that we have seen (e.g. Gen. 24.17; 1 Kgs 17.10).

Finally, given our research up to this point, the reason for the Samaritan woman's surprise when Jesus, who is a Jew, asks her for water is obvious. We have repeatedly seen that Jewish travelers generally sought hospitality from a kinsperson or at least a fellow Israelite. The Jews did not, however, generally seek hospitality from someone who was not considered to be a Jew (e.g. Gen. 24.15-27; Judg. 19.12; Tob. 5.6; 6.11; 9.5; Philo, *Abr*. 116; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.144).

Because of the Samaritan woman's question in Jn 4.10, Jesus then begins to dialogue with the Samaritan woman about his identity. First, Jesus informs the woman that she does not realize how important he is (4.10). The Samaritan woman then responds by asking, either straightforwardly or facetiously, if Jesus considers himself to be greater than Jacob after whom the well is named (4.12). Second, Jesus says, 'If you knew the gift of God, and who it is that is saying to you, "Give me a drink", you would have asked him, and he would have given you living water' (4.10). Here, Jesus' reference to a gift (δωρεά) (4.10) in a context of hospitality and his cryptic allusion to his important identity appear to draw upon common Mediterranean expectations about hospitality.

For instance, in keeping with the traditional protocol for hospitality, the woman does not outright ask Jesus to identify himself at this point. Generally speaking, the proper time to ask a stranger about his or her identity is after they have received food and water. Yet, obviously the woman is puzzling over the identity of this stranger even now. Therefore, she begins to probe. She implicitly raises the question of Jesus' identity by questioning whether Jesus considers himself to be greater than

71. O'Day, 'The Gospel of John', 565. See also Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 22. Mathews claims that Jewish hospitality actually grew out of the Oriental custom of building enclosed lodging areas around the cisterns along the trade routes of the Middle East.

72. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 12.

Jacob. Similarly, when Jesus responds to her, he appears to draw upon the pervasive Mediterranean belief that an unassuming traveler may very well turn out to be someone quite important, most notably either a god or an angel.

Furthermore, Jesus introduces the idea of the 'gift of God' in his response to her. And, as we have seen repeatedly in the previous chapters, an ancient Mediterranean hospitality encounter often involved the giving of gifts between the two parties or at least an act of reciprocity. Therefore, it is not surprising that Jesus mentions a gift that he can provide within a dialogue about his request for hospitality from this Samaritan woman.[73]

Next, in Jn 4.16 Jesus instructs the woman to go and call her husband. In response, the Samaritan woman informs Jesus that she does not have a husband. Jesus, in turn, reveals that he already knows that she does not have a husband. In fact, Jesus knows that she has had five previous husbands, and she is now with one who is not her husband (4.17-18). The woman is astonished, and rightly so, that this complete stranger knows things about her that she has not told him. Consequently, the woman now begins to conclude that Jesus must be someone with special powers. She says, 'Sir, I see that you are a prophet' (4.19).

Here again, the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman continues to make sense when we analyze the conversation while drawing upon our knowledge of ancient Mediterranean hospitality, with which John's audience would have been well acquainted. While we have read about many active, female hosts in texts from the Hellenistic age (e.g. Chariton 5.9; 8.3-4; Achilles Tatius 6.9; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.2; *Jos. Asen*. 15.4; 20.1; Philo, *Abr*. 109; Acts 16.14-15; 1 Tim. 4.5), it does appear that the head of the household was most commonly expected officially to accept a traveler into the home. As a result, when Jesus instructs her to go and call her husband (4.16) even though he knows she is not married, it appears that he is asking her to retrieve the person who can officially extend hospitality to him.

Furthermore, it is not surprising that the Samaritan woman concludes that Jesus is a prophet. In addition to knowing about her life, he is also asking for hospitality. Thus, the Samaritan woman thinks that Jesus is a traveling prophet in the tradition of both Elijah (1 Kgs 17.8-24) and Elisha (2 Kgs 4.8-36), which was discussed in the previous chapter. In addition, by the time that John's audience is reading this pericope,

73. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 426. Schnackenburg argues that Jesus does not refer to himself as a gift. Instead, Jesus refers to the blessings that he is able to provide.

traveling missionaries had become commonplace. Hence, the conversation continues to follow along the lines of traditional hospitality expectations in the latter half of the first century of the Common Era.

The Samaritan woman then begins to test the prophetic traveler. She refers to the Samaritan temple, which was located on Mt Gerizim. She asks Jesus whether people should worship on Mt Gerizim or at the temple in Jerusalem (4.20).[74] When Jesus answers the woman, beginning with Jn 4.21, he contrasts the identity of the god whom the Samaritans worship with the identity of the God of Israel (4.22-24). This in turn leads the woman to refer to expectations about the coming Messiah, who knows all things (4.25). At this point, Jesus acknowledges that he is in fact the Messiah (4.26).

In this section, it is important to note that Zeus, the God of Hospitality, was associated with Mt Gerizim in Jewish tradition.[75] For instance, in 2 Macc. 6.2 we are told that under the authority of Antiochus the Jerusalem temple was renamed as 'the temple of Olympian Zeus', while the temple on Mt Gerizim, which was built by the Samaritans, was renamed as 'the temple of Zeus-the-Friend-of-Strangers' or 'the temple of Zeus the God of Hospitality (Διὸς Ξενίου)'.

Hence, when the Samaritan woman asks Jesus the question about the priority of the two temples, she simultaneously tests Jesus by asking him a difficult religious question and mentions a temple that was previously dedicated to Zeus, the god of hospitality. And, as we have seen, it was not uncommon for hosts to test their guests (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 1.221-23), nor was it uncommon to refer to Zeus, the god of hospitality, within a hospitality context (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 14.53-58; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.2; cf. Homer, *Od*. 9.266-71).

Finally, in Jn 4.26 Jesus identifies himself. The entire conversation in 4.10-26 revolves around the question of Jesus' identity. When Jesus confesses that he is the Messiah, he has finally told the host who he is, which is the courteous thing for a meritorious guest to do in ancient Mediterranean hospitality. Furthermore, despite appearances, it has become clear that, at the very least, Jesus, the stranger, is in fact a religiously important person.

Next, the woman does what we have seen before in other examples of hospitality—she goes to inform the townspeople that a traveler is requesting hospitality (e.g. Gen. 24.28; Exod. 2.18-20). She leaves her water jar, returns to the city, and informs the people about a man who

74. For a discussion of Mt Gerizim, see, for example, Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, I, 386; II, 17-19, 161; III, 71; and Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 178, 187-88.

75. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, I, 521.

may be the Messiah (4.28-29).[76] The Samaritans in turn come out to greet him, and they asked him to stay (μένω) with them (4.40). Second, many of the Samaritans come to believe that Jesus is the Savior of the World (4.42). Finally, Jesus stays (μένω) (4.40) as a guest with the Samaritans for two days (4.40, 43) before departing (ἐξέρχομαι) (4.43).

Here, we continue to see elements of a typical expression of hospitality in antiquity. First, we have seen that it was somewhat customary for the hosts to come out to greet the guest in Mediterranean hospitality (e.g. Gen. 18.2; 24.29; Judg. 19.3; *T. Ab.* 1.2; *Jos. Asen.* 5.3; 19.2; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12). In addition, it is not uncommon for an entire city to extend hospitality to an important guest. For instance, in Xenophon of Ephesus's *An Ephesian Tale* 1.12, Habrocomes and Anthia stay (μένω) with the Rhodians, just as Jesus stays (μένω) with the Samaritans in Jn 4.40.

Second, the identity of the guest continues to be the burning issue. It is not a coincidence, therefore, that many of the Samaritans believe the claim that he is the Messiah, and apply the title 'Savior of the World' to Jesus. Among Greco-Roman peoples, however, Zeus, the god associated with hospitality, was also commonly referred to as 'Savior'.[77]

And finally, Jesus stays as a guest with the Samaritans for only two days. As we shall see below, two days becomes 'the traditional length of time for a genuine missionary or prophet to stay (μένω) in one place' as prescribed by the author of the *Didache* (11.5).[78]

In the end, this pericope exhibits many of the standard features of a hospitality scene. A traveler requests hospitality from a person who is drawing water in the heat of the day. Next, the person drawing water informs those who can officially extend hospitality to the traveler. Third, the city officially receives the guest. Fourth, the hosts deduce that the traveler is either a god or a representative of a god. Finally, the author, John, employs words that are typically associated with hospitality.

76. See, e.g., Robert Gordon Maccini, *Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses according to John* (JSNTSup, 125; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 131-44. Maccini provides a discussion on the importance of the Samaritan woman as a witness to Jesus.

77. C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 1955), 204. Some of the references are Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 15.47.14; Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 26; Alexis, *Frag.* 3.4; 232.4; Aristophanes, *Plut.* 1189; *Comica Adespota* 282.10; Eustathius, *Comm.* 2.139.24; Plutarchus, *De Vit.* 830.B.5; Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.8.17.1; 6.5.25.7; and *Cyr.* 7.1.10.1. For an alternative view, see Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to John*, I, 426. He argues that 'Savior' is not here understood in a Hellenistic sense.

78. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1994), 117.

Therefore, from a theological perspective, John appears to be drawing upon the custom and the imagery associated with hospitality in antiquity in order to identify Jesus more fully. While the Synoptic Gospels show Jesus commissioning his disciples for an evangelistic ministry (Mt. 10.11; Mk 6.10; Lk. 9.4; 10.7), John, in 4.3-43, portrays Jesus as a traveling missionary.[79] Jesus travels without provisions while evangelizing and is dependent upon the hospitality of the Samaritan village to spread his message (cf. 3 Jn 7-8).[80] In the end, it should be obvious to John's authorial audience that Jesus is a true prophet (Jn 4.19), because he only stayed (μένω) two days (cf. *Did*. 11.5).

Hospitality in the Johannine Epistles

The picture of hospitality in the Johannine Epistles is certainly not a complete one. The author does, however, make poignant allusions to this social convention in these documents.

2 John

In 2 Jn 10–11 the elder instructs the congregation, 'Do not receive into the house (μὴ λαμβάνετε…εἰς οἰκίαν) or welcome anyone who comes to you (χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς) and does not bring this teaching; for to welcome is to participate in the evil deeds of such a person'. Hence, if anyone comes to them and does not bring the teaching that acknowledges Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh (2 Jn 7; cf. 1 Jn 4.1-6), the elder wants the recipients of this letter to deny hospitality to them. In addition, the elder informs his readers that if they do extend hospitality to heretical teachers, they will participate in the evil of these heretical teachers.

We can be confident that the elder is referring to hospitality in these verses and that the elder's authorial audience would have recognized these comments as references to hospitality for a variety of reasons. First, we can make the case on semantic grounds. For instance, while χαίρω ('I greet or welcome') is often used in contexts that are completely unrelated to hospitality, in 2 John it is paired with the act of receiving someone into the house (λαμβάνω εἰς οἰκίαν). Taken together, the two phrases almost surely refer to hospitality. Thus, the author is not prohibiting the congregation from saying 'Hello' to strangers. To do so would rule out the possibility of ascertaining their doctrinal views. Instead, the author

79. Cf. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 194-200.

80. Cf. Ernst Haenchen, *Johannesevangelium: Ein Kommentar* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1980), 40.

forbids the recipients of 2 John 10-11 from extending hospitality to those who are questioned and subsequently deemed to be heretics.[81]

Second, the people in question are bringing a teaching. Thus, the implication is that the author is referring to traveling preachers or teachers.[82] As we have seen above, early Christians often hosted traveling missionaries who spread the gospel (e.g. Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; *Did*. 11-12; Ignatius, *Eph*. 7.1; 9.1; Hermas, *Mand*. 11.12). Third, in 2 John 10-11, the author is attempting to limit the extension of hospitality. He is providing the recipients of this letter with guidelines that will help them identify those who are unworthy of Christian hospitality.

Fourth, in 2 John 10–11, the elder assumes that the congregation will question the guests about their identities. As we have seen, the questioning of guests about their identity and city of origin was somewhat common in Mediterranean hospitality. However, in the elder's opinion, it is more important for the congregation to question guests about their theological views than about their city of origin. Specifically, the congregation should test all potential guests to see if they will affirm that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (2 Jn 7; cf. 1 Jn 4.1-6).

Finally, the author straightforwardly associates the evil of the false teachers with anyone who hosts them.[83] Because the extension of hospitality to heretics nurtures and further spreads heresy, the host who extends hospitality to heretics will also be considered evil. Here, we continue to see that the ancients often made evaluations about the character of either the host or the guest based upon their counterpart in a hospitality relationship.

Hence, in 2 John orthodox beliefs about Jesus have replaced all other considerations about the guests. The elder's main thrust is to disqualify those whom he does not consider to be true believers. In addition, the questioning of the guest does not take place after the meal as was proper in Greco-Roman hospitality; rather, it takes place prior to the initial extension of hospitality. Here, the author believes that some theological errors about Jesus are so dangerous that Christians must disregard the common courtesy of waiting to ask guests about their identity until after they have been fed. The orthodoxy of the community is far more important than upholding cultural norms.

81. For example, Stephen S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John* (WBC, 51; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 327-29; A.E. Brooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), 178.

82. Raymond E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB, 30; New York: Doubleday, 1982), 32, 691-92; Georg Strecker, *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John* (ed. Harold Attridge; trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), xxxvii-xl; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 328, 333.

83. Brooke, *The Johannine Epistles*, 179.

3 John

In 3 John 5–6, the elder compliments Gaius for assisting the brethren or believers (ἀδελφοί) even though they were strangers (ξένοι) to Gaius. The elder insists that sending these strangers on their way in a manner worthy of God (προπέμψας ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ) is a good thing (3 Jn 6). Then, in 3 John 7, the elder describes the traveling believers whom Gaius has assisted. They went out for the sake of the name (presumably Jesus' name), and they received or took (λαμβάνω) nothing from the 'non-believers'. Finally, in 3 John 8, the elder again concludes that Gaius ought to support or help (ὑπολαμβάνω) people such as these and thereby become a co-worker with the truth.

Conversely, in 3 John 9–10 the elder condemns Diotrephes for acts of omission and commission. The elder claims that Diotrephes, unlike Gaius, 'does not welcome' or 'receive' us (οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς).[84] Hence, Diotrephes does not receive the elder (possibly a reference to the letter he has written[85]) nor the emissaries that the elder has dispatched (3 Jn 9). Furthermore, Diotrephes desires to be in a position of primacy, makes accusations against the elder and his followers, forbids others to receive the traveling teachers (οὔτε αὐτοὺς ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς ἀδελφούς), and puts out of the church those who do want to receive the traveling teachers (3 Jn 9–10).[86]

Thus, both the elder's description of Gaius and the elder's description of Diotrephes are clear references to the social convention of hospitality (or inhospitality) in a Christian context.[87] Moreover, these references to hospitality share a great deal in common with other references to Christian hospitality that we have seen throughout this chapter.

First, in 3 John the author provides us with another picture of the use of traveling teachers or prophets in the early church (cf. Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; *Did*. 11-12; Ignatius, *Eph*. 7.1; 9.1; Hermas, *Mand*. 11.12) and particularly in the Johannine community.[88] Here, they have been sent out by an authority figure (the elder) in order to bring a message to the Christians in a separate Christian community. As a result, the elder's comments

84. Margaret M. Mitchell, '"Diotrephes Does Not Receive Us": The Lexicographical and Social Context of 3 John 9-10', *JBL* 117 (1998) 299-320. Against the consensus of the last century, Mitchell convincingly argues that the ἐπιδέχομαι phrases in 3 Jn 9-10 should be translated in a parallel fashion. See also Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 109.

85. For example, Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (HTKNT, 13/3; Freiburg: Herder, 1970), 326; Brown, *The Epistles of John*, 716; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 353; Talbert, *Reading John*, 12-13; and Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 106-107.

86. Mitchell, '"Diotrephes Does Not Receive Us"', 299-320.

87. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 92-112.

88. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, 32, 691-92; Strecker, *The Johannine Letters*, xxxvii-xl; and Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 348, 350-51.

simply reinforce for us the prominence of this practice in the first and second centuries of the Common Era.

Yet, the elder does not elaborate upon the message of these traveling teachers. Instead, the elder argues that potential hosts should extend hospitality to them because their actions show them to be upright (3 Jn 6–8, 11). For instance, the traveling teachers go out for the sake of the name, and they accept nothing from non-believers. Thus, the objective in 3 John is similar to the objective in 2 John. In both letters, the author is distinguishing between 'worthy and unworthy travelers'.[89] However, whereas 2 John provides a theological criterion for determining who is worthy of hospitality, 3 John seems to provide ethical criteria for making this determination.

In addition, at least within the Johannine community, traveling missionaries who accept hospitality and provisions from unbelievers are now considered to be immoral. In the next chapter we will see that when Paul enters a new region in the book of Acts, he often seeks out believers for the purpose of securing hospitality (Acts 16.13; 21.4, 7, 8; 28.14). Yet, the elder has taken Paul's practice a step farther. In the Johannine Epistles, these teachers are being praised for exclusively accepting provisions and hospitality from fellow believers while they are traveling.[90] The expectation that Christian teachers and preachers will travel without provisions, however, remains consistent with the depictions of Jesus and his disciples in the gospels (e.g. Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-16; Jn 4.3-43).

Second, Gaius sent the Christian travelers on in a manner that resembles how Gaius would have sent God on if God had stopped at his home for hospitality (προπέμψας ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ). Given the use of the word προπέμπω in other Mediterranean texts, Gaius almost certainly provided the traveling missionaries material support in the form of food, lodging, and/or financial assistance.[91] Furthermore, when the elder refers to sending them on in a manner that is 'worthy of God', he appears to be drawing upon the rich Mediterranean tradition of an incognito god who seeks hospitality from human hosts. In addition, the elder's comments resemble Jesus' instructions that hosts should welcome Jesus' disciples as if they were welcoming him (e.g. Mt. 10.40).

Third, in 3 John we again see the intimate association between the character of the host and the character of the guest. Whereas in 2 John the author stresses that extending hospitality to false teachers negatively links the hosts with the evil work of the guests (2 Jn 11), in 3 John the author positively links the guests to their hosts (3 Jn 8). In 3 John 8, the

89. Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality', 147.
90. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, 713; Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, 351-52.
91. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, 711.

end result is that Christian hosts become co-workers in the spreading of Christianity when they faithfully extend hospitality to traveling preachers or teachers.

Fourth, the author criticizes Diotrephes for his unkind treatment of these same strangers. He does not extend hospitality to them or supply them with provisions. Furthermore, he has, in effect, refused to extend hospitality to the elder by refusing to extend hospitality to the elder's emissaries.

Finally, we can also be certain that the elder is referring to hospitality in 3 John because of his word usage. Semantically, we see that the author employs a variety of words and phrases that are commonly used by Mediterranean authors who refer to hospitality. For instance, we have repeatedly seen ξένος, δέχομαι, and λαμβάνω in our growing semantic field for the custom of hospitality in antiquity.

Hospitality in Non-Canonical Christian Texts

Didache

The author of the *Didache*[92] deals directly with the complications of hospitality in the early church.[93] More precisely, he or she has 'a concern to… prevent abuses of the church's hospitality'.[94] As a result, the author devotes ch. 11 to hospitality as it relates to traveling prophets and ch. 12 to hospitality as it relates to all traveling Christians.

Didache 11. In *Didache* 11 the author specifically discusses the problems that 'itinerant missionaries' or traveling teachers present for Christians who faithfully practice this custom.[95] The first portion of ch. 11 treats the content of the message of the traveling teachers (11.1-2), and the second portion treats the actions of the traveling teachers (11.3-12).

First, the author writes, 'So, if anyone should come (ἐλθὼν…ὑμᾶς) and teach you all these things that have just been mentioned above, welcome

92. Clayton N. Jefford, with Kenneth J. Harder and Louis D. Amezaga, *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 37-39. With regard to the date of the *Didache*, Jefford writes, 'No absolute date is certain, though the broadest consensus of current thought would place the composition of the text in all of its various stages between AD 70 and 150' (p. 37). Jefford then goes on to narrow the time frame to a more probable window of between AD 80 and 120 CE (p. 39).

93. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I, 307.

94. Michael W. Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999), 247.

95. Robert A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*. III. *Barnabas and the Didache* (ed. Robert M. Grant; 6 vols.; New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 170.

(δέχομαι) him' (11.1).[96] On the other hand, 'if the teacher himself goes astray and teaches a different teaching that undermines all this, do not listen to him' (11.2). The author then reiterates, however, that if the teacher contributes to the knowledge of the Lord, 'welcome him as you would the Lord (δέξασθε αὐτὸν ὡς κύριον)' (11.2).

As in 2 John, the author of the *Didache* asks the believers to evaluate the theology of these traveling teachers before extending hospitality to them.[97] If the traveling teachers teach accepted doctrine, the believers should receive them with the same degree of hospitality with which they would receive the Lord (11.1-2). Thus, we continue to see early Christians build upon Jesus' teachings about his intimate association with his followers[98] and secondarily upon the Mediterranean belief that the gods tested human hospitality.

On the other hand, if the traveling prophets espouse unacceptable beliefs, the readers of the *Didache* are instructed not to listen to them (11.2). Thus, in early Christian texts that discuss the extension of hospitality to itinerant missionaries, we continue to see a strong association between welcoming the teachers and listening to their message (e.g. Mt. 10.14). In many respects, it appears that the host's extension of hospitality to a traveling teacher was an indication that the host accepted or agreed with the teaching of the traveling teacher.

Second, in *Did.* 11.3-12 the author goes on to provide specific instructions about how to deal with the apostles and prophets that arrive (11.3). He says,

> Let every apostle who comes to you (ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς) be welcomed as if he were the Lord (δεχθήτω ὡς κύριος). But he is not to stay (μένω) for more than one day, unless there is a need, in which case he may stay another. But if he stays (μένω) three days, he is a false prophet. And when the apostle leaves (ἐξέρχομαι), he is to take nothing except bread until he finds his next night's lodging (αὐλίζομαι). But if he asks for money, he is a false prophet. (11.4-6)

Furthermore, the author instructs the believers not to test a prophet who speaks in the spirit (11.7). Instead, both the true and the false prophet will make himself or herself known by his or her conduct (11.8). For instance, any prophet who eats a meal that was ordered while the

96. In this section I am relying upon the English translation and the Greek text of Michael W. Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999).

97. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 169. Kraft contends that *Did.* 11.1-2 resemble Gal. 1.6-9 and 2 Jn 9–10.

98. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 171. Kraft links the author's logic in this section to Mt. 10.10b and 10.40.

prophet was 'in the spirit', fails to practice what he teaches, or asks for money for himself is a false prophet (11.9-12).

Here, the author of the *Didache* is asking the believers to evaluate the actions of the traveling apostles and prophets to be sure they are true apostles and prophets.[99] In particular, if the guest takes advantage of the host financially, the host can be sure that the guest does not represent the truth of the Lord. If the guest stays too long, asks for money, asks for special meals, or acts hypocritically; then the host is not under any obligation to accommodate his or her guest.

In many respects, the author of the *Didache* is minimizing the financial burden that hosting traveling apostles and prophets most surely placed upon Christian hosts.[100] For instance, the author of the *Didache* has standardized the financial commitment of Christian hosts to their departing guests. Instead of fulfilling the Greco-Roman expectation of giving departing guests valuable gifts and an abundant supply of provisions, Christian hosts are only asked to provide the traveling missionaries with enough bread for their journey. Similarly, instead of guests staying for long periods of time as we occasionally see in Greco-Roman hospitality, the author of the *Didache* prohibits traveling apostles and prophets from staying more than two days.

Didache 12. In *Didache* 12, the author addresses the problems that all traveling Christians present for Christian hosts. Here, unlike ch. 11, the author's comments do not exclusively apply to traveling apostles and prophets. As a result, the author instructs his readers that,

> Everyone 'who comes in the name of the Lord' is to be welcomed (δέχομαι). But then examine him, and you will find out—for you will have insight—what is true and what is false. If the one who comes (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) is merely passing through (παρόδιος), assist him as much as you can. But he is not to stay (μένω) with you for more than two or, if necessary, three days. (12.1-2)

The author's instructions provide us with a variety of insights. First, we continue to see that the evaluation of the guest is now a given in early Christian hospitality exchanges. Furthermore, only after the Christian host has tested the traveler will the host know whether the traveler is a true or false Christian (12.1). Second, the author continues to reduce the financial burden that is placed upon Christian hosts by this social convention. Christian hosts are only instructed to help their guests as much as they can (12.2). This vague instruction actually implies that a host is

99. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 170-71.

100. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, 66. Kraft writes, 'From all indications, the community was not (or its background had not been) particularly rich and thus was rather careful about economic matters (11.5f., 9, 12; 12.2-5; 13.1-7)'.

accountable for a varying degree of generosity based upon the financial means of the host at the time of the guest's arrival. Finally, the author mandates that guests are not permitted to stay (μένω) more than two days or a third day when necessary. Lengthy visits have been ruled out of bounds.

The concessions made by the author of the *Didache*, however, reflect a growing need for Christian leaders to address the burdens of Christian hospitality. We catch a glimpse of this need when the author of Hebrews has to exhort his audience not to neglect hospitality (φιλοξενία) (Heb. 13.2), and the author of 1 Peter exhorts his audience to be hospitable (φιλόξενος) to one another without complaint (1 Pet. 4.9).[101] However, by the time the *Didache* is composed, the author must make concessions that seek to alleviate the increased financial burden and abuses associated with such a custom. Thus, in the early church, safeguards for the hosts had to be implemented.

The Acts of Pilate

The Acts of Pilate 14–16[102] provides us with vivid pictures of private hospitality by an author who wrote well after Luke did, yet the author of this Christian document certainly understands the nuances of this social convention as it was practiced in the time of Christ. In fact, a host receives a guest on four occasions resulting in two sets of reciprocal relationships in *The Acts of Pilate*. Furthermore, one set is narrated as a double hospitality scene, while the other set implies that a double hospitality scene takes place.[103] The sequence of hospitality scenes in *The Acts of Pilate* follows an ABB'A' pattern.

A The Jewish leaders extend hospitality to the three Galileans even though they dismiss their testimony (14.12).

  B Joseph of Arimathea extends hospitality to the delegates from the Jewish leaders (15.3-4).

  B' Nicodemus extends hospitality to Joseph as a representative of the Jewish leaders (15.5–16.1).

A' The Galileans extend hospitality to the delegates from the Jewish leaders (16.4).

101. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 202.

102. *The Acts of Pilate* is difficult to date; see G.C. O'Ceallaigh, 'Dating the Commentaries of Nicodemus', *HTR* 56 (1963) 21-58 (25). O'Ceallaigh demonstrates that the range of opinion about its dating ranges from the first century to the sixth century CE. The majority of the scholars mentioned by O'Ceallaigh advocate a date in either the fourth or fifth century CE.

103. I am relying upon the English translation of *The Acts of Pilate* in Wilhelm Schneemelcher (rev. and ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992).

Last, though the author does not narrate it, the reader can deduce that the Galileans enjoyed hospitality a second time in Jerusalem from the Jewish leaders (16.4-8).

First, I will describe the relationship between the Galileans and the Jewish leaders. The Galileans are Jewish visitors to Jerusalem (14.1). They have seen the resurrected Jesus ascend into heaven, and they want to inform the Jewish leaders about this experience. The Jewish leaders, who function as Jesus' enemies (e.g. 1.1; 4.1, 4-5; 9.3) throughout the first portion of *The Acts of Pilate* (1–13), dismiss the testimony as an 'idle tale' and command them not to speak about this any more (14.2). Then, despite the fact that they dislike the Galilean testimony, the Jerusalem leaders extend kind hospitality to their fellow Jews from Galilee. They feed them and give them something to drink (14.2). Next, as they depart, they give them financial assistance for their travel expenses, and they send three men to escort them to their Galilean homes, thereby protecting them (and effectively preventing the spread of their testimony; cf. 13.3). Finally, this send off is carried out in a context of peace rather than enmity (cf. 1 Cor. 16.10-11).

Upon the departure of the Galileans, the leaders in Jerusalem discuss the topic of Jesus' resurrection though they remain firmly entrenched in disbelief (14.3). Later on, the Jerusalem religious leaders decide to hear the testimony of the Galileans a second time. So, they send the same three Jerusalemites, who had accompanied the Galileans to their home, to Galilee to retrieve the Galileans.

The three delegates first arrive and greet the Galileans with peace (ἠσπάσαντο αὐτοὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ) as we would expect (16.3-4).[104] The Galileans then return the greeting of peace and inquire about why the Jerusalem delegates have come. Next, they pray, eat, and drink together. Finally, in peace, they all return to Jerusalem. Thus, in 16.4, the author of *The Acts of Pilate* describes the relationship between the Galileans and the Jerusalem religious leaders a second time using the standard elements of hospitality in antiquity.

Finally, in 16.4-8 the author implies that the Galileans are again received with hospitality in Jerusalem. They respond to a direct invitation on behalf of the Jerusalem leaders; they come in peace to Jerusalem; and, upon their arrival, the Jerusalem leaders carefully listen to their testimony. Thus, even though the author does not narrate a hospitality scene in this last section, when the Galileans travel to Jerusalem as the

104. I am relying on the Greek text provided by Constantinus de Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2nd edn, 1876 [repr. 1966]). It should be noted in Tischendorf's text, the final sigma is not used.

guests of the Jerusalem leaders it implies that they once again receive hospitality.

The relationship between the Jerusalem leaders and Joseph of Arimathea also conforms to the custom of hospitality in antiquity. Previously, these same Jewish leaders imprisoned Joseph of Arimathea in a house and planned to kill him after the Sabbath had passed (12.1). He was gone, however, when they unlocked the door to release him (12.2).

Therefore, the hospitality relationship between the Jewish leaders and Joseph is forged despite their previous mistreatment of him. To begin with, the Jewish leaders send out their delegates in order to initiate the hospitality relationship (15.3). In all, they send seven of Joseph's friends to Joseph in Arimathea. Upon their arrival, they extend a peace greeting to Joseph as we would expect. In return, Joseph greets them with peace. Then after reading the message from the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, Joseph joyously provides them with food, drink, and a place to sleep. In the morning, they pray together, and Joseph accompanies them to Jerusalem (15.4). In all respects, this interaction in Arimathea follows the traditional form of a hospitable reception. From a hospitality standpoint, the only thing that is unclear in the scene is whether Joseph is escorting the Jerusalem delegates back to Jerusalem or whether they are escorting him.

Joseph's hospitality of the Jerusalem envoys immediately evolves into a second hospitality scene in which Joseph is no longer the host but the guest (15.4). Thus, at 15.4, the author begins to narrate the second half of a double hospitality scene. Upon his entry into Jerusalem while riding on a donkey, all the people of Jerusalem issue a greeting of peace to Joseph, and he returns the greeting. Next, Nicodemus personally receives Joseph into his house (ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν Νικόδημος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ).[105] Nicodemus throws a feast honoring Joseph as was typical in both Jewish and Greco-Roman hospitality, and afterward Joseph remains in the house of Nicodemus (ὁ δὲ Ἰωσὴφ ἔμεινεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Νικοδήμου).

The next day, Nicodemus also brings the religious leaders into his house so that they can all hear the testimony of Joseph (15.5). Upon hearing about Joseph's experience with the resurrected Lord, the religious leaders fall to the ground as dead men. After they recover, everyone eats, drinks, and departs to his own house.

Thus, *The Acts of Pilate* describes four hospitable receptions in chs. 14–16 that resemble standard hospitality relationships in the ancient Mediterranean world. In addition to the contextual elements of a traveler being welcomed into a home, we see a typical selection of Greek words to describe such a relationship.

105. Again, Tischendorf does not utilize the final sigma in his text.

A Brief Word about Later Christian Hospitality

While the majority of references to hospitality in the New Testament deal with the custom of private hospitality,[106] a dramatic shift in Christian hospitality can be detected at least by the third century of the Common Era. In particular, hospitality was placed under the authority of the bishop (cf. 1 Tim. 3.1-7; Tit. 1.5-9), and hospitality primarily became a charitable service for travelers collectively performed by entire congregations and supported with the corporate funds that were available to those congregations.[107]

For instance, Cyprian (c. 200–258 CE) represents a major turn towards the institutionalization of Christian hospitality and away from private hospitality.[108] Rather than encourage individual Christians to host travelers, Cyprian taught that either the bishop should assist travelers on behalf of the congregation using the congregation's funds, or the bishop should at the very least determine when parishioners were allowed to extend hospitality to travelers (*Ep*. 75.25). As a result, in the wake of Cyprian's leadership, it becomes evident that Christian hospitality in the West was placed solely under the authority of the bishop.[109] Eventually, the Synods of Elvira (306), Arles (314) and Antioch (341) all reinforced the authority of the bishop in the extension of hospitality to strangers.[110]

In addition, after Constantine began to favor the Christian Church in the early portion of the fourth century of the Common Era, the bishops not only had more power, but they also had significantly more financial resources at their disposal, resources which could in turn be used to expand the custom of hospitality.[111] As a result, Christian hospitality was largely transformed into a public service performed by public servants.[112] For instance, in 372 CE Basil wrote a letter to Elias the Governor of the province in which he indicated that he had recently built both a church and a hospital just outside of the city.[113] As Basil described the various

106. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 11-12; Stählin, 'ξένος', 17-19.

107. Amy G. Oden (ed.), *And You Welcomed Me: A Sourcebook on Hospitality in Early Christianity* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2001), 215-79.

108. G. Bonet-Maury, 'Hospitality (Christian)', in *ERE*, VI, 804-808 (804).

109. J. Van Paassen, 'Hospitality', in *NCE*, VII, 154-55 (154).

110. Van Paassen, 'Hospitality', 154.

111. Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2002), 26-44. See also W.H.C. Frend, *The Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1982), 163.

112. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 31. See also Christine Dorothy Pohl, 'Welcoming Strangers: A Socioethical Study of Hospitality in Selected Expressions of the Christian Tradition' (PhD dissertation, Emory University, 1993), 127.

113. Roy J. Deferrari, *Saint Basil: The Letters* (LCL; 4 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928 [repr. 1950]), II, 149.

components of the complex that he erected, he also referred to building 'hospices for strangers, for those who visit us while on a journey' (*Ep.* 94).[114]

Similarly, under the direction of John Chrysostom (347–402), his congregation built a series of hospitals, one of which was designated for hosting travelers.[115] Despite the fact, however, that John Chrysostom led his congregation to supply corporate hospitality to traveling Christians, he still reprimanded his listeners for being negligent in private hospitality.[116] For instance, John criticized his listeners for trying to avoid even meeting visitors (*Hom. Gen*. 41.8), sending them away (*Hom. Matt*. 66.3), insulting them (*Hom. Matt*. 66.3), being too concerned about who the guests were and where they were from (*Hom. Gen*. 41.10), making judgments about the guests based upon the guests' appearance (*Hom. Gen.* 41.12), and being too interested in the guests' clothes, jewelry, and cosmetics (*Hom. Gen*. 41.19).

In many respects, John Chrysostom battled the consequences of the institutionalized stage of the rise of Christianity. He was proud that his congregation had assisted three thousand widows in one year and had helped some strangers as well with his congregation's revenue; yet, John implored his congregation to extend hospitality personally (*Hom. Matt.* 66.3). John's sermons give us no reason to think that he was critical of his congregation's public hospitality.[117] He did, however, lament the absence of private hospitality. He clearly wanted to see a combination of corporate and private hospitality.

Summary of Christian Hospitality

In this chapter we have seen a variety of actions that are associated with the custom of hospitality in Christian writings. For instance, at times the host initiates hospitality with a traveler (e.g. *Acts Pil*. 14.2). On other occasions, the guest requests hospitality (e.g. Mk 14.13-15; Jn 4.7; Rom. 15.22-23, 32; 1 Cor. 16.5-6; 2 Cor. 1.15-16). Furthermore, in Christian hospitality the hosts are often bishops (e.g. 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8; Hermas, *Sim*. 9.27.2), and the guests are often traveling missionaries (e.g. Mt. 10.5-42;

114. See Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 34-35. Brown considers these *xenodocheia*, or 'hostels for travelers', to be a Christian innovation that developed in the 350s. Furthermore, Brown describes Basil's complex as 'a combined hostel, poorhouse, and hospital'.

115. Bonet-Maury, 'Hospitality (Christian)', 805.

116. Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 248.

117. Rowan A. Greer, *Broken Lights and Mended Lives: Theology and Common Life in the Early Church* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986), 130.

Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Rom. 15.22-25; 1 Cor. 9.6-14; 2 Jn 10–11; 3 Jn 5–8; 9–10; *Did*. 11–12; Hermas, *Mand*. 11.12; *Sim*. 9.27.2; *Gos. Thom*. 88).

Second, we continue to see a strong association between the identity of the traveler and the angels of the Lord (e.g. Gal. 4.14; Heb. 13.2; *1 Clem*. 10.7; 11.1) or Jesus (e.g. Mt. 10.1-42; 25.31-46; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Gal. 4.14). In addition, the host often asks the guest about his or her identity (e.g. Jn 4.12), and a guest may receive hospitality because he serves as the representative of another more prominent person (e.g. Mt. 10.1-42; 25.31-46; Mk 6.7-11; 14.13-15; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Rom. 16.1-2; Gal. 4.14; Ignatius, *Eph*. 6.1).

Third, in Christian texts, the host may put the guest up in a guestroom (e.g. Mk 14.13-15; Phlm 22). Fourth, we continue to see the standard elements of food (e.g. *Did*. 11.9-12; *Gos. Thom*. 14, 61, 64; *Acts Pil*. 14.2; 15.3, 4; 16.4) and lodging (e.g. *Did*. 11.5; *Acts Pil*. 15.3, 4). Fifth, the guest generally stays for a short period of time (e.g. Jn 4.40, 43; *Did*. 11.4-6; 12.1-2). Sixth, the host and the guest may pray together (*Acts Pil*. 15.4; 16.4; cf. Acts 21.5-6). And finally, Christian hosts routinely escort their guests to their next destination (e.g. *Acts Pil*. 14.3; 15.4), provide them with provisions for their journey (e.g. Rom. 15.24; 1 Cor. 16.6, 11; 2 Cor. 1.16; Tit. 3.13; 3 Jn 6; *Gos. Thom*. 88; *Acts Pil*. 14.3), and send them on in peace (e.g. 1 Cor. 16.10-12; *Acts Pil*. 14.3).

Regarding hospitality terminology in the early Christian writings, we continue to see a significant overlap of terminology between Christian authors and authors within the larger Mediterranean culture when they are referring to or describing hospitality. In particular, we continue to see the prominent use of the ξεν- stem among Christian writers due to its association with the stranger.[118] For instance, ξενία (e.g. Heb. 13.2) and φιλοξενία (e.g. Rom. 12.13; 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8; Heb. 13.2; 1 Pet. 4.9; *1 Clem*. 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.1, 3; Hermas, *Mand*. 8.10; *Sim*. 9.27.2) are used comprehensively to refer to the custom of hospitality. Furthermore, the ξεν- stem is employed more specifically to refer to strangers (e.g. Mt. 25.35, 38, 43, 44; 3 Jn 5-6) and hosts (e.g. Rom. 16.23).[119]

Beyond the ξεν- stem, early Christian writers also use many of the other root words and phrases that Greco-Roman and Jewish authors employ. The phrase ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς is sometimes associated with either a former guest's anticipation of a hospitable reception from an established host (e.g. 1 Cor. 16.5-6, 10, 11; 2 Cor. 1.16; 12.14; 13.1) or with the arrival of a traveler who is seeking hospitality (e.g. Mt. 7.15; Rom. 1.10, 13; 15.22, 23, 29, 32; Col. 4.10; 2 Jn 10; *Did*. 11.1-2, 4-6; 12.1-2).

118. Stählin, 'ξένος', 1; Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, I, 454-55.
119. Stählin, 'ξένος', 2; Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 71.

At times in Christian texts, ἀσπάζομαι (e.g. Mt. 5.47; 10.12; Heb. 13.2; *Acts Pil*. 16.3-4; cf. Lk. 10.4; Acts 21.7)[120] and χαίρω (2 Jn 10–11) refer specifically to the initial greeting that was issued by either the host or the guest at the onset of a hospitality relationship. Next, among others, δέχομαι (e.g. Rom. 16.1-2; 1 Cor. 16.10-12; Gal. 4.13-14; Col. 4.10; *Did*. 11.1-2, 4-6; 12.1-2; *1 Clem*. 12.3; 28.2; 54.3; Ignatius, *Rom*. 9.3; *Eph*. 6.1; Hermas, *Sim*. 9.27.2; *Acts Pil*. 15.4; cf. Lk. 10.38; 19.16; Acts 17.7; 28.7) and λαμβάνω (e.g. Jn 1.11; 5.43; 13.20; 3 Jn 8–10) are associated with the host's initial reception of strangers or travelers,[121] while καταλύω (cf. Lk. 9.12; 19.7) and αὐλίζομαι (e.g. *Did*. 11.6) are occasionally used to describe a guest's acquisition of overnight lodging.

Furthermore, early Christian writers continue to mark the entry of the guest into the host's house (εἰς τὸν οἶκον), thereby signifying the ratification of hospitality (e.g. Mt. 10.12; 2 Jn 10-11; *Acts Pil*. 15.4; cf. Lk. 7.36; 9.4; 10.5; 19.5; Acts 16.5; 21.8). Next, μένω is often employed in Christian texts when the author is referring to either the stranger's acceptance of or continuation in a context of hospitality (e.g. Mt. 10.11; Jn 4.40; 1 Cor. 16.5-8; Gal. 1.18; *Did*. 11.5; 12.2; *Acts Pil*. 15.4).

In addition, as we have seen among Greco-Roman and Jewish authors, Christian authors commonly employ προπέμπω when they are describing the guest's departure. Its use is particularly common due to the presence of traveling missionaries. As a result, προπέμπω can refer to the host's act of escorting the guests to their next destination (e.g. *Acts Pil*. 14.2; cf. Acts 20.38; 21.5), the act of providing the guests with provisions for their journey (e.g. Rom. 15.24; 1 Cor. 16.6, 11; 2 Cor. 1.16; Tit. 3.13; 3 Jn 6; *Acts Pil*. 14.2), or to the guest's departure in general (e.g. 1 Cor. 16.10-12).[122] Finally, συνίστημι is often used when a person is recommending or commending a traveler to a potential host (e.g. Rom. 16.1-2; 2 Cor. 3.1; 10.12, 18).

Summary of Part I: Mediterranean Hospitality

The preceding survey of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian hospitality has provided us with a more complete definition and description of ancient hospitality than has heretofore been constructed. At its core, hospitality is the Mediterranean social convention that was employed when a person chose to assist a traveler who was away from his or her

120. Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, I, 454.

121. Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, I, 453-54.

122. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 96. Προπέμπω is also used in political contexts to refer to the host's protection of foreign envoys (e.g. 1 Esd. 4.47; 1 Macc. 12.4).

home region by supplying him or her with provisions and protection. Furthermore, I have been able to document an overarching similarity among the actions and the typical vocabulary associated with this custom in antiquity, as can be seen in the summaries of Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

Yet, despite the similarities, we have also seen significant differences in the various cultural expressions of this Mediterranean practice. First, the various cultural subgroups had different methods of selecting their hosts and guests. In Greco-Roman hospitality, a meritorious host was expected to assist any traveler who needed assistance. Yet, in reality, Greco-Roman hosts and guests commonly selected counterparts whom they anticipated would create a personal benefit for them through the exchange of gifts and the like (e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.88-89). Alternatively, Jewish travelers typically avoided accepting hospitality from non-Jews. Instead, they generally sought out a distant family member or tribesman if possible. Finally, in early Christian hospitality, despite the fact that both Paul (Rom. 12.13b) and the author of Hebrews (13.2) appear to exhort Christians to provide hospitality to all those in need, in reality Christian hosts typically offered hospitality only to Christian travelers (Mt. 25.31-46; 1 Pet. 4.9; 2 Jn 10–11; 3 Jn 5–8).

A second distinguishing feature of hospitality among the various cultural subsets can be detected in the manner in which guests reciprocated their hosts' generosity. For instance, Christine Pohl argues that Christian hospitality was not reciprocal like its Greco-Roman counterpart.[123] Even though Pohl clearly overstates the differences between Greco-Roman and early Christian hospitality,[124] she nevertheless makes a helpful observation. One can at least say that Jewish and Christian expressions of hospitality do not appear to have carried with them the same degree of expectation in regard to reciprocity as Greco-Roman hospitality did.

As I stated in the Chapter 1, the approach I have used in Chapters 2 through 4 has tremendous benefits for us as we seek to read the biblical documents. Rather than equating hospitality with only one particular action, such as serving a meal to a guest, I have sought to construct a whole range of actions that were carried out by hosts who were assisting travelers. In addition, I have sought to compile a semantic range of the terms commonly used by ancient writers who wrote about hospitality. This two-pronged approach then will help me to achieve more clarity when I attempt to read Luke's writings as the authorial audience did.

123. Christine Dorothy Pohl, *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 17-20.

124. For example, contrast Pohl's views with Dio Chrysostom's *The Hunter*.

Part II

The Custom of Hospitality in Luke and Acts

5

The Custom of Hospitality in Luke's Writings with a Focus on Acts 10–11

Our efforts to compile a list of both common behavioral components and a list of common semantic terms that are often present in ancient descriptions of hospitality will help us tremendously as we turn to Luke's writings. Luke is well aware of the social convention of hospitality. In fact, many scholars claim that hospitality is a sub-theme or motif in Luke's writings.[1] It certainly is not hyperbole to claim that Luke provides us with the clearest pictures of hospitality in the New Testament. Furthermore, many of Luke's depictions of this custom are found only in Luke. As a result, I will begin this chapter by demonstrating Luke's keen awareness of this social convention throughout his writings. Afterward, I will turn and examine more closely the presence of this social convention in Acts 10–11. As we will see, the interactions of Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10–11 unfold according to the expected protocol of Mediterranean hospitality. It certainly is not far-fetched to claim that hospitality provides the underlying logic of the events in Acts 10–11 or to claim that Luke knowingly describes the relationship of Peter and Cornelius as a hospitality relationship. In the end, this knowledge will help us clarify some of the conundrums in this passage and read it as Luke's audience would have.

Examples of Hospitality in Luke and Acts

There are numerous passages in Luke and Acts that demonstrate Luke's awareness of and interest in hospitality. Therefore, I will now examine a variety of Lukan passages in order to chronicle this awareness.

1. For example, Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 85, 120 n. 3; H.J. Cadbury, 'Lexical Notes on Luke–Acts III: Luke's Interest in Lodging', *JBL* 45 (1926) 305-22 (308); B.P. Robinson, 'The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke–Acts', *NTS* 30 (1984) 481-97 (481, 485-87).

Luke 1.39-56

In Lk. 1.39-56, we see that Mary benefits from the hospitality of her relative, Elizabeth. First, Mary sets out from her home and travels to another Judean community (1.39).[2] When she arrives, Mary enters the house (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον) of Zechariah and greets (ἀσπάζομαι) Elizabeth (1.40). As a result, Elizabeth's baby leaps inside of her, and she is filled with the Holy Spirit so that she can speak the truth about the significance of Mary's unborn child (1.41-45). In the end, Mary remains (μένω) with Elizabeth for three months and then returns to her own house (1.56).

Here we see a typical hospitality encounter despite the fact that we are not given any details about food or lodging. First, when Mary departs from her home town, she becomes a traveler.[3] Second, as a Jew, she does what we would expect—she seeks hospitality from her relative (συγγενής) (1.36, 40). Third, it is noteworthy that even though Zechariah possesses the house (1.40), Mary greets and remains with Elizabeth (1.40, 56). Thus, we continue to see the involvement of both men and women in Mediterranean hospitality. Fourth, Mary's three-month visit with Elizabeth is a lengthy stay when compared with most examples of Jewish and early Christian hospitality. And, finally, we see three semantic markers for hospitality in this passage: εἰσέρχομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκον, ἀσπάζομαι, and μένω.

Luke 4.38-42[4]

An abbreviated description of hospitality is also seen in Lk. 4.38-42. Jesus travels to Capernaum (4.31). Upon his arrival, he first enters the synagogue on the Sabbath where he teaches (4.31-33) and exorcises a demon (4.33-35). Then, upon leaving the synagogue, he enters the house (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) of Simon (4.38).[5] Next, he stands over and heals Simon's mother-in-law from a high fever (4.38-39). After Jesus heals her, the mother-in-law gets up and begins to serve those who are present (4.39). As the evening falls, Jesus continues to heal people and exorcise demons (4.40-41). The next morning, as we might expect, Jesus departs. Yet, interestingly, a crowd from the city searches for him and attempts to

2. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 80. Marshall provides a helpful discussion of the uncertain phrase 'πόλις Ἰούδα'.

3. Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 82. Geldenhuys estimates that Mary's trip would have taken four or five days.

4. This story is also narrated in Mt. 8.14-17 and Mk 1.29-39.

5. John Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20* (WBC, 35a; Dallas: Word, 1989), 211. Nolland points out that 'Mark's ἦλθον, "they came", becomes εἰσῆλθεν, "he entered" ' in Luke's Gospel. As a result, I would argue that Luke crafted his version of the story to follow the hospitality tradition more closely.

prevent him from leaving (4.42). Jesus, on the other hand, says, 'I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also' (4.43).

In this passage, we can take note of a variety of hospitality elements. First, when Jesus arrives in the town, he first enters the synagogue. While Jesus' purposes for going to the synagogue were most likely related to his religious devotion and his sense of mission, on a practical level we can note that Jesus the traveler finds a host at the synagogue. This fact strengthens John Koenig's argument that by the time of Jesus, Jewish travelers searched for a host primarily at the synagogue rather than in the city-square.[6] Second, when Jesus reciprocates his host's hospitality by standing over his host's mother-in-law and healing her, his actions resemble those of Elijah and Elisha when they healed the relatives of their hosts in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 and 2 Kgs 4.18-33 respectively. Third, Jesus only spends one night in Simon's house, which is consistent with many of the examples of Jewish hospitality that we have seen.

Fourth, the people of Capernaum react to this traveler in a manner that is the opposite of the way that the crowds of Sodom (Gen. 19.4-9) and Gibeah (Judg. 19.22-25) reacted to travelers in their cities. This contrast may be even more obvious in Mark's version of the story. Mark indicates that the whole city was gathered around the door of Simon's house (Mk 1.33). Yet instead of the townspeople seeking out the guest in order to abuse the guest, the townspeople are seeking out the guest in order to solicit his help. Furthermore, Luke tells us that on the next morning Jesus goes out to a deserted place. Then, when the crowd finds Jesus, they attempt to detain Jesus out of appreciation for him. Even then, the crowd listens to the traveler's objections about not wanting to be detained, rather than ignoring the traveler's objections as the Sodomites did (Gen. 19.4-9). Finally, once again, we see Luke use the phrase εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν to demarcate the establishment of a hospitality relationship.

Luke 7.36-50

When Jesus travels to Nain (7.11), he is first confronted with a funeral procession (7.11-17) and questions about John the Baptist (7.18-35). Afterward, a Pharisee asks Jesus to eat with him.[7] As a result, Jesus enters the

6. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 16-17. In addition, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 194. Marshall claims that 'the main meal of the Sabbath' would be 'served just after the synagogue service (cf. 14.1)'.

7. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, 353. Nolland joins J. Delobel, 'L'onction de Jésus par la pécheresse: La composition littéraire de Lc., VII, 36-50', *ETL* 42 (1966) 415-75, in arguing that Luke here employs 'a Greek literary genre which made use of a meal setting in the report of a discussion'. I, on the other hand, would argue that the

house (εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον) and sits down at the table (7.36). Yet, the Pharisee fails to provide Jesus with the common courtesies that come with an extension of hospitality to a traveler. Therefore, Jesus rebukes the Pharisee when he says, 'I entered your house (εἰσῆλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν); you gave me no water for my feet…you gave me no kiss… You did not anoint my head with oil' (7.44-46). Conversely, a woman in the city, who is not Jesus' host, takes over the duties that one would expect a meritorious host to perform. She bathes, kisses, and anoints Jesus' feet (7.37-38). As a result, Jesus praises her actions (7.44-47). Finally, Luke indicates that soon thereafter Jesus goes on his way (8.1).

In this passage, we discover how Jesus thinks a gracious host should act. Jesus thinks his host should have at least provided him with water so he could wash his own feet. Furthermore, Jesus indicates that a gracious host would have kissed him and anointed his head with oil.[8]

The Pharisee, however, is shown to be lacking as a host, thereby implying that the Pharisee does not value his guest as he should.[9] Conversely, this sinful woman, who is not Jesus' host, takes over and performs the duties that an ideal host should perform. In particular, her actions are consistent with the developing Jewish expectation that an exceptionally meritorious host would make sure the guest's feet have been washed.[10]

ancient custom of hospitality provides a better explanation for the similarities that Delobel and Nolland perceive between this pericope and other ancient Greek texts.

8. *Contra* Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996), 136. Tannehill contends that 'we do not have evidence that foot bathing, kissing, and anointing the head were required for normal hospitality'. If the operative word is 'required' rather than 'evidence' then Tannehill may be able to maintain his view. Yet, we have repeatedly seen bathing (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 1.309-10; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 2.22) and foot washing (e.g. Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; 1 Sam. 25.41; 2 Sam. 11.18; Tob. 7.9; *T. Ab.* 1.3; 3.7-9; *Jos. Asen.* 7.1; 20.2-4; *Sifre Deut.*, Piska 355; Origen, *Hom. Gen.* 4.2) in Mediterranean hospitality contexts, and we saw a reference to the anointing of the head with oil in Ps 23.5. For an alternative viewpoint, see Gilbert Bouwman, *Das dritte Evangelium: Einübung in die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), 153; and Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP, 3; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 129. Johnson says Simon 'violates all the rules of hospitality'. The difficulty with both Tannehill and Johnson's statements is that 'the rules of hospitality' are actually better described as cultural expectations, which are somewhat dynamic rather than static.

9. *Contra* Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT, 3-4; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1969), I, 435-36. Schürmann contends that the Pharisee's actions were technically 'correct'. While the Pharisee was missing compassion, he did not fail to meet the standard expectations of hospitality. Furthermore, Schürmann argues that foot-washing and anointing the guest's head would be considered extras rather than essential elements in a hospitality encounter. Again, I would disagree.

10. *Contra* Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 311-12. Marshall claims that 'The provision of water for guests to wash their feet after travel is attested in patriarchal times

Second, we again see a woman taking the lead in the custom of hospitality.[11] Third, the delinquent host does, at least, provide food for his host. Fourth, Jesus stays for only a brief period of time. Fifth, Luke employs the technical phrase about Jesus entering the house (εἰσέρχομαι εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) twice in this passage (7.36, 44). And finally, the Pharisee, as a host, engages in the practice of evaluating his guest. The Pharisee is attempting to determine whether Jesus is a true prophet or not. The Pharisee concludes that Jesus is not (7.39). Interestingly, as I noted in the previous chapter, later Christian hosts struggled with the task of determining whether the traveling missionaries who came to them were true or false prophets (*Did.* 11). Ironically, however, in this pericope Jesus, the guest, evaluates his host and demonstrates that the host is the one who is lacking.

Luke 9.1-6[12]

Here Jesus calls his twelve apostles together in order to commission them. He sends them out with power to travel from village to village, to proclaim the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick (9.1-2, 6). Furthermore, he forbids them from taking provisions and monetary resources for their journey that would enable them to be self-sustaining (9.3).[13] Instead, he instructs them to depend upon the hospitality of those with whom they stay and for whom they are expected to proclaim the kingdom of God and perform healings. He says, 'Whatever house you enter (εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε), stay (μένω) there, and leave (ἐξέρχομαι) from there' (9.4). Yet, Jesus also knows that his disciples will experience inhospitality at times. As a result, Jesus says, 'Wherever they do not welcome (δέχομαι) you, as you are leaving that town shake the dust off your feet as a testimony against them' (9.5).

This passage reinforces much of what was discussed in the previous chapter. First, in this passage, Jesus commissions his apostles to be trav-

(Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24), but it is not attested in Jewish literature as normal provision for guests' (pp. 311-12). Marshall seems to be unaware of Judg. 19.21; 1 Sam. 25.41; 2 Sam. 11.18; Tob. 7.9; *T. Ab.* 1.3; 3.7-9; *Jos. Asen.* 7.1; 20.2-4; and *Sifre Deut.*, Piska 355.

11. Bouwman, *Das dritte Evangelium*, 154. Bouwman argues that Luke is addressing the Christian missionaries of his day in this pericope. Bouwman thinks the Christian Pharisees of Luke's day were criticizing the Christian missionaries because they commonly accepted hospitality from recently converted women with suspect pasts. Thus, according to Bouwman, Luke wants to include a positive example of a prominent female host in his Gospel.

12. Similar accounts of this story can be found in Mt. 10.1-42 and Mk 6.7-13.

13. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 350. Marshall argues that Jesus wanted his disciples 'to avoid the appearance of other missionaries in the Hellenistic world, who made a good thing out of their preaching'.

eling missionaries who will be dependent upon those who receive them. These missionaries are not expected to secure food or lodging for themselves. Instead, they are to depend upon their hosts' hospitality. Second, Jesus wants his apostles to establish only one hospitality relationship within each community. They are not supposed to move from house to house in order to gain better accommodations (cf. Sir. 29.24).

Third, inhospitality shown to the traveling apostles appears to represent both a moral lapse as well as a rejection of the message and ministry of Jesus. These apostles are functioning as emissaries of Jesus. They carry out their mission by the authority and power that Jesus grants to them. Thus, when potential hosts reject these men, they are simultaneously rejecting the one who sent them as well as the message they bring. The rejection of Jesus, his apostles, his message, and his ministry, then, functions as a testimony against these inhospitable people (9.5). While this conclusion is only implied in Luke, it is explicitly stated in the parallel versions of this pericope in Mt. 10.1-42 and Mk 6.7-13. In both Mt. 10.14 and Mk 6.11, Jesus treats the possibility that the disciples will not be welcomed and the possibility that the people will refuse to listen to the words of the disciples conjunctively.

Fourth, when Jesus' apostles experience rejection and inhospitality, they are supposed to wipe the very dust off their feet that should have been washed off if their potential hosts had taken the appropriate actions and made sure the travelers' feet were washed (9.5).[14] Finally, we continue to see the use of traditional hospitality language in this pericope. For example, μένω, δέχομαι, and εἰσέρχομαι τὸν οἶκον are some of the most common semantic markers that we have found for the custom of hospitality. In addition, we have seen ἐξέρχομαι used to describe a guest's departure in other Mediterranean texts as well.

Luke 9.51–19.27

The Lukan Jesus begins his ministry in Galilee (4.14), where, except for crossing the Sea of Galilee, Jesus remains until Lk. 9.51. Beginning at 9.51, however, he sets his face to go to Jerusalem and thus begins a journey to Jerusalem and ultimately his death.[15] In the initial sub-unit (9.51–10.42) of the larger travel narrative (9.51–19.27), the stories and emphases appear to revolve around the idea of Jesus as a traveler who is

14. Brendan Byrne, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 84. Byrne points out that 'In Acts 13.51 Paul and Barnabas perform this same gesture on being expelled from Antioch of Pisidia'. It should be noted, however, that in his commentary Byrne primarily works with a contemporary definition of hospitality rather than an ancient one.

15. John Nolland, *Luke 9.51–18.34* (WBC, 35b; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 605.

on a journey.[16] In particular, the pericopes in the initial subunit (9.51–10.42) feature elements that are representative of the ancient Mediterranean custom of either hospitality or inhospitality. Conversely, many of the later pericopes of the travel narrative include more of a didactic focus.

Luke's emphasis on Jesus as a traveler, however, takes on an even greater significance because of the narrative context. Jesus commissions the twelve and the seventy (or seventy-two) disciples as missionaries in Lk. 9.1-6 and 10.1-18.[17] Therefore, when Jesus is portrayed as a traveling prophet in 9.51–19.27, we can perceive that Jesus and his disciples have much in common. Furthermore, both Jesus and his disciples would then have a great deal in common with the later traveling missionaries who were active during Luke's day and were dependent upon Christian hospitality for their sustenance (cf. 3 Jn 5-8; *Did*. 11). Therefore, the pericopes that allude to the social convention of hospitality in Lk. 9.51–19.27 almost surely would have been read by Luke's readers as relevant guides for their own times.[18]

Luke 9.51-56

This pericope is not an example of hospitality. Rather, it is an example of the type of inhospitality that Jesus experienced. Unlike Matthew and Mark, who show Jesus traveling to Jerusalem via Perea (Mt. 19.1-2; Mk 10.1), Luke shows Jesus taking the most direct route from Galilee to Jerusalem;[19] as he does in John's Gospel, Jesus, in Luke, travels through Samaria.

Unlike Jn 4.1-45, however, Jesus is not well received by the Samaritans. Instead, the Lukan Jesus' first interaction with the Samaritans is not a positive one.[20] When Jesus' messengers enter into a village (εἰσῆλθον εἰς κώμην) of the Samaritans, the Samaritans refuse to offer hospitality to Jesus. They do not receive (δέχομαι) him and as a result they do not come to believe that he is the Messiah. Therefore, James and John ask Jesus if they should call down fire from heaven to destroy the Samaritans, possibly recalling the way that the Lord rained down brimstone and fire from heaven upon the inhospitable inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19.24-25). Jesus, however, rebukes James and John for their suggestion (9.55). Thus, in this pericope Luke employs standard hospitality

16. R. Alan Culpepper, 'The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, IX, 1-490 (231).

17. Nolland, *Luke 9.51–18.34,* 605.

18. For example, Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 351.

19. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB, 28-28A; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), I, 824.

20. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, I, 828.

language when describing the Samaritans' refusal to extend hospitality to Jesus (e.g. εἰσέρχομαι and δέχομαι), and in many ways Luke has made a comparison between the inhospitality of the Samaritans in Lk. 9.51-56 and the Sodomites in Genesis 19.

Luke 10.1-16

Luke then follows up the theme of Jesus' rejection by the Samaritans with Jesus' commissioning of the seventy (or seventy-two) disciples who will likewise face rejection (Lk. 10.3, 6, 10-16).[21] In this passage, Jesus sends out his seventy disciples 'to every town and place where he himself intended to go'. In addition, he instructs them to depend upon the social convention of hospitality as they carry out their mission of healing and preaching (10.1, 9).[22] For instance, Jesus directs his disciples to refrain from taking any of their own provisions. He does not want them to carry a purse, bag, or sandals (10.4). Furthermore, he does not want them to greet (ἀσπάζομαι) anyone on the way to their destination (10.4).

Instead, Jesus wants them to receive their provisions from those who extend hospitality to them in part because 'the laborer deserves to be paid' (10.7). Furthermore, Jesus wants his disciples to establish only one place of lodging per community. He says, 'Whatever house you enter (εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν), first say, "Peace to this house (Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ)!"' (10.5). Then, if they find a receptive host, Jesus instructs his disciples to, 'Remain (μένω) in the same house, eating and drinking whatever they provide' while refraining from changing hosts within a community (10.7; cf. Sir. 29.24).

Likewise, Jesus instructs his disciples about what to do when an entire community extends hospitality to them.[23] He says, 'Whenever you enter a town (εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε) and its people welcome (δέχομαι) you, eat what is set before you (ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν), cure the sick who are there, and say to them, "The kingdom of God has come near to you"' (10.8-9).

Yet, Jesus must also instruct his disciples about what to do when they enter a town that does not receive them (εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς) (10.10). First, Jesus wants them to go out into the streets and say, 'Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off in protest against you' (10.10-11). Second, Jesus assures his rejected

21. Bruce M. Metzger, 'Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?', *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 299-306. Metzger provides a helpful overview of the debate about whether Jesus sent out seventy or seventy-two disciples in Lk. 10.1-16.

22. Tannehill, *Luke*, 174.

23. Tannehill, *Luke*, 175-76.

disciples that Sodom will be better off than the city that rejects them (10.12). Hence, Jesus explicitly brings the image of Sodom's inhospitality into the conversation (cf. Lk. 9.54).[24] Finally, Jesus sums up his instructions to his seventy (or seventy-two) disciples by saying 'whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me (10.16)'.

Much like Lk. 9.1-6,[25] this passage teaches us that hospitality was not always extended to every traveler in the time of Jesus or Luke. Rejection was as predictable as reception. Second, we continue to see that a hospitable reception was classified under the category of standard wages for these traveling missionaries (10.7). Third, Jesus twice instructs his disciples to eat and drink whatever their hosts provide for them (10.7-8). In this regard, Jesus' instructions are not unique. We have seen other Mediterranean writers indicate that eating whatever the host places before them is standard etiquette for a guest in a hospitality context (e.g. *T. Ab.* 4.7, 10).[26] Fourth, we continue to see that both households and entire communities could extend or deny hospitality to a person (10.5-12).

Fifth, in this instance, Jesus instructs his disciples to protest a community's inhospitality in the city streets by wiping the dust from their feet that would have accumulated during their travels. At that point, the dust functions as evidence that the townspeople have not acted properly. If they had properly received Jesus' disciples, the townspeople would have washed this dust off of their guest's feet (10.10-11). Sixth, we continue to see the social dynamic in which the reactions of households and towns to Jesus' disciples are simultaneously considered to be their reactions to Jesus himself (10.16). When these homes and towns refuse to extend hospitality to Jesus' disciples, they effectively refuse hospitality to Jesus and his message.[27] Finally, we can observe that Luke has employed a variety of standard terms associated with the custom of hospitality: εἰσέρχομαι, μένω, and δέχομαι.

24. Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 95. See also Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 168.

25. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 325. Bultmann argues that 'the missionary charges were very early or originally in a connected group'. As a result, Lk. 10.1-16 has a great deal in common with Mt. 10.1-42, Mk 6.7-13, and Lk. 9.1-6.

26. Bruce J. Malina, 'The Received View and What it Cannot Do: III John and Hospitality', *Semeia* 35 (1986) 171-94 (185). Malina cites Lk. 10.18 when attempting to chart the unspoken 'laws' of hospitality. He contends that, in part, 'the guest is above all bound to accept food'. Refusing the food that the host provides is a highly offensive action.

27. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP, 5; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 467.

Luke 10.38-42

In this pericope, Jesus again enters the village as a traveling prophet, and Martha welcomes (ὑπεδέξατο) him into her home (10.38). Martha immediately appears to be a meritorious host. Her sister, Mary, however does not attend to the duties of hospitality as we might expect. Instead of washing Jesus' feet, she sits at them and listens to him (10.39). Martha, on the other hand, stays very busy with the duties of hospitality, so much so that she petitions Jesus to instruct Mary to join her in carrying out the ideal duties of a host family that engages in the Mediterranean social convention of hospitality (10.40). In the end, however, Jesus makes it clear that he was more pleased with Mary's actions than Martha's actions (10.41-42).

Since the traveling missionaries of the late first century were carrying a message that was similar to Luke's Gospel, it would be difficult to contend that Luke's audience thought Jesus was rebuking Martha for hosting him. Instead, given the cultural customs of both Jesus' and Luke's day, Martha appears to be a virtuous host. She assists Jesus by hosting him and enabling him to spread the message of the kingdom of God (cf. Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; 3 Jn 5–8).[28] Mary, however, is doing something even better than being the virtuous host of a traveler. She actually sits at Jesus' feet and listens like a disciple.[29] She receives the message and the teaching of Jesus. For Mary, Jesus is not only a traveler, but he is a traveling missionary.

Thus, it is difficult to conclude that Martha functions as a negative example for Luke's audience. Instead, given the context of Luke 9–10, Luke's audience would have considered Martha to be a somewhat positive example for hosting traveling missionaries. Yet, Luke's audience would have also realized that Martha was being redirected. Martha was right to have welcomed Jesus, but when the duties of hospitality prevent her from hearing Jesus' message the custom has then become an obstacle.[30] Therefore, Luke's audience most likely would have concluded that they should receive the traveling missionaries, but that they should also spend more time listening to their message than providing Homeric-style hospitality.[31] Christian hosts should not become consumed with the duties of hospitality and thereby neglect the message of the kingdom.

28. Nolland, *Luke 9.51–18.34,* 605.

29. Culpepper, 'The Gospel of Luke', 231.

30. Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 103. Byrne claims, 'Martha has gone overboard in the duties of hospitality' (p. 103).

31. Erling Laland, 'Die Martha-Maria-Perikope Lukas 10, 38-42: Ihre kerygmatische Aktualität für das Leben der Urkirche', *ST* 13 (1959) 70-85 (84-85). Laland relies upon Cyril of Alexandria's interpretation to argue that Lk. 10.25-37, 38-42, and 11.1-5 form a three-pronged address to the early Church. Collectively, these three pericopes

Luke 19.1-10

In this pericope, Jesus is once again on the move. He enters the city of Jericho and is passing through (διέρχομαι) it (19.1). When Jesus arrives at the tree that Zacchaeus has climbed, he says, 'Zacchaeus, hurry (σπεύδω) and come down; for I must stay (μένω) at your house (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου) today' (19.5). As a result, Zacchaeus hurries (σπεύδω) down and happily (χαίρω) welcomes (ὑποδέχομαι) Jesus (19.6). The crowd then grumbles because Jesus entered (εἰσέρχομαι) in order to become the guest (καταλύω) of a sinner (19.7). Then, after Zacchaeus vows to give a significant portion of his money to the poor, Jesus declares that Zacchaeus is a son of Abraham (19.9). Finally, Jesus departs from Jericho and concludes his journey when he arrives in Jerusalem (19.28).

We see a variety of interesting elements in this hospitality encounter. First, we continue to see that it is appropriate for a traveler to request hospitality from a potential host. Second, Zacchaeus's actions may actually remind us of Abraham's exemplary actions in Genesis 18 as well as the later interpretations of Genesis 18, which I chronicled in Chapter 3. For instance, after Jesus accepts hospitality in Zacchaeus's house, he pronounces that 'salvation has come to this house (τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ)', Jesus then provides his rationale for his statement. It is because Zacchaeus has shown himself to be 'a son of Abraham' (19.9). Furthermore, Zacchaeus moves quickly and receives Jesus joyfully. As we saw in Chapter 3, Abraham is often described as moving quickly and receiving his guests joyfully (e.g. Gen. 18.6-8; Philo, *Abr*. 109; *QG* 4.8; Origen, *Hom. Gen*. 4.1). Hence, while Luke's audience may have taken the reference to Abraham in any number of ways, given the notoriety of Abraham's hospitality in Luke's day and given Zacchaeus's extension of hospitality to Jesus, it would have been reasonable for Luke's audience to surmise that Zacchaeus's hospitable actions were responsible for making him a 'son of Abraham'.

Third, we continue to see bystanders evaluating the character of either the host or the guest based upon the host's or guest's counterpart in a hospitality relationship (cf. Achilles Tatius 8.8.11). In this case, the bystanders appear to be critical of Jesus because the host he has selected is a sinner (19.7). Fourth, we can see that at least to some degree, Zacchaeus welcomes not only Jesus but also Jesus' message.[32]

instruct early Christians to take a balanced approach with traveling missionaries; they should extend hospitality to the traveling missionaries, but their actions should also be characterized by restraint and balance.

32. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 285. In addition, see David Lertis Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* (JSNTSup, 123; Sheffield:

For instance, as a result of welcoming Jesus, the traveling prophet, Zacchaeus makes significant lifestyle changes (19.8). Finally, Luke employs a variety of the semantic markers that are often used when referring to hospitality (e.g. μένω, δέχομαι, εἰσέρχομαι, and καταλύω).

Luke 24.28-31

This scene takes place after Jesus' resurrection as two of Jesus' followers are leaving Jerusalem and traveling to the village of Emmaus. It is unclear whether they live in Emmaus or have family in Emmaus, but it is clear that they have already secured some type of home or lodging in Emmaus.[33]

Jesus then enters the picture as an unidentified stranger who travels along with these two disciples (24.15-16). For instance, Cleopas describes Jesus as one who is visiting (παροικέω) Jerusalem (24.18). Then, as they approach the village, Jesus acts as if he will travel farther (24.28). The disciples, however, extend hospitality to Jesus. They urge (παραβιάζομαι) Jesus to stay (μένω) with them (24.29). As a result, Jesus goes in to stay (εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι) with them (24.29), and he is seated (κατακλίνω) at a table so that he can eat bread with his hosts (24.30). Yet, when Jesus takes, blesses, breaks, and gives the bread to his hosts, the two disciples realize that the incognito stranger is actually Jesus (24.30-31). Simultaneously, Jesus vanishes (24.31), and the hospitality encounter ceases. The disciples then continue to reflect upon Jesus' incognito visit with amazement and excitement (24.32-35).

At this point, Luke's audience almost surely would have interpreted this passage in light of the larger, Mediterranean hospitality tradition. For instance, when Luke's audience heard this story they likely compared Jesus' visit to Emmaus with the Jewish notion that Yahweh or his angels occasionally visited humans (Gen. 18.1-21; 19.1-23; Tob. 5.4; cf. Heb. 13.2; Gal. 4.14),[34] or even the Greco-Roman notion that the gods or their representatives often visited humans (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 17.483-87; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.212-15; 8.688-90).

Second, the appearance that Jesus will continue on his way until the urging (παραβιάζομαι) of the disciples convinces him otherwise is consistent with some of the Jewish accounts of hospitality[35] that I discussed in

Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 70. Matson contends that 'Jesus is functioning in his proto-typical role as missionary to the house'.

33. Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 5th edn, 1922 [repr. 1953]), 556.

34. For example, Robinson, 'The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke–Acts', 485. Robinson concludes that that Luke was influenced by Gen. 18–22 when he penned Lk. 24.

35. Nolland, *Luke 9.51–18.34*, 1205.

Chapter 3. For instance, in Genesis 19, when Lot asks the two angels to turn aside into his house, the angels resist his offer (Gen. 19.2). Therefore, Lot has to urge (καταβιάζομαι) them again to enter his house before they will do so (Gen. 19.3). In Judg. 19.19-20, the Levite is prepared to stay in the town square, but the old man has to persuade him to accept hospitality in his home. Also, in Acts 16.15, Lydia has to persuade (καταβιάζομαι) Paul and his associates to accept hospitality in her house. Hence, it appears that meritorious guests often refused the initial offer of hospitality until they could judge whether the potential hosts sincerely wanted to entertain them.

Third, in Lk. 24.28-31, we continue to see the standard features of a traveler, an invitation to the traveler, the seating of the guest, and food. And finally, Luke employs a variety of Greek words that have been consistently used by authors who describe hospitality encounters (e.g. παροικέω, μένω, and εἰσέρχομαι). Thus, when Luke writes about Jesus approaching as a disguised traveler who later reveals his divine identity, he is not discussing a novel idea. Instead, Luke narrates the Emmaus story with many of the well-known features of hospitality scenes from antiquity.

Acts 16.11-15

In this 'we-passage',[36] when Paul and his companions arrive in Philippi they encounter Lydia on the Sabbath (16.11, 14). Upon hearing the gospel, Lydia and her household are baptized (16.15). After her baptism, she urges Paul and his companions to stay in her home. She says, 'If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come and stay at my home (εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε)' (16.15). In addition, Lydia prevails (παραβιάζομαι) upon Paul and his companions to stay with her, and they do so (16.15).[37] Finally, after a short imprisonment, Paul and Silas once again return to Lydia's home (εἰσῆλθον πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν) before leaving Philippi altogether (16.40).

In this brief passage, we see a variety of interesting details that are relevant for a discussion of early Christian hospitality. First, we continue to see some of the common hospitality terms that we have been tracking (e.g. εἰσέρχομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκον and μένω). Second, Lydia is an example of a prominent female host in a Gentile context. Thus, we continue to see a shift from the dominance of male hosts in archaic Greek civilizations to a more active role of women in the Hellenistic period. Third, this text

36. For a helpful discussion of the 'We-Passages' in Acts, see Colin J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. Conrad H. Gempf; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 308-64.

37. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 293. Johnson points out that παραβιάζομαι is used in a similar fashion in Lk. 24.29; LXX Gen. 19.3, 9; and LXX 2 Kgs 2.17.

provides us with another example in which a host offers a traveler hospitality on the Sabbath (cf. Lk. 4.38-42), thereby once again strengthening Koenig's assertion that in Jewish contexts hosts often assist travelers on the Sabbath.[38] Fourth, this passage chronicles the first occasion in which Paul accepts hospitality from a Gentile.[39]

Finally, when Lydia urges Paul and his companions to accept hospitality in her home, she provides a rationale. She begins her invitation with the preface, 'If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord…' (16.15). Hence, Lydia prefaces her invitation with an allusion to Paul's evaluation of her worthiness to be his host. In this case, the question of worthiness revolves around Lydia's faithfulness to the Lord. Yet, Lydia's preface further illustrates for us the dynamic in which an ancient traveler would at times evaluate the character of the host before accepting hospitality from that person (cf. Mt. 10.11-13).[40] In part, this dynamic was necessary because, as we have seen, bystanders repeatedly judged the moral character of the host and the guest to be roughly equivalent (e.g. Achilles Tatius 8.8.11).

Acts 21.3-6

This we-passage is another brief, yet typical account of early Christian hospitality. When the ship that Paul and his companions are traveling in lands at Tyre (Acts 21.3), Paul and his companions first seek out the disciples (μαθηταί) who live in Tyre (21.4). Upon finding them, they stay (ἐπιμένω) with them for seven days. Then, after seven days, Paul and his companions leave and proceed on their journey. As they depart (ἐξέρχομαι), however, all of the disciples in Tyre, including wives and children, escort (προπέμπω) Paul and his companions outside of the city (21.5). Before parting, everyone kneels, prays together, and says farewell (Acts 21.5-6; cf. *Acts Pil*. 15.4; 16.4).

In this pericope, we see that Paul not only accepts hospitality from a convert like Lydia, but Paul actually seeks out believers upon arriving in a city in order to locate a Christian host. Again, this resembles the traditional Jewish practice of seeking out a relative or a kinsperson upon arrival in a foreign community, and it also appears to foreshadow the later development of Christian missionaries exclusively accepting hospitality

38. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 16.

39. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 587. Fitzmyer writes, 'Paul and his companions sojourn in the house of Lydia; thus Jewish Christians accept the hospitality of a Gentile Christian host. Luke depicts Paul doing what Peter has done (Acts 10)'.

40. In Mt. 10.11-13, the Matthean Jesus instructs his disciples to enter the house of whomever the disciples find to be worthy (ἄξιος) in a community.

from other Christians (e.g. 3 Jn 7). A common belief in Jesus as Lord now appears to have replaced the Jewish criteria of tribal relationships.

Second, in this passage we also see the hosts escorting their guests out of town at the conclusion of the hospitality encounter. Furthermore, the actions of the hosts correlate closely with the traditional Mediterranean pattern for sending guests on their way. We see that the whole community of disciples actually walks Paul and his companions outside of the city. Then, when they part they pray together and say farewell. Although these Christian hosts are praying to the same Lord whom Jesus addresses as Father, their act of petitioning for divine assistance is not an entirely new development in Mediterranean hospitality. We have seen hosts and guests pour libations to the gods and pronounce blessings upon one another just before the guests depart in other Mediterranean texts (e.g. Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.6-8). Finally, we see the familiar semantic markers of μένω, ἐξέρχομαι, and προπέμπω.

Acts 21.7-16

Here we see two more brief yet typical extensions of hospitality in the we-passages of Acts. First, Paul and his companions arrive at Ptolemais (21.7). When they arrive, they greet the believers (ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφούς) and stay (μένω) with them for one day (21.7).[41]

This first hospitality encounter, which is narrated in one verse, again shows us that Paul sought out and requested hospitality from believers when possible. Second, in Christian hospitality we continue to see an association between the word ἀσπάζομαι and the initial request or reception of hospitality (cf. Lk. 10.4). Similarly, μένω has a prominent position in Luke's writings when he is referring to a guest staying in a host's home.

On the next day, Paul and his companions arrive in Caesarea. When they arrive, they go into the house of Philip (εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου), the evangelist, and they stay (μένω) with him (21.8). Next, Luke tells us that Philip has four unmarried daughters who have the gift of prophecy; Luke does not, however, provide us with any additional information about them (21.9). What Luke does tell us is that Paul and his companions stay (ἐπιμένω) with Philip for several days (21.10). Then, when it is time for Paul to depart, he readies himself and sets out (21.15). Some of the disciples in Caesarea, however, accompany (συνέρχομαι) Paul to his next destination. In fact, they lead (ἄγω) Paul to the house of

41. For example, Ben Witherington, III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 632. Witherington argues that Luke is referring to believers when he uses ἀδελφός. See also Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 464.

Mnason, who is also a disciple, so that Paul and his companions can be hosted (ξενίζω) by Mnason (21.16).

In this pericope, we again see Paul seeking out believers when he needs hospitality. Second, we can see that lengthy visits ('several days', 21.10) were not considered to be inappropriate at this stage in the development of early Christian hospitality. Third, we see that hosts not only escorted the guest out of town, but they occasionally helped the guest find a hospitable reception at the next stop on his journey.[42] We saw this same dynamic in the *Odyssey* as well (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 3.325-27, 368-70, 475-86). Moreover, Paul's hosts send an escort with him as a way of protecting him until he has passed through the region.[43] Finally, Luke employs typical hospitality terminology in this pericope (e.g. μένω, εἰσέρχομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκον, and ξενίζω).

Acts 28.1-10

Acts 28.1-10 is another we-passage that chronicles the hospitality that Paul experiences. This episode begins as Paul is being transported to Rome. The ship in which he is traveling is shipwrecked (27.33-44). Yet, Paul and those traveling with him arrive safely on the island of Malta (28.1), where the natives (βάρβαροι) show kindness (φιλανθρωπία) to Paul and his co-travelers (28.2). First, the natives build a fire so that the wet and cold shipwreck victims can warm up (28.2). At that point, however, a snake bites Paul's hand (28.3). Immediately, the natives surmise that the gods are punishing Paul for being a murderer (28.4).[44] Yet, once the natives see that nothing bad happens to Paul as a result of the snake bite, they then conclude that Paul must be a god (28.5-6).[45] In essence, they surmise that he must be an incognito god who has arrived as a stranger.

Consequently, the leading man of the island, Publius, receives (ἀναδέχομαι) and extends kind hospitality (φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν) to Paul for three days (28.7).[46] While staying with Publius, Paul then heals Publius's sick

42. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 373.

43. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 635.

44. Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 221-22. Talbert provides a discussion about ancient conceptions of divine judgment as enacted through the elements of nature and animals.

45. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 779. Witherington thinks that Luke includes this information, in part, to link it with Lk. 10.18-19 where Jesus provides his followers with authority to walk over snakes and scorpions.

46. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 463. Johnson points out that the adverb φιλοφρόνως is also associated with hospitality in 2 Macc. 3.9; *Letter of Aristeas* 183; and Josephus, *Ant.* 11.340. Also Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 783, unnecessarily concludes that all 276 people mentioned in Acts 27.37 received hospitality from Publius. I, however, have discussed instances in which only a portion of the larger group actually enters into a hospitable abode, thereby preventing the host from being burdened (e.g. Achilles Tatius 8.7.2).

father from his fever and dysentery (28.8). Afterward, Paul heals many other people from their diseases (28.9). Furthermore, during Paul's visit, the natives bestow many honors (οἳ πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς) upon Paul and his companions. And finally, when it is time for Paul and those with whom he is traveling to depart, the natives put on board all the provisions they need (28.10).

This narrative account also provides us with many insights into Mediterranean hospitality during the time that Luke is writing. Here, we clearly do not have an account of Christian hospitality, but we do have an exemplary expression of hospitality by those who have not yet been reached by the gospel. Second, we see that Luke and most likely Luke's audience are well aware of the tradition that gods sometimes appear as strangers in need of hospitality. Luke only provides a brief explanation that the natives deemed Paul to be a god because he survived the snake bite. Luke, however, does not need to say more about why the natives would have jumped to such a conclusion. Luke's audience would have been well aware of the belief that traveling strangers sometimes turn out to be incognito gods.

Third, after the natives deduce that Paul is a god, it is the leader of the natives that extends hospitality to Paul.[47] This also is a familiar element in Mediterranean hospitality. We have seen the leader of the people function as the primary host in antiquity in numerous places. For instance, in the *Odyssey*, the Phaeacian king functions as Odysseus's official host (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 11.347-53).[48] This concept also manifests itself in early Christianity when the bishops take on a leading role in the extension of hospitality to strangers, as we saw in the previous chapter.

Fourth, Paul reciprocates the kindness of his host when Paul heals his host's father, and he reciprocates the kindness of the people of Malta in general when he heals their diseases.[49] This is not unusual either. We have seen the connection between hospitality and healing in other passages as well (e.g. Lk. 4.38-42; 9.1-6).

Fifth, upon Paul's departure, the natives provide Paul and his fellow travelers with provisions for their journey. Sixth, it should be noted that Paul does not stay in Publius's house for the entire length of his stay in Malta. Paul only stays in Publius's house for three days (28.7),[50] whereas

47. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 776. Witherington debates whether Publius was the chief official of the island or the chief benefactor of the island.

48. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 102.

49. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 776.

50. Robinson, 'The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke–Acts', 493. Robinson unnecessarily argues that Paul's three days in the home of Publius is an intentional echo of 'Jesus' three days in the sepulcher' at the end of the Gospel of Luke. Robinson,

he and his fellow travelers are on the island for three months (28.11). Thus, it appears that at some point, a guest may transition from the hospitality of a host to some other status, perhaps the position of being a self-supported traveler who is staying in the area. And finally, Luke uses many of the semantic terms that were consistently used by Mediterranean authors when referring to hospitality (e.g. φιλανθρωπία, δέχομαι, and ξενίζω).

Acts 28.13-14

After leaving Malta, Paul arrives in Puteoli (Acts 28.13). Here, Paul finds some believers (ἀδελφοί),[51] and the believers invite (παρακαλέω) him to stay (ἐπιμένω) with them for seven days (28.14). Here, we again see that Paul searches for believers, when he arrives in a new area. In addition, we see that παρακαλέω is sometimes employed by ancient writers when referring specifically to a host's invitation of hospitality.

Summary of Hospitality in Luke and Acts

Within the New Testament, Luke provides us with perhaps the most complete pictures of early Christian hospitality. Furthermore, the examples of hospitality in Luke supplement and support the picture of hospitality that was constructed in the first portion of this monograph. Yet, most importantly, these Lukan examples of hospitality provide evidence that Luke was well acquainted with this social convention and that he often referred to it using traditional Mediterranean terminology. Therefore, it is beneficial to document and summarize Luke's understanding of this custom.

In Luke's writings we again see that at times the host initiates hospitality (Lk. 7.36; 10.38; Acts 28.7; cf. Acts 10.22-23), while at other times the guest requests hospitality (Lk. 19.5; Acts 21.4, 7, 8). Second, in Acts, when Paul arrives in a new community, he specifically seeks out believers whenever possible so that he can request hospitality from them (Acts 16.13; 21.4, 7, 8; 28.14). Third, we continue to see the standard elements of food (Lk. 7.36; 10.40; cf. Acts 10.10; 11.3) and lodging (cf. Acts 10.6, 23) as a part of the custom of hospitality. While in a Judean context, Jesus criticizes his host for not kissing him (7.45), anointing his head (7.46), and

however, appears to be unaware that a three-day visit is common in Mediterranean hospitality and especially among early Christians (e.g. Jn 4.40, 43; *Did*. 11.4-6).

51. For example, Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 464. Johnson claims that 'brothers' here refers to 'the messianic movement' rather than 'fellow Jews' (Acts 1.16; 6.3; 9.17, 30; 10.23; 11.1; 12.17; 15.1, 32; 16.40).

for not providing him with water so that he can wash his feet (Lk. 7.44; cf. Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; *T. Ab.* 1.3). Fourth, we see that the character of the guest is intimately intertwined with the character of the host and vice versa (Lk. 19.7; Acts 17.7; cf. Acts 10.28; 11.3). Finally, while in a Hellenized context, Luke repeatedly shows the hosts escort ing their guests to their next destination (Acts 21.5, 16; cf. Homer, *Od.* 3.479-80; 12.301-302; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.11; cf. Acts 10.23) and providing them with provisions for their journey (Acts 28.10; cf. Homer, *Od.* 3.479-80; 12.301-302; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.11).

The Custom of Hospitality in Acts 10–11

As we have seen, the custom of hospitality is especially prominent in Luke's writings. Yet, perhaps the most important manifestations of the custom of hospitality in Luke's writings are found in Acts 9.43–11.18.[52] In these verses, Luke connects three separate and consecutive manifestations of hospitality within this one unit. Yet, the importance of the first two expressions of hospitality in this unit is not seen when they are merely examined individually. Rather, their importance is best seen when the three expressions of hospitality are examined collectively. Ultimately, as a result of Luke's tripartite reference to this custom within this one unit, Luke appears to be drawing attention intentionally to this particular social convention in Acts 9.43–11.18,[53] as well as to the third and climactic expression of this particular social convention in Acts 9.43–11.18.

Once again, in this section my intention is to treat the final form of the text by attempting to read Acts 10–11 as Luke's authorial audience would have. As a result, I will not focus upon the sources behind the text as Dibelius[54] and those who followed him have done,[55] nor will I focus

52. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 333. Witherington thinks that 'Luke has added' Acts 9.43 'to link the story with what follows in Acts 10' (p. 333).

53. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 109. Gaventa claims that Luke intends to connect Cornelius's conversion with 'the issue of *hospitality*'. Furthermore, Joseph B. Tyson in his article 'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10.1–11.18', *Forum* NS 2/2 (1999) 179-96, argues that 'repetitions in Acts appear to be signals of significance' (180).

54. Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Heinrich Greevan; London: SCM Press, 1956), 109-22.

55. For example, François Bovon, 'Tradition et redaction en Actes 10,1–11,18', *TZ* 26 (1970) 22-46; Karl Löning, 'Die Korneliustradition', *BZ* 18 (1974) 1-19; Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1989), 130-33.

primarily upon the narrator's skill, as others have done.[56] Rather, I want to read the text as Luke's first audience read it. More precisely, I want to interpret Acts 10–11 in light of the Mediterranean social convention of hospitality. I am contending that the ancient custom of hospitality provides the overriding contextual logic for this pericope. Furthermore, even though the presence of hospitality in the Cornelius story has been mentioned in recent scholarship,[57] there is a growing need for scholars to work with a more complete understanding of the custom of hospitality in antiquity such as I have provided in the first part of this study.

The Presence of Hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18

While the Gentiles have already participated in God's salvation to a limited degree (e.g. Acts 8.4-40), the conversion of Cornelius and his household in Acts 9.43–11.18 serves as the first public conversion of the Gentiles.[58] Cornelius, a Roman centurion who lives in the predominantly Gentile city of Caesarea (10.1),[59] is instructed by an angel through a vision to send for Peter, a Jewish Christian from Jerusalem (10.3-5). Consequently, Cornelius sends three of his men to find Peter and bring him back to Caesarea (10.8). Therefore, given this cross-cultural interaction between a Roman soldier and a leader of the Jewish Christians, we should not be surprised to discover the three-fold presence of the custom of hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18. At its most basic level, hospitality is a social convention that takes place in cross-cultural contexts. Cornelius and Peter begin as strangers who represent different cultures and different peoples.[60] Thus, hospitality serves as the particular avenue through which these strangers will overcome their cultural differences, thereby allowing the salvation of God to spread and allowing the Gentiles to be incorporated into the fellowship of the Church.

56. For example, Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. II. *The Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 128-45; Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts*, 86-134.

57. For example, Walter T. Wilson, 'Urban Legends: Acts 10.1–11.18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives', *JBL* 120 (2001) 77-99 (91-93).

58. For example, Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 1971), 361; Mikeal C. Parsons, 'Acts of the Apostles', in Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson (eds.), *Mercer Commentary on the Bible* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1995), 1083-122 (1100).

59. F.F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. edn, 1988), 201.

60. Ronald D. Witherup, 'Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again', *JSNT* 49 (1993) 45-66 (52-57). After Acts 10, Cornelius's name disappears from the text even though allusions to his conversion are repeated (11.3; 15.7-11). Witherup therefore argues that Cornelius functions as a comprehensive symbol for the Gentiles (p. 60).

Scene 1 (Acts 9.43–10.23).[61] Peter, the dominant voice for Christianity in the first half of Acts, is already receiving hospitality (ξενίζω, 10.6, 18, 32) from Simon the tanner who lives in Joppa.[62] Furthermore, while Peter is staying (μένω, 9.43) as a guest in Simon's house, Peter receives a vision from God as he is praying on the roof top (10.9-16). Even though he is unable to understand it at the time (10.17a), Luke eventually informs us that the Lord is instructing Peter to stop making distinctions between clean and unclean people (10.28; 11.11-18).[63] Instead, because of God's cleansing power, the Jews will no longer be defiled by associating with Gentiles.[64]

Thus, the pericope about Cornelius's conversion begins as Peter is already engaged in a hospitality relationship with Simon the tanner in Joppa. Luke's audience almost surely could not have missed this point. Three times Luke employs ξενίζω, the most obvious semantic marker for the custom of hospitality, to describe Peter's stay in Joppa (10.6, 18, 32). In addition, Luke also employs μένω to describe Peter's relationship with Simon the tanner (9.43). Similarly, the context matches the typical contexts of hospitality encounters. Peter is a traveler who is moving about the region healing people (e.g. 9.34, 40-41), causing people to believe in the Lord (e.g. 9.35, 42), and depending upon hospitable believers (e.g. 9.32) for his provisions. Thus, the custom of hospitality provides the starting point for this tripartite narrative unit.

Scene 2 (Acts 10.17-23a). At that point, Cornelius's three emissaries arrive in Joppa, ask directions to Simon's house, position themselves at Simon's gate, and ask if Peter is present (10.17-18). All of this happens around noon (10.9). Hence, the actions of Cornelius's emissaries resemble those of other travelers in antiquity. We have repeatedly seen guests ask for directions to a potential host's home (see, e.g., Homer, *Od*. 7.142-45;

61. For the sake of clarity, I will supply a generic title for each of the three hospitality scenes that are located in Acts 9.43–11.18.

62. Commentators are divided over the question of whether Simon the tanner would have been considered unclean by other first-century Jews on account of his occupation; see Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 104 and Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 179. Perhaps it is safer to conclude that the tanning business was associated with a foul odor (James D.G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* [Narrative Commentaries; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996], 130) and the lower class (Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, I, 486). Regardless, Peter's decision to accept hospitality from Simon sets up a noticeable progression within Acts 9.43–10.18. First, Peter accepts hospitality from an undesirable (and possibly unclean) Jew. Next, Peter extends hospitality to three Gentiles. Finally, Peter accepts hospitality from a Gentile.

63. Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 107.

64. Mikeal C. Parsons, '"Nothing Defiled AND Unclean": The Conjunction's Function in Acts 10.14', *PRS* 27 (2000) 263-74.

1 Sam. 9.17-18). In addition, we have seen guests position themselves at the person's gate and call inside to the potential host when necessary (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 1.120; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.56; *Jos. Asen*. 5.3-4; 19.1-2).

Simultaneously, the Holy Spirit directs Peter, who is still up on the roof (cf. 1 Sam. 9.18-27; Josephus, *Ant*. 6.49), to 'get up, go down, and go with them without hesitation' (Acts 10.19-20). Peter then begins to follow the directions of the Holy Spirit. Yet, before Peter travels to Cornelius's house, he first extends hospitality to Cornelius's emissaries. As he does so, Peter appears to follow the standard hospitality protocol, yet with appropriate caution. First, he greets the men (10.21). Next, he questions the strangers about why they have come (10.21). As we saw in Greco-Roman hospitality, the host traditionally waits until after the guest has been fed before asking about the guest's identity. Yet, we have also seen in early Christian hospitality that the questioning of the guest is repeatedly carried out prior to an official offer of hospitality (e.g. 2 Jn 10–11; *Did*. 11). Therefore, Peter's request for information from the traveling strangers appears cautious, but not unusual. Finally, after hearing the emissaries' explanation about Cornelius's vision, Peter, as opposed to Simon, invites them into Simon's house (εἰσκαλέω) and extends hospitality (ξενίζω) to them as their host (10.23).[65]

Peter's extension of hospitality to Cornelius's Gentile emissaries is noteworthy for multiple reasons. First, when Peter extends hospitality (ξενίζω) to the travelers, it is now the second example of a hospitality encounter in the narrative unit that runs from Acts 9.43–11.18.

Second, Peter's hospitable response to the three strangers is an indication of his intimate relationship with God and his Jewish ancestors. Beyond simply being obedient to the Holy Spirit, Luke portrays Peter as a pious and righteous person because he welcomes strangers. As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, even in Luke's day, Abraham was the primary example in the Jewish tradition of one who receives strangers as God desires[66] and was therefore deemed to be pious and righteous by later writers.[67] When Abraham encounters three strangers around noontime at the oaks of Mamre, he compels them to enter his tent, and he extends kind hospitality to them. Then, only after extending hospitality to them,

65. For example, Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 457. Fitzmyer also points out that Peter treats these Gentiles as guests in a home where he himself is a guest.

66. For example, Gen. 18.1-33; Philo, *Abr.* 107-18; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196-98; *T. Ab.* 1.1-8; *1 Clem.* 10.7.

67. For instance, Philo informs his readers that Abraham's hospitality (φιλοξενία) is 'a by-product of a greater virtue', which he then identifies as piety (θεοσέβεια) (*Abr.* 114-15). Furthermore, the author of the *Testament of Abraham* concludes that Abraham was pious and righteous due to his willingness to extend hospitality to strangers (1.1-6).

Abraham discovers that these three strangers are actually an anthropomorphic manifestation of God (Gen. 18).

Similarly, Peter's actions in Acts 10.23 resemble Abraham's actions. Peter, like Abraham, encounters three strangers at noontime, and he must decide whether he will entertain them or turn them away. Obviously, Peter's decision is complicated by the fact that the strangers are Gentiles. Yet, Peter has a distinct advantage over Abraham. The Holy Spirit has already informed him beforehand that God was sending three men to him (10.20). Thus, when Peter extends hospitality to these three strangers, it is not difficult to imagine that Luke's audience may have been comparing Peter's hospitality to Abraham's hospitality.

As a result, Luke's establishment of Peter's piety and righteousness along with his Abrahamic type of hospitality are all important points since Peter plays the pivotal human role in the incorporation of the Gentiles into the early Christianity community, all of which takes place in our third and climactic hospitality scene. In other words, the state of Peter's relationship with God prior to and during Peter's stay in Cornelius's house is a vitally important matter. Yet Luke decisively portrays Peter in a positive light for his readers in this portion of Acts. After Peter raises Tabitha from the dead (9.36-42), receives a vision from God (10.9-16), and demonstrates Abrahamic type of hospitality (10.17-23), surely Luke's audience would have concluded that Peter was a faithful agent of God. Surely Luke's audience would have concluded that they could trust Peter and the decisions he made while he was in Cornelius's home.

Third, when Peter receives Cornelius's emissaries, he is simultaneously receiving Cornelius himself. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, Margaret Mitchell has demonstrated that people in the Mediterranean world were expected to receive an emissary as if they were receiving the sender.[68] Furthermore, we have seen that this dynamic was clearly incorporated into the practices and beliefs of the early Christians (e.g. Lk. 10.16; Mt. 25.35, 38, 43, 44; Gal. 4.14; 3 Jn 9–10). Perhaps one of the clearest examples is found in Ignatius's *Letter to the Ephesians*. He writes, 'For everyone whom the master of the house sends to do his business ought we to receive (δέχομαι) as him who sent him' (6.1). Thus, according to both Mediterranean custom and early Christian teaching, Peter's response to Cornelius's emissaries is a precursor to Peter's response to Cornelius.[69]

68. Margaret M. Mitchell, 'New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus', *JBL* 111 (1992) 641-62 (644).

69. We can also say that Peter's response to God's emissaries is Peter's response to God since the Holy Spirit has informed Peter that the Spirit has personally sent these men to Peter (10.19-20).

Fourth, beginning with Acts 10.17, Luke describes a double hospitality scene in which the host (Peter) welcomes the guests (Cornelius's emissaries) only to see the guests' household welcome their former host as a guest at a later time.[70] This double hospitality scene is quite pronounced because the two expressions of hospitality take place within a short timeframe and therefore may be considered noteworthy.[71] By narrating a double hospitality scene in this way, the audience would almost surely perceive a pronounced emphasis upon this social convention in Acts 9.43–11.18.

Fifth, while Peter's use of Simon's home is somewhat unusual,[72] the extension of hospitality to guests by a person who himself is a guest (Peter) in someone else's (Simon, the tanner) home is not unique to Acts 10.23. Instead, we noted this same dynamic earlier. For instance, in *An Ethiopian Story* (2.21.7), Heliodorus tells us that Kalasiris, who was the guest of Nausikles, offers hospitality to Knemon while drawing upon the household and resources of Nausikles (cf. Homer, *Od*. 17.380-86). Thus, Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story* simply confirms for us that Luke is in fact describing a recognizable hospitality scene to his audience. Nevertheless, it remains logical to conclude that this rare dynamic would draw even more attention to the custom of hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18, thereby heightening the emphasis upon this social convention within this narrative unit even more.

Scene 1 Continued (Acts 10.23b). Peter's hospitality in Simon the tanner's home concludes in a typical manner as well. On the next day, when Peter departs (ἐξέρχομαι) and travels with Cornelius's emissaries to Caesarea, some of the believers from Joppa accompany Peter (συνῆλθεν αὐτῷ) (10.23; 11.12).

70. *The Acts of Pilate* 15.3–16.1 also features a double hospitality scene in which the events move directly from the host's (Joseph of Arimathea) house to the guest's (Nicodemus) house.

71. Tannehill, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 136. Tannehill claims that these passages illustrate the dynamic of reciprocity, which accompanies hospitality. Furthermore, in a previous article ('The Ancient Custom of Hospitality, the Greek Novels, and Acts 10.1–11.18', *PRS* 29 [2002] 53-72 [67-68]), I agreed with Tannehill that this double hospitality scene illustrates the dynamic of reciprocity in Mediterranean hospitality. At this point, however, I need to nuance that claim. I still agree that this double hospitality encounter provides us with an example of what Marshall Sahlins refers to as 'generalized reciprocity' in Mediterranean hospitality, but not what Sahlins refers to as 'balanced reciprocity' (see the discussion above, pp. 17-21). Thus, I would agree that it would be morally right for the guests to provide lodging for their former host at a later time, but I am no longer convinced that Peter has committed himself to a long-term, reciprocal relationship with these Gentiles at this point in time.

72. Haenchen, *Acts*, 349.

As noted above, hosts often escorted their guests out of the region and sometimes even to their next destination (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 3.325-27, 368-70, 475-86; Gen. 18.16; 1 Sam. 9.26-27; Tob. 10.10-11; Acts 21.16; Chariton, *Chaer*. 1.13.6; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.11.1). At times, the escorting of the guest out of the region may have even been linked to the host's obligation to protect his or her guest (e.g. Gen. 19.4-8; Josh. 2.4; Judg. 9.18; 19.22-24; Ps. 23.5; Acts 17.5-9, 14-15). Thus, when the believers from Joppa travel with Peter to Caesarea, they appear to be fulfilling their duties of hospitality. They travel with him in order to ensure the safety of Peter amid these Gentiles.[73]

Semantically, both Peter's stay in Joppa (Scene 1) and Peter's extension of hospitality to Cornelius's men (Scene 2) are narrated with typical hospitality terminology. In Acts 9.43, Luke says that Peter stayed (μένω) with Simon the tanner in Joppa. In 10.6, 18, and 32, Luke describes this same situation by saying that Peter was receiving hospitality (ξενίζω) from Simon. Furthermore, in 10.23 Luke says that Peter both invited Cornelius's messengers into Simon's house (εἰσκαλέω) and extended hospitality to them (ξενίζω). Hence, it is safe to conclude that Luke's audience would have perceived both a contextual and a semantic emphasis upon the custom of hospitality in Acts 9.43–10.23.

Scene 3 (Acts 10.24-48). Cornelius's reception of Peter then functions as the second half of the double hospitality encounter between Cornelius and Peter as well as the third hospitality scene within Acts 9.32–10.48. This passage also features both contextual and semantic markers that once again clarify for the reader that Cornelius and his household are first and foremost extending hospitality to Peter.

This third hospitality encounter begins when Peter arrives (εἰσέρχομαι) at Cornelius's house (10.25). Upon Peter's arrival, Cornelius greets Peter and falls down at Peter's feet to worship him (10.25). Consequently, Peter feels the need to clarify for Cornelius that he is only a mortal while raising Cornelius to his feet (10.26). As they talk, Peter then enters (εἰσέρχομαι) Cornelius's house where a large crowd has assembled (10.27).

At that point, Peter begins to speak. First, Peter acknowledges the traditional belief that it is 'taboo' for a Jew to associate himself (or herself) with (κολλάω) or to go into (προσέρχομαι) a foreigner or non-Jew

73. In Acts 11.12 these men from Joppa also function as important witnesses for Peter. See Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 82. Thus, these men also protect Peter from his Jewish critics.

(ἀλλόφυλος),[74] but God has now taught Peter otherwise (10.28). Second, Peter asks Cornelius to explain why Cornelius has sent for him (10.29). Third, upon hearing Cornelius's story (10.30-33), Peter explains the importance of Jesus Christ (10.34-43). At that point, the action shifts back to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit falls upon all those who are hearing the word (10.44). Furthermore, the circumcised believers who have escorted Peter from Joppa to Caesarea are astounded 'that the gift (δωρεά) of the Holy Spirit', is poured out on the Gentiles (10.45-46). Peter then responds by calling for these Gentiles to be baptized (10.47-48). Finally, these Gentiles invite Peter to stay (ἐπιμένω) with them for several days (10.48).

Once again, there are a variety of elements in this third hospitality scene that verify for us that Peter's visit to Cornelius's house is a somewhat typical expression of Mediterranean hospitality. First, when Cornelius sees Peter, about whom an angel has instructed him, he falls down to worship the traveler as if Peter is a god who has come to test his hospitality (10.25-26).[75] While this act of reverence resembles Jewish thought regarding hospitality,[76] it most nearly conforms to Greco-Roman thought regarding hospitality,[77] which I have described in Chapter 2.

For instance, the authors of the Greek novels, who can be loosely described as contemporaries of Luke and therefore appear to share a similar world view with Luke, clearly build upon the belief that the gods often disguised themselves as strangers and were therefore the subjects of either human hospitality or inhospitality. For example, in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Leonas and those with him assume Callirhoe is a goddess when she arrives for the first time (1.14.1). In addition, in Xenophon of Ephesus's *An Ephesian Tale* (1.12.1), when Habrocomes and Anthia disembark from their ship in Rhodes, the Rhodians gather to see them. Because of their beauty, some of the people think they are gods and worship them.

Perhaps even more compelling, though, Luke mentions this same association between strangers and gods in Acts 14.8-18 and 28.1-6. In Acts 14.8-18, after Paul heals a man, the Lycaonians shout, 'The gods

74. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 209; Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 353. Both Bruce and Witherington argue that translating ἀθέμιτος as 'taboo' rather than 'unlawful' is appropriate here.

75. Adelbert Denaux, 'The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)Hospitality in Luke–Acts: Its Old Testament and Graeco-Roman Antecedents', in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 255-79 (260-61, 263-79). See also, Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 138-39. Dunn argues that Cornelius's actions reflect 'pagan ideas about God'.

76. For example, Gen. 18-19; cf. Heb. 13.2; Gal. 4.14.

77. For example, Homer, *Od.* 17.48-487; Ovid, *Metam.* 8.611-724.

have come down to us in human form!' (14.11). As a result, Paul has to explain that he and Barnabas are mortals (14.15) in order to prevent the people from offering sacrifices to them (14.13). Moreover, in Acts 28.1-6, when Paul does not suffer any ill effects from a snake bite while in a context of hospitality, the natives on the island of Malta become convinced that Paul is in fact a god (28.6).

Thus, when Cornelius falls down to worship Peter in a context of hospitality and when Peter has to clarify that he is only a mortal, the implication is that Cornelius thinks Peter is a god or at least a divine figure. Cornelius's actions, however, are not novel. Instead, Luke portrays Cornelius as a conscientious person who is spiritually aware of divine matters.

Second, upon Peter's entrance into (εἰσέρχομαι) Cornelius's house, a crowd of both Cornelius's relatives (συγγενεῖς) and friends (φίλοι) welcomes Peter (10.27), listens to his sermon (10.44), and is baptized (10.48).[78] Thus, Luke quickly demonstrates for us that even though Cornelius initiates the welcome to Peter, many more people are involved. In this respect, Luke narrates the extension of hospitality to Peter much like a hospitality scene between a community and an individual, which we have seen before. For instance, even the Lukan Jesus makes references to contexts in which communities would either extend or deny hospitality to his disciples in Lk. 10.8-12.

Furthermore, we have seen illustrative examples of communities extending hospitality to an individual in a variety of Mediterranean literary works. For instance, John indicates that the Samaritans extend hospitality to Jesus in Jn 4.4-40, and Xenophon of Ephesus shows the Rhodians collectively granting hospitality to Habrocomes and Anthia in *An Ephesian Tale* 1.12. Therefore, when all of those gathered at Cornelius's home invite Peter to stay with them, it does not diminish our certainty that Peter is entering into a recognizable hospitality relationship with these Gentiles. Instead, when Luke emphasizes the communal nature of this hospitality relationship, it simply reinforces Witherup's claim that Cornelius functions as a symbol for all Gentiles.[79]

Third, beyond Cornelius's initial reaction to Peter, Luke is careful to point out that when Peter enters (εἰσέρχομαι) Cornelius's home he thereby ratifies a hospitality relationship and demonstrates that Peter deems Cornelius worthy of at least a modest association with him (10.27; 11.3, 12). Luke goes on to highlight the radical nature of Peter's actions

78. It is interesting that Cornelius invites both his relatives (συγγενεῖς) and his friends (φίλοι) since both of these terms are common in hospitality contexts (e.g. Lk. 1.39-56; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.6-8).

79. Witherup, 'Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again', 60.

by claiming that up to that point devout Jews were discouraged from associating with foreigners (10.28; 11.3).[80] This cautious approach to the Gentiles has been readily apparent in the foregoing discussion of Jewish hospitality in Chapters 3 and 4. In particular, we saw the Jewish aversion to accepting hospitality from non-Jews in Judg. 19.12, when the Levite refused to stop in Jebus and seek lodging among the Jebusites (cf. Tob. 5.4-9). Furthermore, we saw that early Christians apparently adopted a similar aversion to accepting hospitality from non-believers near the end of the first century of the Common Era.

I cannot, however, assume that the opposite is true. It is not clear that Jews typically refrained from extending hospitality to Gentiles in the same way that some Jews typically refrained from accepting hospitality from Gentile hosts.[81] Abraham, for example, was praised for extending hospitality to everyone. And while the events of Genesis 18 took place before the Israelites were constituted as a people group, we have seen many Jewish writers refer to Abraham's hospitality while instructing Jews in the Hellenistic period about how they should assist travelers. For instance, the author of the *Testament of Abraham* says that Abraham 'welcomed (ὑποδέχομαι) everyone—rich and poor, kings and rulers, the crippled and the helpless, friends and strangers (ξένοι), neighbors and passersby (παρόδιος)—all on equal terms did the pious, entirely holy, righteous, and hospitable (φιλόξενος) Abraham welcome (ὑποδέχομαι)' (1.2). He goes on to urge his readers to do the same.

In that same vein, it is noteworthy that Peter hosts Cornelius's emissaries even before he understands the lesson that the Spirit is teaching him. In 10.17, Peter puzzles about the vision. In 10.19-20, the Spirit

80. Talbert (*Reading Acts*, 108) clarifies that 'no specific law forbade Jews to associate with Gentiles'. Rather, this perspective was common among those concerned with upholding the purity regulations (see, e.g., *Jub.* 22.16). For a similar conclusion see C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), I, 515; and David L. Balch, 'Attitudes toward Foreigners in 2 Maccabees, Eupolemus, Esther, Aristeas, and Luke–Acts', in Abraham Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris and James W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church in its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (NovTSup, 90; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), 22-47 (42). Balch demonstrates that 'there was a spectrum of attitudes in Maccabean Jerusalem concerning relationships with foreigners'. Also see Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 457, 461. Fitzmyer draws upon both intertestamental literature and rabbinic writings to show that some Jews considered the home of a Gentile to be unclean.

81. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 208; Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 351. Bruce writes, 'For Peter to entertain these Gentiles in his lodgings was a step in the right direction, although it did not expose him to such risk of defilement as would a Jew's acceptance of hospitality in a Gentile's house'. Similarly, Witherington writes, 'It was certainly less problematic for a Jew to invite a Gentile into his house, since there would not be the problem of nonkosher food'.

instructs him to go with the men that are looking for him. Finally, after Peter arrives at Cornelius's house and listens to Cornelius's testimony, Peter understands what the vision means. Yet, long before Peter understands the vision, Peter knows it is proper to extend hospitality to travelers, regardless of their race and ethnicity. He knows this because of his Jewish heritage. Not even the Spirit has to instruct him to be kind to travelers.

Moreover, Peter's comment about Jewish relations with the Gentiles makes sense from another angle as well. We have repeatedly seen bystanders make judgments about the host or the guest in a hospitality relationship based upon the bystanders' evaluation of the counterpart. For example, the Jewish leadership in Jerusalem criticizes Peter for his host selection (Acts 11.2-3). These leaders are disturbed by the intimate contact created by Peter's acceptance of Cornelius's hospitality. This closely resembles the criticisms laid out by Thersandros against the priest of Artemis in *Leucippe and Clitophon* (Achilles Tatius 8.8.11). Thersandros impugns the character of the host (the priest) based upon his perception of the character of the guests (Leukippe and Kleitophon). Thus, by entering Cornelius's house, Peter has clearly taken the bold step of associating himself with a Gentile household. Likewise, Luke is careful to point out that Peter not only entered the house of these Gentiles, but he also ate with these Gentiles, which is likely the most serious concern (Acts 11.3).[82]

For instance, in *Joseph and Aseneth* (7.1), Joseph accepts hospitality from an Egyptian named Pentephres, but Joseph refuses to eat with his host because he is an Egyptian. Instead, Joseph's food is served to him privately. Furthermore, Joseph refuses to kiss Aseneth, Pentephres' daughter, in 8.5 because of her association with idols.[83] Peter, however, does not simply stay in Cornelius's house for a few days (10.48). Instead, Peter presumably dismisses his concerns about purity when he touches his Gentile host (10.26) and eats with him (11.3).

Thus, unlike Joseph (*Jos. Asen*. 7.1), Peter fully participates in the Mediterranean custom of hospitality, thereby giving Cornelius, his Gentile host, the respect that he was due. Finally, after entering Cornelius's home, Peter stays (ἐπιμένω) with Cornelius for several days (10.48).[84]

82. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, 210; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 197; Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 351.

83. Cited by Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 108.

84. Joseph Tyson, in his article 'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10.1–11.18', argues that 'two major problems' in Acts 10.1–11.18 draw attention to Luke's previous sources (pp. 181-82). One of the two problems that Tyson cites is the tension he perceives between Acts 10.48 and 11.3. In 10.48, we are told that Peter was invited to stay (ἐπιμένω) in Cornelius's house, while in 11.3 we are told that Peter entered (εἰσέρχομαι) and ate with a Gentile (pp. 190-91). My research on

Fourth, even though Peter has not previously known Cornelius or his household, Peter is on safe ground when he concludes that Cornelius is worthy of hosting him. Peter does not have to worry about Cornelius's character. First, Luke has already informed his readers that Cornelius's lifestyle is consistent with traditional Jewish piety.[85] For instance, he is a devout man who gives alms to the people, prays constantly to God, and obeys the commands of God (10.2-8). Moreover, Cornelius and his entire household fear God (φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν) (10.2, 4). Second, the Holy Spirit has already informed Peter that the men who approach Simon's house are from the Spirit (10.19-20). Third, Cornelius's emissaries describe Cornelius as 'an upright and God-fearing man (ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν), who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation' and whom the Holy Spirit has directed (10.22). Fourth, when Cornelius relays the message of the Spirit to Peter, Cornelius mentions that God is pleased with his prayer and his alms (10.31).

Yet, I still need to ask whether Luke's audience would have been convinced that Cornelius was worthy of his guest. In particular, would Luke's audience have seen enough evidence to convince them that the descriptions of Cornelius were accurate? Based upon our research, the answer has to be 'Yes'. As I mentioned above, both Philo and the author of the *Testament of Abraham* consider Abraham to be pious and righteous because he extended hospitality to strangers (e.g. Philo, *Abr*. 114-15; *T. Ab.* 1.1-6).

Both of these qualities are also strongly associated with meritorious hosts in the Greco-Roman culture as we have already seen. This association is best seen in Homer's *Odyssey* where Homer repeatedly associates inhospitality with a person who is unjust and hospitality with a person who fears the gods.[86] For instance, when Odysseus wakes up in Phaeacia, he asks himself, 'Are they cruel, and wild, and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι)? Or are they kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)?' (6.119-21). Odysseus articulates the same

hospitality in antiquity, however, has demonstrated that the differences in vocabulary and behavior between 10.48 and 11.3 would not have represented a discrepancy to an ancient audience. First, we have not seen a hospitality encounter in which the guest either does not eat a meal or where it is not at least implied that the guest ate a meal. Second, we have repeatedly seen Mediterranean authors, including Luke, use μένω and εἰσέρχομαι interchangeably to indicate that a traveler has accepted hospitality from a host. Hence, the differences between 10.48 and 11.3 are not convincing proof of multiple sources or redactions.

85. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, I, 493; Tannehill, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 133; Johannes Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (rev. William F. Albright and C.S. Mann; AB, 31; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), 93.

86. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 149.

question when he arrives in the land of the Cyclopes. He wonders 'whether they are cruel, and wild, and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι), or whether they are kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)?' (9.175-76). When he arrives at Ithaca, Odysseus asks for a third time, 'Are they cruel, and wild, and unjust (οὐδὲ δίκαιοι)? Or are they kind to strangers (φιλόξεινοι) and fear the gods in their thoughts (σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής)?' (13.200-202). Finally, when Alcinous, the king of the Phaeacians, questions Odysseus about his identity and his experiences, Alcinous uses these same phrases once again to ask about the kinds of people that Odysseus has encountered while traveling (8.573-76). As a result, I concluded in Chapter 2 that Homer weds the act of fearing the gods with the act of showing hospitality toward humans.

Consequently, when Cornelius obeys the Spirit, bows down before Peter as if Peter is a god, and extends hospitality to these strangers, Cornelius demonstrates that he is in fact a righteous and God-fearing man. As a result, Luke's audience would have been able to draw upon Luke's narrative skill as well as typical Mediterranean values to conclude that Cornelius is a worthy host. In effect, the only question about Cornelius's qualifications as a host arises from his status as a Gentile, and the Holy Spirit has addressed that concern already.

Fifth, Luke highlights the exchange of stories or testimonies between Cornelius and Peter (10.28-29, 30-33, 34-43). They both explain the events that have led to their actions, which have resulted in this hospitality encounter. Here again, their behavior conforms to the typical behaviors that are associated with the custom of hospitality as previously documented.

The commonplace of asking questions and listening to reports about the stranger's identity, travels, and intentions is readily apparent in the texts I have surveyed in this project. For instance, in Homer's *Odyssey*, both the king and queen of the Phaeacians question Odysseus about his identity and business in their region. This questioning then provides Odysseus with an opportunity to tell his story (7.236-39; 8.548-86; 9.1–11.332; 11.385–12.453). In Xenophon of Ephesus's *An Ephesian Tale*, Aegialeus gladly takes Habrocomes in and treats him as a son (5.1-2). The two become great friends and tell their stories to each other. In Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon*, both Sostratos and Kleitophon tell their respective stories upon the priest's request (8.4-7). Finally, in Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story*, when Knemon and Kalasiris first meet, both men ask the other to tell their stories or travels (2.21.4–23.5).

In Acts 10.1–11.18, the exchange of stories between the guest and the host plays a significant role. It allows Peter to be sure that the three strangers who arrive at Simon's door are in fact the strangers about

whom the Holy Spirit has informed him (10.21-22). It allows Cornelius to relate his encounter with God's angel to Peter (10.29-33a). And, most importantly, Peter delivers his sermon about salvation through Jesus Christ to the Gentiles in the guise of the typical questions and answers that are an integral part of the custom of hospitality (10.33b-43).

Sixth, Cornelius's household is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (10.47-48). This is not a surprising outcome given that Peter and Cornelius's household are engaged in a hospitality relationship. In fact, the guest often identifies with the host's god in Greco-Roman hospitality. For instance, in *An Ephesian Tale* Habrocomes and Anthia worship the local deity, Helius (1.12.2). In *Daphnis and Chloe*, Daphnis agrees to stay overnight with Chloe's family so he can join them in a sacrifice to Dionysus the next day (3.7-11). In *An Ethiopian Story*, Knemon and Kalasiris make a libation to the regional god (2.22-23). And, in 5.12.3–5.13.1, Kalasiris and his friends join Nausikles in a sacrifice to Hermes whom Nausikles considers to be his patron god.

In Acts 10.48 we see a similar dynamic, but with one significant alteration. As opposed to the novels, the hosts (Cornelius's household) identify with the guest's (Peter's) God. Thus, from the moment that Cornelius's emissaries enter into Peter's hospitality in Joppa, the authorial audience may have realized that Luke was using the standard associations with the custom of hospitality to heighten his foreshadowing of the Gentile conversion. It was simply a matter of time before they identified with Peter's God.

Finally, in Acts 10.24-48 Luke employs many of the commonplace hospitality terms while narrating this scene. First, Peter is clearly being asked to come into Cornelius's house (εἰς τὸν οἶκον) (10.22). In 10.27, Peter enters (εἰσέρχομαι) Cornelius's home (see also 10.25; cf. 10.28). Also, in 11.12, Luke uses the most complete phrase to say that Peter went into the house of Cornelius (εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀνδρός; cf. Gen. 19.3). Last, Cornelius's household asks Peter to stay (ἐπιμένω) with them (10.48).

The Importance of Hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18

As I have demonstrated above, in Acts 9.43–11.18 Luke repeatedly and explicitly refers to the custom of hospitality while narrating a radical change in the theology and praxis of the early Church. More precisely, Luke narrates three consecutive hospitality encounters within these verses, the second of which is carried out by a host who is not even in his own home. As a result, the custom of hospitality itself takes on an important and noticeable role in the theology and message of Acts 10–11. So, at this point, I need to address how the presence of the custom of hospitality in Acts 10–11 impacts the overall message of Acts 10–11.

Past Research. Unfortunately, the connection between hospitality and the message of Acts 10–11 has been largely overlooked despite some helpful observations by a handful of scholars. For instance, Beverly Roberts Gaventa points toward a fruitful path of inquiry in her treatment of Acts 10–11 in *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. Over against Dibelius's thoughts about pre-Lukan sources she writes,

> The narrative that stands in Acts 10.1–11.18 was written entirely by Luke and reflects his concerns at every point. These concerns are several, but one that is overlooked as a result of Dibelius's work is the connection between the conversion of Cornelius and the issue of *hospitality*, the sharing of food and shelter between Jews and Gentiles. By means of the issue of hospitality, Luke demonstrates that the conversion of the first Gentile required the conversion of the church as well.[87]

Hence, Gaventa helpfully links the custom of hospitality with Cornelius's conversion as well as later Jewish and Gentile relations. Yet, the scope of her work does not require her to define hospitality fully nor to pursue her comments further.

In addition, John Koenig makes some helpful observations in his monograph, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission*. While discussing the importance of hospitality in Luke's writings, Koenig writes, 'Luke highlights hospitality in order to help residential believers, whose faith and life are centered in house church communities, take their rightful place alongside itinerant prophets in the worldwide mission initiated by Jesus'.[88] Koenig goes on to say that Luke 'presses for a partnership in ministry by means of which both wanderers and residents, who may be estranged from one another, can join forces to advance the gospel'.[89] Hence, Koenig makes a helpful observation when he links the custom of hospitality in Luke's writings with Luke's message for his audience. According to Koenig, Luke is instructing his readers to practice hospitality as a way of participating in the spread of the gospel (cf. 2 Jn 11; 3 Jn 8). Yet, despite Koenig's insightful reading of Luke's writings, the scope of Koenig's work does not allow him to discuss Acts 10–11 at any significant length.

Finally, John Mathews in his dissertation, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study', also connects the custom of hospitality and the ministry of the early church. He writes,

> There is found an intimate connection between the Gospel which she so ardently proclaimed and the hospitality which she so extensively practiced. This close association of the two was neither accidental nor arbitrary.

87. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 109.
88. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 86.
89. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 103.

> Ultimately it was rooted in the Church's understanding of God's redemptive work in Christ as an act of divine hospitality.[90]

Mathews's comments are significant because he not only links the practice of hospitality with the ministry of the early church, but he also links it with the work of God.

As a result, I will pick up where Gaventa, Koenig, and Mathews left off. In particular, I want to ask, 'What theological and practical significance did the custom of hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18 have for Luke's authorial audience?' I will begin by discussing the theological aspect of this question.

Theological Import. Given the Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian texts that we have examined in the first portion of this project, the theological impact of Acts 10–11 upon Luke's audience could have been quite significant. While on the surface a hospitality relationship appears to have been forged between Peter and Cornelius, a closer reading of the text as well as a re-examination of Mediterranean thought about the custom of hospitality point toward a different theological conclusion. It is quite logical to surmise that, after reading Acts 10–11, Luke's audience would have concluded that God had personally extended hospitality to the Gentiles gathered at Cornelius's house; Peter only functions as God's representative.

In the end, Peter might be best described as God's emissary to Cornelius. For instance, God and Cornelius are engaged in a relationship prior to any mention of Peter. Cornelius has been routinely praying to God (10.2), and God has sent an angel to Cornelius instructing him to send for Peter, whom Cornelius presumably does not know (10.3-6).[91]

In addition, God has provided Peter with a vision (10.9-16) and instructions from the Holy Spirit (10.19-20) thereby directing Peter's actions (10.9-16). Moreover, Peter seems to be unaware of the reason for his visit to Cornelius's house. As a result, Peter has to ask why Cornelius sent for him (10.29). Hence, in Acts 10–11, when Peter travels to Cornelius's house he is simply doing as he is told. Peter is not acting on his own initiative; he is simply God's emissary.

Perhaps even more significant, though, Cornelius refers to God when he explains why he sent for Peter. Cornelius not only refers to the dialogue that he and God have already been having (10.31-32), but when Cornelius completes his explanation he concludes by saying 'So now all of us are here in the presence of God (ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ) to listen to all that

90. Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', iii.
91. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 358.

the Lord has commanded you to say' (10.33). Hence, Cornelius is here informing Peter of God's presence among them. God is clearly communicating as directly with Cornelius as God is with Peter.

As a result, both Cornelius and Luke's audience know that Cornelius is fundamentally in dialogue with God rather than Peter. Peter is merely the emissary of God. Cornelius originally bows down upon Peter's arrival because he knows he is in dialogue with God, and he thinks it is possible that God just may be coming to visit him (10.25-26). Yet, even after Peter informs Cornelius that Peter himself is only a mortal, Cornelius is no less sure that God is present (10.33). Instead, Cornelius is positive that Peter will simply speak what the Lord, who is present, has commanded him to say (11.14).

Yet, this conclusion is not an entirely new observation. Many people have commented on the fact that Peter is passive while God is active in Acts 10–11.[92] I, on the other hand, am claiming that Luke's audience would have understood God's activity in Acts 10–11 as that of a host who extends hospitality to guests. God has forged a permanent hospitality relationship between himself and the Gentiles who are gathered in Cornelius's house.

The evidence for this interpretation is compelling. We are not only told that God is present at Cornelius's home and that God is speaking through Peter (10.33b), but we are also told that God gives the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's home while in a context of hospitality (10.45; 11.17).

For instance, beginning with 10.44, we read that the Holy Spirit falls upon all those who hear Peter's message. Furthermore, when Peter makes his defense to those in Jerusalem, he also begins by simply stating that the Holy Spirit fell upon his Gentile audience (11.15). Hence, in both instances, Luke is fully capable of describing the Holy Spirit's arrival by simply stating that the Holy Spirit fell. Yet, in both instances, Luke goes on to expound on the significance of the Holy Spirit's arrival. In Acts 10.45, Luke goes on to refer to 'the gift (ἡ δωρεά) of the Holy Spirit'. Furthermore, when Peter makes his defense to those in Jerusalem, he too goes further and characterizes the Holy Spirit's arrival. In Acts 11.17, Peter characterizes the Holy Spirit as the gift (δωρεά) that God has given (δίδωμι) to both the Jews and the Gentiles.

It is therefore striking that Luke describes the Holy Spirit as a gift (δωρεά) that is poured out upon the Gentiles (10.45). On the one hand, Luke refers to the gift of the Holy Spirit in other places (Acts 1.4; 2.38; cf. Acts 8.20; 11.17). Yet, on the other hand, given the fact that Luke is narrating this sequence of events within the context of three consecutive

92. For example, Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 358.

though distinct hospitality encounters that take place within Acts 9.43–10.48, this phrase takes on an added significance. Importantly, we have repeatedly seen the act of gift-giving within a context of hospitality. For instance, in *Odyssey* 8.541-45, Alcinous, the king of the Phaeacians, discusses preparations for Odysseus's 'sending (πομπή) and the gifts of friendship (φίλα δῶρα) which we give him of our love (τὰ οἱ δίδομεν φιλέοντες)'. Furthermore, the king of Persia gives expensive gifts (δῶρα) to Callirhoe, his guest, in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (5.9.7). Conversely, Kalasiris gives Nausikles, his host, a royal ring, which Nausikles accepts as a gift (δῶρον) from the gods in Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story* (5.15.2). In addition, Dio Chrysostom criticizes the hosts in his day who 'welcome open-heartedly with gifts and presents (ὑποδέχεσθαι φιλοφρόνως ξενίοις καὶ δώροις) only the rich, from whom, of course, the host expected a like return' (7.88-89). Even the Johannine Jesus broaches the subject of a gift (δωρεά) within a hospitality context in Jn 4.10.[93]

In Chapter 2, I discussed the importance of gift-giving within a Greco-Roman context. As I demonstrated above (pp. 3-7), classicists often distinguish between 'temporary' and 'permanent' hospitality relationships,[94] the latter of which are sometimes referred to as guest-friendships. Furthermore, these permanent hospitality relationships generally take on the characteristics of kinship. For instance, Gabriel Herman adeptly describes a permanent hospitality relationship or a guest-friendship as 'a bond of trust, imitating kinship and reinforced by rituals, generating affection and obligations between individuals belonging to separate social units'.[95] More importantly, among classicists it is commonly argued that the act of giving a valuable gift to one's counterpart in a hospitality context marks the transition from a temporary to a permanent hospitality relationship.[96]

93. For additional examples of gift-giving in a hospitality context, see Homer, *Od.* 1.311-18; 8.430-32; 13.4-23, 47-53; 15.74-77, 99-132, 536-38; 17.163-65; 19.309-11; Longus 3.9; 4.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.21-22, 45, 57-58, 93; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.152-69; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 5.15.1; Tob. 10.10-11; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.281-82.

94. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 271-72. Cf. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 148-49; Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 290; Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, 191-95; Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 57; Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 102, 123.

95. Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 287, 290. See also John P. Gould, '*Hiketeia*', *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 93 (1973) 74-103 (93). Gould writes, 'The analogy with the kin is a natural one since once the due ceremonies of ξενία or ἱκετεία are over, the ξένοι and ἱκέται have become kin—"spiritual kin" rather than kin by blood or marriage, but nevertheless members of the group'.

96. For example, Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', 150; Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 272; Herman, 'Friendship, Ritualized', 290; Bolchazy, 'From Xenophobia to Altruism', 57; Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 65; St George Stock, 'Hospitality (Greek and Roman)', 809-10. This same transition appears to be present in Jewish hospitality

As a result, I would argue that when God gives the Holy Spirit as a gift to the Gentiles in Acts 10–11, Luke's authorial audience would have been keenly aware of the pivotal transition. Despite any reservations that Peter as God's emissary may have, God gives the gift to the Gentiles. God establishes an intimate and more importantly a permanent relationship with Cornelius, who has many other Gentiles under his authority and influence. While Peter on his own may have only engaged in a temporary hospitality relationship with Cornelius, God forges an ongoing, intimate, and kinship-like relationship by supplying the gift in a hospitality relationship. Just as Peter extends hospitality to Cornelius's emissaries even though Peter is in Simon the tanner's house in Acts 10.23, so also God establishes a hospitality relationship with Cornelius's household even though God is present at Cornelius's house in Acts 10.25-48.

Consequently, because God has entered into a permanent relationship with Cornelius, those closely associated with God (e.g. the leaders of the Jerusalem church) and with Cornelius would have been impacted by the events that took place in Caesarea. Unlike temporary hospitality, a permanent hospitality relationship in ancient Greece was passed down from generation to generation. For example, in Homer's *Iliad* (6.215-31), Glaucus and Diomedes relate to one another as guest-friends and exchange gifts because their fathers forged a hospitality relationship. As a result of their forefathers' decisions, the later generations of the two parties were morally bound by this contractual agreement (e.g. *Il*. 6.215-31).[97]

While Homer's *Iliad* was clearly written at an earlier time, we have seen that Luke's audience would have been well versed in Homer's works. As a result, even though the custom of hospitality changed significantly over time, Luke's audience would have been cognizant of the ramifications from the events in Cornelius's home. Clearly, according to Luke in Acts 11.1-18, the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem are upset by Peter's acceptance of hospitality from a Gentile (11.1-3).[98] They somehow perceive that Peter's actions have 'repercussions for the whole community'.[99] Yet, once the leaders in Jerusalem hear that God has given the Gentiles the gift of the Holy Spirit, their criticisms cease (11.15-18). At that point, it is clear that God has guided Peter's decisions, and God has personally forged this relationship. Hence, the Christian leaders in Jerusalem realize

when the host gives his daughter or bride to the guest as a bride, thereby forging an ongoing kinship relationship.

97. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal*, 271.

98. The leaders in Jerusalem do not, however, interrogate Peter about his offer of hospitality to the Gentiles in Simon's home. In fact, Luke never even mentions that expression of hospitality again, thereby clearly placing the stress upon the events in Caesarea. See Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 471.

99. Gillman, 'Hospitality in Acts 16', 181-82.

that the events in Caesarea have ramifications for them as well. When God gives a gift to the Gentiles, it forges a long-term, kinship-like relationship between God, Peter, and Cornelius's household, which in turn impacts Jew and Gentile relationships in the early Church.

Here, it is appropriate to add an additional observation. There is a degree of reciprocity apparent in the actions of the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's home, but it is also apparent that this reciprocity is in no way comparable to the overtures of God. For instance, Cornelius's household officially invites Peter to stay (ἐπιμένω) with them after God has already given them the gift of the Spirit. Hence, on the one hand, the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's home reciprocate the hospitality of God by providing hospitality for God's emissary, Peter. When the Gentiles welcome Peter into their home, they are welcoming into their home the one who has already offered them an ongoing relationship. As a result, Cornelius completes the process and seals the permanent hospitality relationship between God and the Gentiles associated with Cornelius when he hosts Peter. Yet, on the other hand, Luke does not attempt to portray an equitable gift exchange between the two parties. To describe the exchange as lopsided is to understate the situation. God is the one who initiates the permanent relationship, and God provides a gift that far surpasses the response of Cornelius's household. Nonetheless, the actions of both parties indicate that a permanent hospitality relationship or cross-cultural relationship has been ratified between God and the Gentiles who are associated with Cornelius.

Third, in Acts 15.6-29 we see another piece of evidence that points to the concept of God as host. When the early Christians meet to debate the role of the Gentiles within the Christian community, Peter refers back to his experience in Cornelius's house as authoritative proof of God's intentions (15.7-11). James then reiterates Peter's point in Acts 15.13-21 when he says, 'Simeon has related how God first looked favorably on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name' (15.14). Thus, both Peter and James identify Peter's visit with Cornelius as the inaugural event in which God initiated a kinship-like bond with the Gentiles. This kinship-like bond was established by means of the custom of hospitality, and the unwritten laws of hospitality demanded that the descendents of both parties honor this bond for generations to come.

Fourth, the case for God's involvement as a participant in the hospitality encounter that takes place in Acts 10.25-48 can also be made on contextual grounds. Here I am claiming that Luke's audience would have held preconceived notions that would have allowed them to envision God as a participant in a hospitality relationship with the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's house. For instance, we have seen in a variety of

Greco-Roman (e.g. Ovid, *Metam*. 1.125-244; 8.618-724), Jewish (e.g. Gen. 18.1-16), and early Christian (e.g. Heb. 13.2) documents the commonplace belief that the gods or their representatives sometimes visited humans in the form of a traveler and accepted hospitality from them.

Yet, for the Gentiles in Caesarea and for Luke's audience, the association between Zeus and hospitality would have likely held the most force. As I have noted above, Zeus is often described as Zeus Xenios, the God of Hospitality. This is evident as far back as Homer's *Odyssey,* where both Eumaeus (14.389) and Odysseus (9.270-71; 14.283-84) refer to Zeus as the God of Hospitality, and as far reaching as Heliodorus's *An Ethiopian Story*, where both Knemon and Kalasiris refer to Zeus as the God of Hospitality (2.22.2). Yet, as was discussed in Chapter 2, perhaps the best known illustrations of Zeus's involvement in the custom of hospitality from antiquity appear in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*

Ovid, writing shortly before the ministry of Christ, tells the story of how Jove (or Zeus) descends from Olympus in order to test human hospitality (1.125-215). As a result, Zeus disguises himself as a human while traveling back and forth throughout the land (1.212-15). Most notably, Zeus punishes the inhospitable Arcadian king, Lycaon, by using a thunderbolt to destroy his house and by turning him into a wolf (1.210, 231-44). Conversely, after Jupiter (Zeus) and Atlas disguise themselves as mortals (8.626-27) and search for a hospitable reception in the Phrygian hills (8.628-29), Baucis and Philemon, an elderly couple, receive them and entertain them extravagantly despite their severe poverty (8.636-78). As a result, Zeus and Atlas reward their hosts for their hospitality (8.690-93). In short, all those who read Greek (including Hellenistic Jews) or who were influenced by the Homeric legacy in any way would have known that Zeus was the quintessential God of Hospitality (e.g. 2 Macc. 6.2).

In Acts 10–11 Cornelius appears to be aware of this tradition about the gods when he falls down and begins to worship Peter upon Peter's arrival (10.25). Furthermore, Peter appears to be aware of this tradition when he tells Cornelius, 'Stand up; I am only a mortal'. Consequently, both Cornelius's actions and Peter's response show us that Cornelius was expecting an incognito god to visit his home.

Moreover, regardless of whether Luke's authorial audience would have included pagans who still believed that gods like Zeus existed or whether Luke's authorial audience would have consisted exclusively of believers who now scoffed at the very thought of Zeus, the authorial audience certainly would have been familiar with the cultural expectations of their Mediterranean milieu. As a result, the preceding extensions of hospitality, the bowing down of Cornelius, and Peter's disclaimer all would have focused Luke's audience upon the identity of the arriving traveler. Luke's audience knew that a typical, god-fearing Gentile would

have wondered whether the arriving stranger was a god like Zeus, who had the ability to take on the form of a human and put the hospitality of mortals to the test. In addition, Luke's audience knew that Homer had closely linked the fear of the Greek gods and the Greek idea of righteousness with the practice of meritorious hospitality (e.g. *Od*. 6.119-21; 9.175-76; 13.200-202).

Yet, it is precisely at this point that Luke overturns the hospitality tradition for his audience. Cornelius's instincts prove to be correct. A God has come near, and Cornelius is confident of his presence (10.33). Yet, Luke does not present Zeus, the God of Hospitality, to his audience as god-fearing Gentiles might expect. Instead, Luke presents the God who is manifest in Jesus Christ to his audience. Luke shows his audience that this God is the true God of Hospitality. Luke provides his audience with an answer to the question of what this God is like and how this God is different from the Olympian gods. As a result, the sermon that Peter preaches while he is a guest in Cornelius's home provides the authoritative description of this God's identity (10.34-43).

Furthermore, in the midst of the hospitality encounter between God and the Gentiles, it would also have become clear that the God manifest in Jesus does not interact in a hospitality encounter as Zeus purportedly does. The God to whom Peter testifies has not come to test the hosts in order to measure their character and dole out rewards or punishments accordingly. This God has not come to discern whether Cornelius is god-fearing and hospitable. This God already knows these things. Alternatively, the Christian God participates in a hospitality relationship by giving instead of receiving. The Christian God is a gracious God who takes the initiative by extending love and forgiveness to the Gentiles rather than waiting for them to prove themselves (10.43). The Christian God is a gracious God who takes 'a people for his name' on the day that he extends hospitality to the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's house (15.14).

For the Gentiles to convert to Christianity, regardless of whether we are talking about the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's house or Luke's authorial audience, the Christian God must be differentiated from the philosophies and belief systems to which the Gentiles adhered. In Acts 10–11, Luke has built upon standard Gentile expectations about the custom of hospitality and about Zeus, the God of Hospitality, to make a bold statement about the superiority of the God manifest in Jesus Christ.

Practical Import. While the theological implications of the presence of hospitality in Acts 10–11 would have been significant for Luke's authorial audience, the practical implications of the presence of hospitality in Acts 10–11 would have been no less significant. In fact, Luke's audience

may well have perceived at least three important injunctions related to the practice of hospitality in Acts 10–11.

First and foremost, Luke's audience would have easily been able to discern the importance of Christian hospitality as a means of spreading the gospel and fulfilling the Christian mission. As Koenig rightly points out, Luke often creates a connection between the custom of hospitality and the Christian mission.[100] For instance, Jesus' commissionings of the twelve disciples and of the seventy (or seventy-two) disciples (Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-16), Jesus' stay in Zacchaeus's house (19.1-10), and Jesus' incognito visit with the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (24.13-32), all demonstrate the link between hospitality and the Christian mission in Luke's Gospel.

Moreover, Luke's authorial audience would almost certainly have read these passages from Luke's Gospel with an ear toward their own circumstances, lives, and ministries. In particular, they likely found instructions for how to carry out the Christian mission in their own day in Luke 9–10. As a result, Lukan scholars have often argued that Jesus' commissionings of the twelve in Lk. 9.1-6 and of the seventy (or seventy-two) in Lk. 10.1-6 provide us with many clues not only about the hospitality that was extended to Jesus' disciples, but also about the experiences of second generation Christian missionaries.[101]

Yet, Luke's audience should have also detected an association between hospitality and the Christian mission in Acts. For instance, in the book of Acts Paul spreads the good news about Jesus and heals people while accepting the hospitality of willing hosts in Philippi (Acts 16.11-40), Tyre (21.1-6), Ptolemais (21.7), Caesarea (21.8-16), and Malta (28.1-10). As a result, Luke's audience would have most likely detected a consistent message in both Luke and Acts that encouraged them to utilize the social convention of hospitality as a way to participate in the ministry and message of Jesus (cf. 2 Jn 11; 3 Jn 8).[102]

Yet the clearest connection between hospitality and the Christian mission in Luke's writings is actually found in Acts 9.43–10.48. In these three consecutive pericopes Peter embodies Luke's desired use of this

100. See also Henrich, 'Godfearing', 14-44.

101. For example, Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 351; Ferdinand Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (SBT, 47; London: SCM Press, 1965), 41-46; F.W. Beare, 'The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels', *JBL* 89 (1970) 1-13. As Hahn discusses Jesus' commissioning of the apostles, he simultaneously addresses the question of how these passages functioned among early Christians. Beare, however, is even more straightforward with his argument. He claims that the evangelists collected, structured, and supplemented Jesus' teachings in order to address the evangelists' own generation through these passages (see, e.g., pp. 2-4, 13).

102. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 103.

social convention by early Christians who were on mission. For instance, in Acts 9.32–10.48 Peter spreads the good news about Jesus and heals people while accepting the hospitality of willing hosts in Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea. In essence, Peter functions as a traveling missionary in a manner reminiscent of Lk. 9.1-6 and 10.1-16. Yet, Peter takes the connection between hospitality and the Christian mission a step further. He not only accepts hospitality, but in the second pericope of this narrative unit he also extends hospitality to others (10.23). Luke sandwiches an image of Peter as host in between two images of Peter as guest. Thus, regardless of whether Peter finds himself playing the role of guest or host, he carries out the ministry and the message of Jesus. Similarly, Luke's readers should have perceived an injunction exhorting them do the same.

In essence, Luke seems to be saying that the custom of hospitality uniquely functions as the best means for Christians to spread the gospel. Yet, we still need to say more about the occasions in which Luke pairs these two entities together in his writings. Simply observing the connection between the custom of hospitality and the Christian mission in Luke–Acts does not fully account for Luke's authorial decisions nor for the way Luke's authorial audience would have interpreted the link between hospitality and the Christian mission in Luke–Acts.

For instance, after documenting Luke's interest in hospitality throughout the Gospel of Luke and in large portions of Acts, it is somewhat surprising that Luke's first clear references to the custom of hospitality in Acts are not found until Acts 9.43–10.48, at least not when we work with an ancient understanding of hospitality.[103] In other words, Luke does not refer to nor provide examples of this social convention in Acts while narrating the spread of the gospel in Jerusalem, Judea, or Samaria (1.8). Instead, the first appearance of this social convention in Acts coincides with the beginning of the Gentile mission. Hence, in Acts 9.43–10.48 we not only see that Luke links hospitality with the *Christian mission* in general, but at this point it is clear that Luke links the custom of hospitality with the *Gentile mission* in particular. Luke then maintains this association throughout the rest of the book of Acts (e.g. Acts 16.11-15; 28.1-10).

The observation that Luke links the custom of hospitality and the Christian mission to the Gentiles in particular gains even more strength when we reconsider Luke's use of the material found in the Double Tradition (material found in Matthew and Luke) and Triple Tradition (material found in Matthew, Mark, and Luke). For instance, because Luke adds the story about Jesus' commissioning of the seventy (or

103. I am grateful to Mikeal C. Parsons for bringing this to my attention.

seventy-two) disciples in the Lk. 10.1-16, many have wondered whether Luke uses this pericope to foreshadow the later Gentile mission.[104] Despite the fact that the original event is set in a Jewish context, there are two elements in this narrative that may have caused Luke's audience to associate it with the later Gentile mission.

First, Lukan scholars commonly ask whether the symbolic relevance of the numbers seventy or seventy-two can aid textual critics as they attempt to discern the original number of disciples commissioned by Jesus in Lk. 10.1.[105] For example, while the textual evidence can support either seventy or seventy-two appointees, both Alan Culpepper and Robert Tannehill turn to contextual arguments to settle upon seventy-two. They consider the number of disciples in Lk. 10.1 to be a symbolic reference to the complete list of Gentile nations found in Genesis 10.[106] Thus, just as the twelve apostles (Lk. 9.1-6) are likely symbolic of the restored, complete, and true nation of Israel,[107] the seventy-two additional disciples are likely symbolic of all Gentile nations.[108] Consequently, the appointment of the seventy-two emissaries appears to foreshadow the Gentile mission of the Church as described in Acts.[109]

Additionally, when Jesus twice instructs his disciples to eat and drink whatever their hosts provide for them in Lk. 10.7-8, his comments may once again foreshadow the Gentile mission. The Lukan Jesus' comments may not have been controversial for Jesus' Jewish disciples in a Jewish context; however, when Luke's authorial audience read these comments at a time after the Gentile mission had begun, these instruction likely evoked images of ritually unclean food.[110] Hence, Luke's readers likely

104. For example, Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1982), 115. Talbert argues that this passage foreshadows the mission to the world that is chronicled in Acts. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 415.

105. For example, Metzger, 'Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?', 299-306; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 414-16.

106. Culpepper, 'The Gospel of Luke', 219; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. I. *The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 233. Culpepper points out that the Hebrew text of Gen. 10 refers to the existence of seventy nations, while the Septuagint text of Gen. 10 refers to the existence of seventy-two nations. Thus, in the Jewish tradition, both numbers were associated with the total number of Gentile nations.

107. Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*. I. *The Proclamation of Jesus* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 234-35.

108. Culpepper, 'The Gospel of Luke', 219; Tannehill, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 233; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 415.

109. Tannehill, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 233.

110. Tannehill, *Luke*, 176. Tannehill comments on this phrase. He says it 'may indicate that food should not be refused because of purity regulations'. See also,

found instructions for their own participation in the Gentile mission when they read Lk. 10.1-16.

In addition, Luke's use of the Double Tradition material also points toward the connection between hospitality and the Christian mission to the Gentiles. For example, in Mt. 8.5-13 Matthew tells of a centurion who personally comes to Jesus in Capernaum and informs Jesus of his servant who is paralyzed (8.5-6). Jesus in turn agrees to come and heal the servant (8.7). The centurion, however, claims that he is 'not worthy' to have Jesus 'come under his roof' (8.8). Therefore, he asks Jesus simply to speak a word of healing upon his servant from where Jesus is at the moment (8.8). Consequently, Jesus says he has not seen such faith among the Israelites (8.10). Then, at that point, Matthew appears to include references to the tradition of Abraham's hospitality. Jesus says, 'I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven' (8.11).

Luke, however, in Lk. 7.1-10, does not include such a reference to Abraham. As a result, it appears that Luke omits an allusion to hospitality that may have been present in the material he inherited. At the very least, one can say that Matthew added a reference about hospitality to the story of the centurion in Mt. 8.5-13 that Luke does not add.

Yet, upon a careful comparison of the two passages, it is apparent that Luke also adds material to this pericope that Matthew does not. For instance, Luke provides us with more details about the centurion. Interestingly, these additional details have a great deal in common with the story about Cornelius in Acts 10.[111] Instead of the centurion traveling to find Jesus himself as we saw in Mt. 8.5, Luke tells us that the centurion sent a group of Jewish elders to Jesus to make the request for him (Lk. 7.3; cf. Acts 10.7-8, 17-23).[112] In addition, only Luke tells us that the Jewish elders vouched for the centurion's character (Lk. 7.4-5; cf. Acts 10.2, 22).[113] Notably, they claim that the centurion is worthy (ἄξιος) of Jesus' assistance because he loves the Jews and he has built a synagogue for them (7.4-5). Yet, despite his noble character, the centurion once again informs Jesus that he is not worthy to have Jesus come under his roof (οὐ γὰρ ἱκανός εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς) (7.6).

Adolf von Schlatter, *Das Evangelium des Lukas: aus seinen Quellen erklärt* (Stüttgart: Calwar, 2nd edn, 1975), 277.

111. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, I, 650-51. Fitzmyer contends that the centurion in Lk. 7.1-10 foreshadows Cornelius, the centurion in Acts 10. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 277-78; Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, I, 395.

112. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 277; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 120.

113. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 278.

In short, in Lk. 7.1-10 Luke does not include a reference to Abraham and his hospitality, as Matthew does, but Luke crafts the story of the centurion in Luke 7 to parallel the story of the centurion in Acts 10. Thus, whereas Luke appears to be increasing the parallels between Lk. 7.1-10 and Acts 10, he simultaneously appears to be decreasing the references to hospitality in Lk. 7.1-10 as compared to Mt. 8.5-13. The primary difference, however, between Lk. 7.1-10 and Acts 10 relates to the Gentile mission. Whereas, Jesus was willing to enter the house of the Gentile centurion in Lk. 7.1-10, the centurion prevents him from doing so because the centurion deems himself 'unworthy'. Yet, after the death and resurrection of Jesus and when it is time for the Gentile mission to begin, Peter, as an agent of God, enters the house of another Gentile centurion. At the same time, God forges a hospitality relationship with Cornelius and his household.[114] Hence, by decreasing the emphasis on hospitality while Jesus is in Jewish territory, Luke has simultaneously heightened the importance of hospitality in Acts 10 when Jesus' followers are in Gentile territory.

As a result, we have seen that Luke connects the custom of hospitality and the *Christian mission* in general. Yet, Luke's use of the Double and Triple Traditions confirms for us that Luke has carefully constructed an identifiable and pronounced connection between the custom of hospitality and the *Gentile mission* in particular. When Luke was looking for a way to communicate the best method for the spread of Christianity to the Gentiles, he turned to the social convention of hospitality. This choice allowed him to communicate to a wide audience the significance of Christianity's openness to the foreign stranger in a way unprecedented in early Christianity.[115]

Hence, if Luke's audience will emulate Peter by both extending hospitality to Gentiles (10.23) and receiving hospitality from Gentiles (10.25-48), they will be able to spread the Christian message. Regardless of whether Luke's authorial audience includes residential or itinerant Christians,[116] Luke is teaching his readers that the custom of hospitality can be a practical and useful tool in the Gentile mission. If they will simply make use of the question and answer component of the custom of hospitality, they will be able to spread the gospel in cross-cultural contexts.

114. Tannehill, *Luke*, 126. Tannehill says that in Lk. 7.1-10 it is 'not yet time for the Gentile mission by Lukan reckoning. When the Gentile mission must begin, Peter will encounter another centurion, Cornelius (Acts 10).'

115. Again, I am grateful to Mikeal C. Parsons for bringing this to my attention.

116. Cf. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 86, 103.

Moving on, Luke's audience could have easily perceived at least two more practical injunctions embedded within Luke's narration of Acts 9.43–11.18. First, Luke's readers should have logically concluded from Acts 10–11 that if Jewish and Gentile Christians would extend hospitality to one another they would also be simultaneously laying the groundwork for healthy relationships among Jews and Gentiles within the Church. Luke has already referred to rising tensions among Hellenists and Hebrews within the Church in Acts 6.1. Yet, we do not see such tensions in Acts 10–11. By forging a hospitality relationship with Cornelius and the Gentiles in his home, God simultaneously forges a permanent guest-friendship between Peter and these Gentiles. In many respects they now find themselves in a kinship relationship in which the identity of the host and the guest are intimately connected and in which both parties appear to function on equal terms.

As a result, Luke's audience should have logically perceived that by properly practicing Christian hospitality they would also be uniting the culturally diverse individuals who make up the Church. Furthermore, in Acts 10–11 Luke uses the custom of hospitality to illustrate the level of interaction and unity that God requires among believers. In regard to Jew and Gentile relations in Acts 10–11, Beverly Gaventa writes, 'The inclusion of Gentiles does not have to do merely with a grudging admission to the circle of the baptized. Including Gentiles means receiving them, entering their homes, and accepting hospitality in those homes.'[117]

Finally, by reading Acts 10–11 Luke's audience may have arrived at the practical implication that the practice of Christian hospitality leads to an increased degree of spiritual transformation. Cornelius and his entire household are converted after Peter testifies to what God has done and after God has given the Holy Spirit to them. Yet, in the process Peter's theological framework for evaluating people is drastically revised.[118] In the midst of these three hospitality scenes Peter comes to a better understanding of the God he serves. In Acts 10–11, Peter comes to recognize that fearing God is more important to God than racial heritage. Subsequently, Peter's personal, spiritual transformation leads to the transformation of the perspective of the Jewish Christian leadership in Jerusalem. Thus, according to Luke in Acts 9.43–11.1-18, God not only uses the custom of hospitality to convert Cornelius and his household; instead, God also works through the custom of hospitality to transform Peter and the Jewish Christian leadership as well.

117. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 120.
118. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 109, 112, 124.

In conclusion, Luke's audience may well have perceived three separate injunctions while reading Acts 10–11. They may well have interpreted this pericope to mean that they should employ hospitality as a means of spreading the gospel message to the Gentiles, establishing relationships between previously divisive groups, and contributing to the transformation of the believers.

6

Conclusion

In this study I have first sought to provide an extended description of the custom of hospitality in antiquity. In particular, I have consulted Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian texts as a way of delineating the expectations and actions associated with this social convention. Furthermore, I have compiled an extensive list of the vocabulary that ancient writers generally employed when they referred to or described a hospitality encounter.

Second, I have sought to utilize my extended description of hospitality in antiquity as a backdrop for reading Acts 9.43–11.18 as Luke's authorial audience would have.[1] As a result, I have sought to use the ideas and thought patterns present in Luke's day as safeguards for my interpretation of Acts 10–11. As opposed to reading Acts 10–11 with a twenty-first-century understanding of the custom of hospitality, I have tried to read Acts 10–11 with a first-century understanding of the custom of hospitality. Thus, I have attempted to build upon the thought patterns that were prevalent in Luke's milieu and that Luke's audience would have logically perceived. My goal has simply been to read the text as Luke's intended audience did.

Conclusions about the Custom of Hospitality in Antiquity

While seeking to describe the custom of private hospitality in Mediterranean antiquity, I concluded that hospitality is an extensive set of behavioral conventions that are associated with a host assisting a traveler. Essentially, anything that takes place 'from the moment a visitor approaches someone's house until the moment he departs' is considered to be an outgrowth of either hospitality or inhospitality when that visitor is outside of his or her home region.[2]

1. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction', 126-27.
2. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 5.

In addition to a broad definition, I was also able to detect a variety of recurring elements that comprised the typical protocol and expectations for private hospitality interactions in antiquity. Furthermore, I found these repeated actions and expectations across the spectrum of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian writings. As a result, even though it is possible to find distinctive elements of this broad Mediterranean custom within the subsets of the overarching culture, it is best to think of this social convention as one custom, as opposed to three or more. Consequently, I organized the first portion of this work under the heading of 'Mediterranean hospitality' to affirm the commonality of this social convention among the various subsets of the broader culture.

Having said that, I will now list some of those elements of Mediterranean hospitality that routinely occur across the traditional boundaries of the various cultural subsets. First, it was as equally acceptable for the host to approach and greet the traveler (Homer, *Od*. 1.123; 3.34-35; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5; Gen. 18.2; 19.1; 24.29; Lk. 7.36; 10.38; Acts 10.22-23; 28.7; *Acts Pil*. 14.2) as it was for the traveler to approach the householder and request hospitality (Homer, *Od*. 7.142-45; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.218-19; 8.628-35; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.52; Gen. 24.17, 23; Josh. 9.6; Tob. 7.1; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.246; *Jos. Asen*. 3.3; Mk 14.13-15; Lk. 19.5; Jn 4.7; Acts 21.4, 7, 8; Rom. 15.22-23, 32; 1 Cor. 16.5-6; 2 Cor. 1.15-16).

It should be noted, however, that while Greeks and Romans simply sought out a receptive household with a worthy host,[3] Jewish travelers generally requested hospitality from a distant relative or kinsman (Gen. 24.15-27; Tob. 5.6; 6.11; 9.5; Philo, *Abr*. 116; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.144) or at least from a fellow Israelite (Judg. 19.12). Furthermore, Jewish travelers typically attempted to locate a host at a well or source of water while in a rural area (Gen. 24.17; Exod. 2.15; 1 Sam. 9.11-13) or at the city gate or the city-square in an urban area (Gen. 19.1; Judg. 19.14-15; 1 Kgs 17.10). Furthermore, early Christian travelers began to search for Christian hosts whenever possible so that they could request hospitality from them (Acts 16.13; 21.4, 7, 8; 28.14).

After the initial conversation between the host and the guest, it was somewhat common for the host to take the stranger by the hand and lead him or her into the house (Homer, *Od*. 1.120-24; 3.34-35; Longus 3.7; Virgil, *Aen*. 8.152-69; *Jos*. *Asen*. 20.1). Furthermore, at numerous points we saw that the hospitality relationship was officially ratified when the guest entered the host's dwelling (Homer, *Od*. 1.120-24; Ovid, *Metam*. 8.636; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.56, 64; Gen. 19.3; 24.29; 43.17; Josh. 2.1; Judg. 19.21; 2 Jn 10–11).

3. Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest, and the Hostile Host', 25-26.

Moreover, throughout the Mediterranean world, ancient writers often concluded that the traveler was associated with the gods. This conviction, however, was nuanced differently in Mediterranean antiquity based upon the cultural subset from which the author was writing. For instance, in Greco-Roman contexts the traveler was often associated with Zeus and the other pagan gods (Homer, *Od*. 1.102-324; 6.207-10, 276-81; 9.266-71; 14.55-60, 389, 283-84; 16.172-85; 17.483-87; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.1; 2.2.4; 3.2.6; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.212-15; 8.688-90; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.2; 5.15.2; 6.2.2). As a result, if the host came to the same conclusion as the author, namely, that the guest was associated with the gods, then the host worshipped the guest whom the host deemed to be divine (Ovid, *Metam*. 1.220-21; 8.626-27). Similarly, in the pre-Hellenistic Jewish tradition, the traveler was at times associated with Yahweh (Gen. 18.1-16).[4] More often, however, in the Hellenistic Jewish tradition and in the early Christian tradition, the traveler was associated with the angels of Yahweh (Gen. 19.1-23; Judg. 13.16; *T. Ab*. 113; Philo, *QG* 4.16-17; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.196; Gal. 4.14; Heb. 13.2; *1 Clem*. 10.7; 11.1; Origen, *Hom. Gen*. 4.1) or with Jesus (Mt. 10.1-42; 25.31-46; Mk 6.7-11; Lk. 9.1-6; 10.1-18; Gal. 4.14). Here again, in these last two cultural subsets, the proper response to the divine, divinely commissioned, or royal hospitality counterpart was to bow down and show reverence to the visitor (Gen. 18.2; 19.2; 43.26; *Jos. Asen*. 5.6-7; *T. Ab*. 3.5).

Once the guest was inside the dwelling, Mediterranean hosts typically followed a somewhat uniform protocol that was focused upon providing the traveler with the necessary provisions. Often, either before or after a meal, the host made arrangements so that the guest could take some type of bath. This bath, however, took numerous forms, as we have seen. In Greco-Roman contexts, the host or the host's servants bathed the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.309-10; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22). In Jewish and Christian contexts, however, the host often provided water so that the guests could wash their own feet or bathe themselves (Gen. 18.4; 19.2; 24.32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; 1 Sam. 25.41; 2 Sam. 11.18; Tob. 7.9; *T. Ab*. 1.3; Lk. 7.44), so that servants could wash their feet (LXX Gen. 18.4; *Jos. Asen*. 7.1; 20.4; *Sifre Deut*., Piska 355), or so that the host could wash their feet (*Jos. Asen*. 20.2-4; *T. Ab*. 3.7-9; Origen, *Hom. Gen*. 4.2).

Second, the host also concerned himself or herself with providing the traveler with food to eat. For instance, the host at times seated the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.130-31; 3.36-41; Ovid, *Metam*. 8.640-60; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.57). Next, the host typically provided a meal. This meal was often

4. Koenig, 'Hospitality', 299-300.

quite extravagant, thereby showing honor and respect to the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.136-39; 3.36-41; 14.72-82; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.226-31; 8.677-78; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.5, 52-53, 57, 65, 75-76, 83; Gen. 18.5-7; 19.3; 24.33; 43.34; Josh. 13.15; Judg. 19.6, 21; 1 Sam. 9.24; 10.4; 2 Sam. 12.4; 1 Kgs 17.13-16; 2 Kgs 4.8; Ps. 23.5-6; Tob. 7.9; *Jos. Asen*. 7.1; 20.6-7; Philo, *Abr.* 108; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.252; Lk. 7.36; 10.40; Acts 10.10; 11.3; *Did*. 11.9-12; *Gos. Thom*. 14; 61; 64; *Acts Pil*. 14.2; 15.3, 4; 16.4).

Third, the host also commonly provided overnight lodging since the travelers were away from their homes (Homer, *Od*. 14.518-33; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.6, 79-80, 83; Gen. 19.2; 24.25; Josh. 2.8; Judg. 19.4, 21; 1 Sam. 9.25; 1 Kgs 17.19; 2 Kgs 4.10; Tob. 6.11; *Jos. Asen*. 21.1; *Did*. 11.5; *Acts Pil*. 15.3, 4). In fact, hosts often put guests up in a designated guestroom (2 Kgs 4.10; *T. Ab*. 4.1; Mk 14.13-15; Phlm 22). The length of the traveler's stay, however, varied considerably in Mediterranean hospitality. In informal hospitality encounters in Greco-Roman contexts, the guest commonly stayed for only one night (Homer, *Od*. 3.487-93; 15.184-91). Short visits were also particularly common in Jewish and early Christian contexts (Gen. 18.1-33; 24.54, 59; Judg. 19.27-28; 1 Sam. 9.19, 26; *Jos. Asen*. 9.5; Jn 4.40, 43; Acts 10.6, 23; *Did*. 11.4-6; 12.1-2). Yet, Greco-Roman hospitality encounters that evolved into guest-friendships typically resulted in stays that lasted multiple nights (Homer, *Od*. 17.515; Achilles Tatius 4.1.1; 8.19.2), or even for many weeks (Homer, *Od*. 10.14; 11.353-61; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.21-23; 5.12-16; 6.6-8).

Fourth, the host often cared for the guest's animals (Gen. 24.19, 32; 43.24; Judg. 19.21; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.252), gave the guest new clothes (Homer, *Od*. 10.542; 13.4-23; 14.515-17; Longus 4.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.58, 82), and provided some type of entertainment for the guest (Homer, *Od*. 1.150-55; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 5.15-16). In addition, the host often supplied the guest with material provisions as the guest renewed his or her journey (Homer, *Od*. 14.515-17; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.3; Longus 3.11; 4.6; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.11; Acts 10.23; 21.5, 16; 28.10; Rom. 15.23-24; 3 Jn 5–8).

Yet, in addition to provisions, the host was also expected to protect the guest during his or her stay from anything or anyone that might threaten the traveler (Homer, *Od*. 14.21-22, 29-36; Chariton 8.3.2; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.52-53; Gen. 19.3-8; Josh. 2.4-21; 9.18; Judg. 19.23; Ps. 23.5; cf. Judg. 4.17-22; Jer. 14.8). As a result, the host often escorted the guest out of town (Chariton 8.4.7-8; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.7-8, 52-53, 58; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 6.11; Gen. 18.16; 1 Sam. 9.26-27; Tob. 10.10-11; Rom 15.24; 1 Cor. 16.6, 10-12; 2 Cor. 1.16; Tit. 3.13; 3 Jn 6; *Gos. Thom*. 88; *Acts Pil*. 14.3; 15.4). By walking with the guest as the guest was departing the region, the host demonstrated his fondness for the guest, but he was also

fulfilling his duty to protect the guest until the guest had left the host's domain.[5]

Finally, once the relationship was established, a certain degree of reciprocity was often apparent. At the most basic level, the host expected to receive information from the traveler in exchange for provisions and protection. For instance, the host generally asked the guest about his or her identity in a hospitality exchange (Homer, *Od*. 1.169-77; 3.69-71; 7.236-39; 9.252-55; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.6; Gen. 24.34; Josh. 13.17-18; Judg. 19.16-18; Tob. 7.2-3; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.252; Jn 4.12). We have discussed, however, how the early Christians adapted the standard etiquette related to this questioning of the guests. Whereas the Homeric tradition reflects the conviction that the host should refrain from asking the guest about his or her identity until after the guest has eaten; in Hellenistic contexts and especially in early Christian contexts, the questioning of the guest was often conducted prior to the ratification of the hospitality relationship (e.g. 2 Jn 8–9).

In addition, there was another basic assumption about reciprocity, even within temporary or informal hospitality relationships. It was generally assumed that if either person was in a counterpart's home region at a later date, the traveler could expect the householder to extend a hospitable reception to him or her (Homer, *Od*. 1.178-83; Gen. 18.10, 14; Judg. 4.17; 2 Kgs 4.8-36; *Jos. Asen*. 18.1). Furthermore, loosely related to reciprocity, the guest often joined with the host in worshipping the host's gods (Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.2; Longus 3.9-10; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.5–23.1; 5.12.3–13.1). Hence, it was not uncommon for the guest to show gratitude to the host by joining the host in his or her religious activities.

Finally, in formal or permanent hospitality relationships that resembled kinship relationships, the host and the guest exchanged gifts. In Greco-Roman hospitality, the guest occasionally provided a gift or blessing to the host in the initial visit. For instance, the guest occasionally rewarded the host or assisted the host while the guest was still in the host's home (Ovid, *Metam*. 8.690-724; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 5.15.2). More commonly, however, the guest would give a gift to his or her host at a later point in time (Homer, *Od*. 3.4-485 and 15.193-214; 4.1-624 and 15.1-184; Chariton 8.3-4; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.53-54). Furthermore, in Greco-Roman hospitality, the host often gave costly gifts to the guest that required a substantial financial sacrifice on the part of the host (Homer, *Od*. 1.311-18; 8.430-32; 13.4-23, 47-53; 15.74-77, 99-132, 536-38; 17.163-65; 19.309-11; Chariton 5.9.7; Longus 3.9; 4.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven*. 7.21-22, 45, 57-58, 88-89, 93; Virgil, *Aen*. 8.152-69).

5. Pitt-Rivers, 'The Stranger, the Guest, and the Hostile Host', 26-27.

In Jewish hospitality, guests occasionally reciprocated the host's hospitality at a later date (e.g. Josh. 2.21; 9.5, 11, 15, 18-21; Judg. 4.17). Yet, Jewish guests primarily showed reciprocity during the initial visit. For instance, the guest often rewarded the host or assisted the host while the guest was still in the host's home (e.g. Gen. 18.10; 19.9-23; 24.50-51; 43.26; Exod. 3.4; 1 Kgs 17.17-24; 2 Kgs 4.13-17; cf. Philo, *Abr*. 110; *1 Clem*. 10.7; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 7; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.249). Furthermore, in Jewish hospitality, the host occasionally gave material gifts to his guests (Tob. 10.10-11; Josephus, *Ant*. 5.281-82). Yet, perhaps the most noteworthy form of reciprocity in Jewish hospitality occurred when the host gave his daughter or sister as a bride to the guest, thereby creating a kinship relationship (Gen. 24.50-51; Exod. 2.21; Tob. 7.11; *Jos. Asen*. 4.8; 21.1-3).

Second, our survey of Mediterranean hospitality has demonstrated that one can reconstruct a semantic domain of Greek words or phrases that was consistently employed by Mediterranean writers who wrote about private hospitality.[6] In other words, in the Mediterranean world, authors traditionally used the same phrases and terms when they were referring to the custom of hospitality. As a result, we can assume that those capable of reading or understanding Greek texts in Mediterranean antiquity would have recognized those terms and phrases as being associated with this social convention if the context allowed it. This semantic domain, in turn, helps us to recognize when the biblical authors are referring to the custom of hospitality.

For instance, the Greek stem of ξεν-, due to its association with the stranger, is the most common Greek semantic marker for Mediterranean hospitality.[7] As we have seen, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, and φιλοξενία are all used comprehensively to refer to hospitality or to the offer of hospitality regardless of the context in antiquity (Homer, *Od.* 3.487-93; 5.91; 6.119-21; 9.175-76, 266-71; 13.200-202; Herodotus, *Hist*. 1.69; 2.119; Xenophon, *Hell*. 6.1.3; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.22, 60, 82; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.2; Sir. 29.27; Philo, *Abr.* 107; 109; 114; *QG* 4.8; Josephus, *Ant*. 1.250, 196; 5.140-43, 147, 282; *T. Ab*. 1.1, 2, 6; Rom. 12.13; 1 Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.8; Heb. 13.2; 1 Pet. 4.9; *1 Clem*. 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.1, 3; Hermas, *Mand*. 8.10; *Sim*. 9.27.2). Similarly, ξένος and its cognates are routinely associated with the participants in a hospitality relationship throughout the Mediterranean world (Homer, *Od.* 1.120, 187-88, 214; 3.34, 350; 5.91; 9.266-71; 11.338; 17.382-87; Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.114-15; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.2; Chariton 1.12.6, 10; 8.3.2; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.5, 10, 68, 71, 78, 82, 88, 91;

6. Louw and Nida, *Greek–English Lexicon*, vi-xx. Here I am adopting Louw and Nida's terminology.

7. Stählin, 'ξένος'. See also, Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 10-11.

Achilles Tatius 8.4.2, 7.2; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.6.2; 2 Sam. 12.4; Job 31.32; 2 Macc. 6.2; Sir. 19.25; Wis. 19.14; Philo, *Abr.* 93-94; 96; 107; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196, 200, 201; 5.143, 145, 146; 6.51; *T. Ab.* 1.2; *T. Job* 10.1-3; 11.1; 53.3; Mt. 25.35, 38, 43, 44; Rom. 16.23; 3 Jn 5-6).[8]

In addition to the ξεν- stem, however, we have seen a handful of other prominent semantic markers. For example, ἀσπάζομαι (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.67; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.196; Mt. 5.47; 10.12; Lk. 10.4; Acts 21.7; Heb. 13.2; *Acts Pil.* 16.3-4) and χαίρω (2 Jn 10-11) can refer specifically to the initial greeting that was issued by either the host or the guest at the onset of a hospitality relationship;[9] καλέω is occasionally employed to describe the host's invitation to the stranger (Homer, *Od.* 17.382-87; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.5; Acts 10.23); and λαμβάνω (Gen. 43.18; Philo, *Abr.* 96; Jn 1.11; 5.43; 13.20; 3 Jn 8–10) as well as δέχομαι and its cognates (Chariton 1.14.2; Longus 4.5; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.52, 82, 83, 88; Achilles Tatius 8.4.1, 8.11; Tob. 7.8; Wis. 19.14; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.145; 8.326; *T. Ab.* 1.2; 2.2; Lk. 10.38; 19.16; Acts 17.7; 28.7; Rom. 16.1-2; 1 Cor. 16.10-12; Gal. 4.13-14; Col. 4.10; *Did.* 11.1-2, 4-6; 12.1-2; *1 Clem.* 12.3; 28.2; 54.3; Ignatius, *Rom.* 9.3; *Eph.* 6.1; Hermas, *Sim.* 9.27.2; *Acts Pil.* 15.4) are used to describe the action of receiving a traveler.

The phrase εἰς τὸν οἶκον, often in conjunction with the verbs ἄγω or ἔρχομαι, commonly marks the ratification of the hospitality relationship (Chariton 1.12.10; Longus 3.7; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.56, 64; Gen. 19.2-3; 24.32; 43.16-17; Josh. 2.21; Judg. 19.3, 18, 22, 23; Tob. 7.1; *Jos. Asen.* 5.2-3; 7.1; 20.1; Mt. 10.12; Lk. 1.40; 7.36; 8.41; 24.29; Acts 16.15; 21.8; 2 Jn 10-11; *Acts Pil.* 15.4); μένω and its cognates describe the guest's decision to stay or remain in a hospitable home (Homer, *Od.* 1.309-10; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.12.3; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.80; Achilles Tatius 8.19.2; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 6.6.2; Tob. 8.20; Judg. 19.9; *Jos. Asen.* 20.8; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.282; Mt. 10.11; Lk. 10.7; 19.5; 24.29; Acts 21.4, 10; 28.12, 14; Jn 4.40; 1 Cor. 16.5-6, 7-8; Gal. 1.18; *Did.* 11.5; 12.2; *Acts Pil.* 15.4); and καταλύω is used in conjunction with a traveler's actions of halting and finding lodging (Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.79; Gen. 19.3; 24.23; Josh. 2.1; Judg. 19.15; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.1; Lk. 9.12; 19.7).[10]

Finally, προπέμπω and its cognates are used to describe the host's send off, which often includes both escorting the guest out of the region and providing the guest with provisions for his or her journey (Homer, *Od.* 3.325-27, 368-70, 475-86; 10.542, 571-73; 13.38-39; 15.74-77, 99-132; Dio Chrysostom, *Ven.* 7.58; Gen. 18.16; 24.54, 59; 1 Sam. 9.53; Acts 20.38; 21.5;

8. Stählin, 'ξένος', 2; Mathews, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church', 71.
9. Cf. Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, 454.
10. Louw and Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon*, 455.

Rom. 15.24; 1 Cor. 16.6, 10-12; 2 Cor. 1.16; Tit. 3.13; 3 Jn 6; *Acts Pil*. 14.2),[11] while ἐξαποστέλλω (Josh. 2.21; 1 Sam. 9.19, 26; Tob. 10.8) was used in a similar manner in Jewish texts.

Conclusions about the Custom of Hospitality in Acts 10–11

In my analysis of Acts 9.43–11.18, I discovered that Luke describes three separate manifestations of hospitality within this one narrative unit. As a result, I concluded that Luke was intentionally drawing attention to the presence of this social convention in Acts 9.43–11.18.[12] I then set out to chronicle both the presence and the importance of this social convention in these passages.

The Presence of Hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18

First, in Acts 9.43–10.23, I noted that Peter is receiving hospitality (ξενίζω, 10.6, 18, 32) from Simon the tanner who lives in Joppa. Second, while Peter is staying (μένω) as a guest in Simon's house (9.43), Peter invites Cornelius's emissaries into Simon's house (εἰσκαλέω) and extends hospitality (ξενίζω) to them as their host (10.23).[13] Finally, in 10.24-48, Cornelius and his household extend hospitality to Peter when Peter enters (εἰσέρχομαι) Cornelius's house (10.27) and stays (ἐπιμένω) with them for several days (10.48). Furthermore, all three of these references exhibit both contextual and semantic markers that once again clarify for the reader that Luke is referring to the custom of hospitality in 9.43–11.18.

This third hospitality encounter, however, takes on far greater significance because, through the means of the standard exchange of information between the host and the guest, Peter is able to explain the importance of Jesus Christ to these Gentiles (10.34-43). At that point, the Holy Spirit falls upon all those who hear the word (10.44), and Peter calls for these Gentiles to be baptized (10.47-48).

The Importance of Hospitality in Acts 9.43–11.18

From a theological standpoint, I suggested that Luke's audience would have concluded that God had personally extended hospitality to the Gentiles gathered at Cornelius's house because God is present (10.33), God gives the hospitality gift to the Gentiles (10.45; 11.17), and God takes a people for himself on that day (15.14; cf. 14.27). Peter only functions as God's representative or emissary.

11. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 96.
12. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 109.
13. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 457. Fitzmyer points out that Peter treats these Gentiles as guests in a home where he himself is a guest.

The idea that a god would in some way participate in a hospitality encounter with a mortal certainly would not have been a foreign concept to Luke's Mediterranean readers. This is especially true for the Gentiles in Luke's authorial audience. In particular, the association between the custom of hospitality and Zeus, who was known as the God of Hospitality, was quite pronounced in antiquity (e.g. Homer, *Od*. 9.270-71; 14.283-84, 389; Ovid, *Metam*. 1.125-244; 8.626-93; Heliodorus, *Aeth*. 2.22.2). Furthermore, Luke draws attention to this belief when Cornelius falls at Peter's feet and begins to worship him upon his arrival (Acts 10.25) and when similar occurrences take place in 14.8-18 and 28.1-6. Consequently, Peter has to inform Cornelius that he is only a mortal and not a god (10.26).

Luke then subverts the Mediterranean hospitality tradition. In the end, Luke shows his audience that the God manifest in Jesus Christ is the true God of Hospitality. Cornelius's actions and Peter's words in 10.25-26 merely point Luke's audience to the question of the identity of the God manifest in Christ. Peter's sermon then provides the authoritative description of this God's identity (10.34-43).

Furthermore, it becomes clear that the God manifest in Jesus does not interact in a hospitality encounter as Zeus purportedly does. The God about whom Peter testifies has not come to test the hosts in order to measure their character and dole out rewards or punishments accordingly. Instead, this gracious God begins by extending love and forgiveness to the Gentiles rather than waiting for them to prove themselves (10.43). As a result, in Acts 10–11 God takes 'a people for his name' when God extends hospitality to the Gentiles gathered in Cornelius's house (15.14).

From a didactic standpoint, I then went on to suggest that Luke's narration of Acts 10–11 would have likely conveyed at least three important messages about Christian practice to Luke's audience. First, I suggested that Luke's audience would have perceived Luke holding up Christian hospitality as a means of spreading the gospel to the Gentiles. This association between the Gentile mission and the custom of hospitality is then maintained throughout the rest of the book of Acts (e.g. Acts 16.11-15; 28.1-6). Hence, Luke's audience may well have perceived an injunction both to extend and to receive hospitality as a means of spreading the gospel to the Gentiles. A social convention that manifests itself in cross-cultural contexts is a perfect tool for taking the gospel from its Jewish context and spreading it among the Gentiles.

Second, Luke's audience may well have surmised from Acts 10–11 that the practice of Christian hospitality could improve the Jewish and

Gentile relationships within the Church. By practicing Christian hospitality, the Church would be able to forge a unity that crossed the cultural divide.

Finally, in Acts 10–11 Luke's audience may have learned that the practice of Christian hospitality leads to an increased degree of spiritual transformation. A great deal of Peter's theological framework was drastically revised as he participated in this social convention with Cornelius and his household. Subsequently, the Jewish Christian leadership in Jerusalem experienced a similar transformation as a result of Peter's hospitality experiences in Acts 10–11. Thus, from Acts 9.43–11.18 Luke's audience would be able to perceive that God can also work through the custom of hospitality to transform those who already follow him.[14]

14. Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*, 109, 112, 124.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* (trans. Ebbe Vilborg; Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, 15; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962).

Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (trans. H. Rackham; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934 [repr. 1975]).

The Babylonian Talmud (ed. I. Epstein; 18 vols.; London: Soncino, 1961).

Brenton, C.L., *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986).

Cameron, Ron (ed.), *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982).

Chariton, *Callirhoe* (trans. G.P. Goold; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Clement, 'An Ancient Christian Sermon (2 Clement)', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 102-27.

—'The Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians (1 Clement)', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 22-101.

Cyprian, *The Letters of St. Cyprian.* I. *Letters 1–27* (trans. and annotated by G.W. Clarke; New York: Newman, 1984).

'The Didache (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 246-69.

Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments (trans. R. Hugh Connolly; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929 [repr. 1969]).

Dio Chrysostom (trans. J.W. Cohoon; 5 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).

Epictetus (trans. W.A. Oldfather; LCL; New York: Charles Putnam's Sons, 1926).

'Epistle to Diognetus', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 528-55.

Euripides (trans. Arthur S. Way; 4 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912 [repr. 1964]).

The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan (trans. Judah Goldin; YJS, 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).

The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan: An Analytical Translation and Explanation (trans. Jacob Neusner; BJS, 114; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

Genesis Rabbah (trans. Jacob Neusner), in *Genesis Rabbah, the Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis: A New American Translation* (BJS, 105; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

Heliodorus of Emesa, *Les Ethiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée)* (ed. R.M. Rattenbury and T.W. Lumb; trans. J. Maillon; Collection des universités de France; Paris: Société d'édition 'Les Belles lettres', 1935).

Herodotus (trans. A.D. Godley; LCL; 4 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920 [repr. 1975]).
Homer, *The Iliad* (trans. A.T. Murray; rev. William F. Wyatt; LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2nd edn, 1999).
—*The Odyssey* (trans. A.T. Murray; rev. George Dimock; LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).
Ignatius, 'To the Ephesians', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 136-49.
—'To the Magnesians', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 150-57.
—'To the Philadelphians', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 176-83.
—'To the Romans', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 166-75.
—'To the Smyrnaeans', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 184-93.
John Chrysostom, *Saint John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 18–45* (trans. Robert C. Hill; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 1990).
'Joseph and Aseneth' (trans. C. Burchard), in *OTP*, II, 177-247.
Joseph et Aseném (compiled by M. Philonenko; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).
Josephus (trans. H.St.J. Thackeray *et al*.; LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–65).
Kleist, James A., *The Didache; The Epistle of Barnabas; The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp; The Fragments of Papias; The Epistle to Diognetus* (Ancient Christian Writers, 6; New York: Newman, 1948).
Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* (trans. George Thornley and J.M. Maxwell; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962).
Lucian (trans. A.M. Harmon; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913).
The Mishnah (trans. Herbert Danby; London: Oxford University Press, 1933).
New Testament Apocrypha (ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher; 2 vols.; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, rev. edn, 1992).
Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus* (trans. Ronald E. Heine; Fathers of the Church, 71; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982).
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (trans. Frank Justus Miller; LCL; 6 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977–79).
Philo (trans. F.H. Colson; LCL; 12 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935–51).
Plato (trans. H.N. Fowler *et al*.; LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967–81).
Pritchard, James B. (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 3rd edn, 1969).
Reardon, B.P. (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
'The Shepherd of Hermas', in Holmes (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 328-527.
'Sibylline Oracles' (trans. J.J. Collins), in *OTP*, I, 317-42.
Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy (trans. Reuven Hammer; YJS, 24; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
The Talmud of Babylonia: An Academic Commentary. XVII. *Sotah* (trans. Jacob Neusner; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).
Tertullian: Apologetical Works and Minucius Felix Octavius (trans. Rudolph Arbesmann, Emily Joseph Daly and Edwin A. Quain; New York: Fathers of the Church, 1950).
'Testament of Abraham' (trans. E.P. Sanders), in *OTP*, I, 871-902.
'Testament of Jacob' (trans. W.F. Stinespring), in *OTP*, I, 913-18.
'Testament of Job' (trans. R.P. Spittler), in *OTP*, I, 829-68.

Thucydides (trans. Charles Forster Smith; LCL; 4 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919 [repr. 1969]).
Tischendorf, Constantinus de, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2nd edn, 1876 [repr. 1966]).
Xenophon (trans. Carleton L. Brownson *et al*.; LCL; 7 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968–80).
Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum libri V: de amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae (trans. Antonios D. Papanikolaou; Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1973).

Secondary Sources

Aland, Barbara, *et al*. (eds.), *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 4th rev. edn, 1998).
Albright, William F., 'Jethro, Hobab and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition', *CBQ* 25 (1963) 1-11.
Alexander, T. Desmond, 'Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to his Righteousness', *JBL* 104 (1985) 289-91.
Arterbury, Andrew, 'Abraham's Hospitality among Jewish and Early Christian Writers: A Tradition History of Genesis 18:1-16 and its Relevance for the Study of the New Testament', *PRS* 30 (2003) 359-76.
—'The Ancient Custom of Hospitality, the Greek Novels, and Acts 10:1–11:18', *PRS* 29 (2002) 53-72.
Ashley, Austin S., 'Xenia: A Study of Hospitality in Ancient Greece' (senior thesis, Harvard University, 1940).
Ashworth, Harold Mark, 'Hospitality as an Informing Image for the Christian Community: A Study in Theological Ethics' (PhD dissertation, Baylor University, 1997).
Attridge, Harold W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989).
Balch, David M., 'Attitudes toward Foreigners in 2 Maccabees, Eupolemus, Esther, Aristeas, and Luke–Acts', in Abraham Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris and James W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church in its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (NovTSup, 90; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), 22-47.
Barrett, C.K., *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).
—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
—*The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 1955).
Barth, Markus, and Helmut Blanke, *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (The Eerdmans Critical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
Bartlett, D.L., 'An Exegesis of Matthew 25.31-46', *Foundations* 19 (1976) 211-13.
Bauer, Walter, *et al*., *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (rev. and ed. Frederick W. Danker; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000).
Beare, F.W., 'The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels', *JBL* 89 (1970) 1-13.

Belmont, David E., 'Early Greek Guest-Friendship and its Role in Homer's *Odyssey*' (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1962).
Black, David Alan, 'The Pauline Love Command: Structure, Style, and Ethics in Romans 12.9-21', *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 2 (1989) 3-22.
Boccaccini, Gabriele, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
Bolchazy, Ladislaus J., 'From Xenophobia to Altruism: Homeric and Roman Hospitality', *The Ancient World* 1 (1978) 45-64.
—*Hospitality in Antiquity: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares, 1977).
Bonet-Maury, G., 'Hospitality (Christian)', in *ERE*, VI, 804-808.
Borgen, Peder, 'Philo of Alexandria', in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 233-82.
—'Philo of Alexandria', in *ABD*, V, 333-42.
—*Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for his Time* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).
Bouwman, Gilbert, *Das dritte Evangelium: Einübung in die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968).
Bovon, François, *De vocatione gentium: histoire de l'intérpretation d'Act. 10, 1–11, 18 dans les six premiers siècles* (Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1967).
—'Tradition et redaction en Actes 10,1–11,18', *TZ* 26 (1970) 22-46.
Bowie, Ewen L., 'The Greek Novel', in P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 683-98.
Bray, Gerald (ed.), *Romans* (ACCS: New Testament, 6; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998).
Briggs, Charles A., and Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906 [repr. 1976]).
Brodie, Thomas L., *The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
Brooke, A.E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
Brown, Peter, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2002).
Brown, Raymond E., *The Epistles of John* (AB, 30; New York: Doubleday, 1982).
—*The Gospel according to John* (AB, 29-29A; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966).
Bruce, F.F., *The Book of the Acts* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. edn, 1988).
—*The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).
Brueggemann, Walter, *Genesis* (IBC; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982).
Bruner, Frederick Dale, *Matthew*. II. *The Churchbook: Matthew 13–28* (Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
Bultmann, Rudolf, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare and J.K. Riches; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971).
—*The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; New York: Harper & Row, 1963).
—*The Johannine Epistles: A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (ed. Robert Funk; trans. R. Philip O'Hara with Lane C. McGaughy and Robert Funk; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973).

Burton, Ernest de Witt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921).
Butler, Trent C., *Joshua* (WBC, 7; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983).
Byrne, Brendan, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000).
Cadbury, Henry J., 'Lexical Notes on Luke–Acts III: Luke's Interest in Lodging', *JBL* 45 (1926), 305-22.
—*The Making of Luke–Acts* (London: SPCK, 1927).
Caird, G.B., *The Gospel of St Luke* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963).
Campbell, W.S., 'The Rule of Faith in Romans 12.1–15.3', in D.M. Hay and E.E. Johnson (eds.), *Pauline Theology*. III. *Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 259-86.
Capper, Brian, 'Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts', in I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 499-518.
Carden, Michael, 'Homophobia and Rape in Sodom and Gibeah: A Response to Ken Stone', *JSOT* 82 (1999) 83-96.
Carter, Warren, 'The Crowds in Matthew's Gospel', *CBQ* 55 (1993) 54-67.
—'Matthew 4.18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective', *CBQ* 59 (1997) 58-75.
—'Recalling the Lord's Prayer: The Authorial Audience and Matthew's Prayer as Familiar Liturgical Experience', *CBQ* 57 (1995) 514-30.
Carter, Warren, and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience Oriented Perspectives* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998).
Casson, Lionel, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).
Catchpole, D.R., 'The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Reappraisal of Matthew XXV.31-46', *BJRL* 61 (1979) 355-97.
Cazeaux, Jacques, 'Mystique et sagesse: le repas des trois anges et d'Abraham à Mambré vu par Philon d'Alexandrie', in *Prière, mystique et Judaïsme: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 12–17 Septembre 1984* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1987), 21-41.
Chadwick, Henry J., 'Justification by Faith and Hospitality', *Texte und Untersuchengen* 79 (1961) 281-85.
Childs, Brevard S., *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974).
Coats, George W., 'Moses in Midian', *JBL* 92 (1973) 3-10.
Cogan, Mordechai, *1 Kings* (AB, 10; New York: Doubleday, 2000).
Collins, Raymond F., *First Corinthians* (SP, 7; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999).
Conzelmann, Hans, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).
—*The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1960).
Cope, Lamar, 'Matthew 25.31-46: "The Sheep and the Goats" Reinterpreted', *NovT* 11.1-2 (1969) 32-44.
Court, J.M., 'Right and Left: The Implications for Matthew 25.31-46', *NTS* 31 (1985) 223-33.
Cousar, Charles B., *Galatians* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1982).
Craigie, Peter C., *Psalms 1–50* (WBC, 19; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983).
Cranfield, C.E.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979).

Crenshaw, James L., *The Psalms: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
Cross, F.L., and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 1974 [repr. 1990]).
Culpepper, R. Alan, 'The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, IX, 1-490.
Culy, Martin M., 'Jesus—Friend of God, Friend of his Followers: Echoes of Friendship in the Fourth Gospel' (PhD dissertation, Baylor University, 2002).
Danker, Frederick W., 'Benefactor', in *ABD*, I, 669-71.
—*Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, rev. edn, 1988).
Davies, W.D., and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997).
De Silva, David A., *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle 'to the Hebrews'* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
Deferrari, Roy J., *Saint Basil: The Letters*, II (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928 [repr. 1950]).
Delobel, J., 'L'onction de Jésus par la pécheresse: La composition littéraire de Lc., VII, 36-50', *ETL* 42 (1966) 415-75.
Denaux, Adelbert, 'The Theme of Divine Visits and Human (In)Hospitality in Luke–Acts: Its Old Testament and Graeco-Roman Antecedents', in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (BETL, 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 255-79.
Denis, Albert-Marie, *Concordance greque des pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament: concordance, corpus des textes, indices* (Leuven: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1987).
DeVries, Simon J., *1 Kings* (WBC, 12; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985).
Dibelius, Martin, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Heinrich Greeven; London: SCM Press, 1956).
Dodd, C.H., *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).
Donahue, John R., 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian Ethics (Matt 25.35-36)', *TS* 47/1 (1986) 3-31.
Donfried, Karl (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991).
Donlan, Walter, *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers* (ed. Walter Donlon; Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy–Carducci, 1999).
—'Reciprocities in Homer', *CW* 75 (1982) 137-75.
Dowd, Sharyn Echols, *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel* (Reading the New Testament; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2000).
Dunn, James D.G., *The Acts of the Apostles* (Narrative Commentaries; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1996).
—*The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993).
—'The Formal and Theological Coherence of Romans', in Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, 245-50.
—'Jesus, Table-Fellowship, and Qumran', in *idem*, *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected Essays of James D.G. Dunn*. I. *Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 96-111.
—*Romans 9–16* (WBC, 38a; Dallas: Word Books, 1988).
Durham, John I., *Exodus* (WBC, 3; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).
Elliot, John H., *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

Evans, Craig A., *Mark 8.27–16.20* (WBC, 34B; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001).
—*Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992).
Feldman, Louis H., *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. III. *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (ed. S. Mason; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).
Finley, M.I., 'Marriage, Sale and Gift in the Homeric World', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 2 (1955) 167-94.
—*The World of Odysseus* (New York: Penguin Books, 2nd edn, 1979).
—'The World of Odysseus Revisited', *PCA* 71 (1974) 13-31.
Firebaugh, W.C., *The Inns of Greece and Rome: And a History of Hospitality from the Dawn of Time to the Middle Ages* (New York: Bloom, 1928 [repr. 1972]).
Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB, 31; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1998).
—'The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke–Acts* (Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978), 139-52.
—*The Gospel according to Luke* (AB, 28-28a; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982).
—*The Letter to Philemon* (AB, 34c; New York: Doubleday, 2000).
—*Romans* (AB, 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993).
Flacelière, Robert, 'Hospitality', in Pierre Devambez *et al.* (eds.), *The Praeger Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Civilization* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967), 246-47.
Flender, Helmut, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).
Freedman, David Noel, 'The Twenty-Third Psalm', in Louis L. Orlin (ed.), *Michigan Oriental Studies in Honor of George G. Cameron* (Ann Arbor: Department of Near Eastern Studies, The University of Michigan, 1976), 139-66.
Frend, W.H.C., *The Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1982).
Fretheim, Terence E., 'The Book of Genesis', in *NIB*, I, 319-674.
—*Exodus* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1991).
Gamble, Harry, Jr, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism* (SD, 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
Garland, David E., *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (Reading the New Testament; New York: Crossroad, 1993).
Gaventa, Beverly Roberts, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* (OBT, 20; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
Geldenhuys, Norval, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954).
Gillman, John, 'Hospitality in Acts 16', *LS* 17 (1992) 181-96.
Gnilka, Joachim, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT, 1-2; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1992).
—*Der Philemonbrief* (HTKNT, 10; Freiburg: Herder, 1982).
Goodenough, Edgar J., *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2nd edn, 1963).
Gottschalk, Alfred, *Father Abraham in the Midrash, Kierkegaard and Philo* (Jerusalem: Mesharim, 1987).
Gould, J.P., 'Hiketeia', *JHS* 93 (1973) 74-103.
Grant, Robert M. (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary* (6 vols.; New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964–68).
Gray, John, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).
Gray, Sherman W., *The Least of My Brothers: Matthew 25.31-46, A History of Interpretation* (SBLDS, 114; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

Greenstone, Julius H., 'Hospitality', in Isidore Singer *et al.* (eds.), *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (12 vols.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1904), VI, 480-81.

Greer, Rowan A., *Broken Lights and Mended Lives: Theology and Common Life in the Early Church* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986).

—'Hospitality in the First Five Centuries of the Church', *Monastic Studies* 10 (1974) 29-48.

Griffin, Alan H.F., 'Philemon and Baucis in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *GR* 38 (1991) 62-74.

Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

—*Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

Gunkel, Hermann, *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997).

Gunneweg, Antonius H.J., 'Mose in Midian', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 61 (1964) 1-9.

Haarhoff, T.J., *The Stranger at the Gate: Aspects of Exclusiveness and Co-operation in Ancient Greece and Rome, with Some Reference to Modern Times* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938 [repr., Westport, CN: Greenwood, 1974]).

Haenchen, Ernst, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans and rev. R.McL. Wilson; Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 1971).

—*Johannesevangelium: Ein Kommentar* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1980).

Hägg, Tomas, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1971).

—*The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

Hagner, Donald A., *Matthew 1–13* (WBC, 33a; Dallas: Word Books, 1993).

—*Matthew 14-28* (WBC, 33b; Dallas: Word Books, 1995).

Hahn, Ferdinand, *Mission in the New Testament* (trans. Frank Clarke; SBT, 47; London: SCM Press, 1965).

Haight, Elizabeth Hazelton, *Essays on the Greek Romances* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1943).

Hamilton, Victor P., *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18–50* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

Handy, David Allan, 'The Gentile Pentecost: A Literary Study of the Story of Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10.1–11.18)' (PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1998).

Hanson, John Stephen, 'The Dream/Vision Report and Acts 10.1–11.18: A Form-Critical Study' (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1978).

Hare, Douglas R.A., *Matthew* (IBC; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1993).

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

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1998).

Hemer, Colin J., *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. Conrad H. Gempf; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990).

Henrich, Sarah Schurz, 'Godfearing in Acts 10: The Changing Rules of Hospitality in Early Christianity' (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1994).

Herman, Gabriel, 'Friendship, Ritualized', in *OCD*, 611-13.
—'Gift, Greece', in *OCD*, 637.
—*Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
Hirsch, Steven W., *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover: Published for Tufts University by University Press of New England, 1985).
Hobbs, T. Raymond, 'Hospitality in the First Testament and the "Teleological Fallacy" ', *JSOT* 95 (2001) 3-30.
—'Man, Woman, and Hospitality (2 Kings 4.8-36)', *BTB* 23 (1993) 91-100.
Hock, Ronald F., 'Homer in Greco-Roman Education', in Dennis R. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2001), 56-77.
—'Why New Testament Scholars Should Read Ancient Novels', in R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance and J. Perkins (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 121-38.
Holmes, Michael W. (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999).
Hornblower, Simon, 'Hellenism, Hellenization', in *OCD*, 677-79.
Hultgren, Arland, 'The Johannine Footwashing (13.1-11) as Symbol of Eschatological Hospitality', *NTS* 28 (1982) 539-46.
Humphrey, Edith M., 'Collision of Modes?—Vision and Determining Argument in Acts 10.1–11.18', *Semeia* 71 (1995) 65-84.
Jauss, Hans Robert, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (trans. Timothy Bahti; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982).
Jefford, Clayton N., 'Acts of Pilate', in *ABD*, V, 371-72.
Jefford, Clayton N., with Kenneth J. Harder and Louis D. Amezaga, Jr, *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996).
Jeremias, Joachim, *New Testament Theology*. I. *The Proclamation of Jesus* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971).
Jervell, Jacob, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke–Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).
Jewett, Robert, 'Ecumenical Theology for the Sake of Mission: Romans 1.1-17 + 15.14–16.24', in David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson (eds.), *Pauline Theology*. III. *Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 89-108.
Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP, 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992).
—*The Gospel of Luke* (SP, 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991).
—*The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke–Acts* (SBLDS, 39; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).
—*Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Reading the New Testament; New York: Crossroad, 1997).
Juel, Donald, *Luke–Acts: The Promise of History* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983).
Kamperidis, Lambros, 'Philoxenia and Hospitality', *Parab* 15 (1990) 4-13.
Kampling, Rainer, 'Fremde und Fremdsein in Aussagen des Neuen Testaments', in Ottmar Fuchs (ed.), *Die Fremden* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1988), 215-39.
Käsemann, Ernst, *An die Römer* (HNT, 8A; Tübingen: Mohr, 1973).
Keener, Craig S., *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

Kelley, Shawn Joseph, 'And Your Young Will See Visions: A Functionalist Literary Reading of the Visions to Saul and Peter in Acts' (PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1991).
Keyes, C.W., 'The Greek Letter of Introduction', *American Journal of Philology* 56 (1935) 28-44.
Kieffer, Rene, 'From Linguistic Methodology to the Discovery of a World of Metaphors', *Semeia* 81 (1998) 77-93.
Kilgallen, John J., 'Clean, Acceptable, Saved: Acts 10', *Expository Times* 109 (1998) 301-302.
Kilian, Rudolf, *Die vorpriestlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen* (BBB, 24; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1966).
Kim, Chan-Hie, *Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation* (SBLDS, 4; Misssoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).
Kim, H.C., *The Gospel of Nicodemus* (Toronto: Hunter Rose, 1973).
Koenig, John, 'Hospitality', in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (16 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1987), VI, 470-73.
—'Hospitality', in *ABD*, III, 299-301.
—*New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (OBT, 17; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
Koester, Craig R., *Hebrews* (AB, 36; New York: Doubleday, 2001).
Kraft, Robert A., *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*. III. *Barnabas and the Didache* (ed. Robert M. Grant; 6 vols.; New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965).
Krodel, Gerhard A., *Acts* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986).
Kurz, William S., *Reading Luke–Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993).
Kuss, Otto, *Der Römerbrief* (2 vols.; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963).
Ladd, G.E., 'The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Recent Interpretation', in R. Longenecker and M. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 191-99.
Lake, Kirsopp, *The Apostolic Fathers* (LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912 [repr. 1977]).
—'The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians', in *idem*, *The Apostolic Fathers*.
Laland, Erling, 'Die Martha-Maria-Perikope Lukas 10,38-42. Ihre kerygmatische Aktualität für das Leben der Urkirche', *ST* 13 (1959) 70-85.
Lampe, Peter, 'Roman Christians in Romans 16', in Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, 216-30.
Lane, William L., *Hebrews 9–13* (WBC, 47b; Dallas: Word Books, 1991).
Lasine, Stuart, 'Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World', *JSOT* 29 (1984) 37-59.
Lightfoot, J.B., *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp: Revised Texts with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations* (5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1889–90 [repr. 1981]).
Lindars, Barnabas, *The Gospel of John: Based on the Revised Standard Version* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972 [repr. 1981]).
Lindars, Barnabas, Ruth B. Edwards and John M. Court, *The Johannine Literature* (New Testament Guides; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
Loader, J.A., *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions* (ed. T. Baarda and A.S. van der Woude; CBET, 1; Kampen: Kok, 1990).

Lohse, Eduard, *Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (ed. Helmut Koester; trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971 [repr. 1975]).
Longenecker, Richard N., *Galatians* (WBC, 41; Dallas: Word Books, 1990).
Löning, Karl, 'Die Korneliustradition', *BZ* 18 (1974) 1-19.
Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1994).
Lowery, Richard H., *Sabbath and Jubilee* (St Louis: Chalice, 2000).
Lüdemann, Gerd, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1989).
Maccini, Robert Gordon, *Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses according to John* (JSOTSup, 125; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
Maddox, Robert, *The Purpose of Luke–Acts: Studies of the New Testament and its World* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982).
—'Who are the "Sheep" and the "Goats": A Study of the Purpose and Meaning of Matthew 25.31-46', *Australian Biblical Review* 13 (1965) 19-28.
Malherbe, Abraham J., *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2nd enl. edn, 1983).
Malina, Bruce, 'The Received View and What it Cannot Do: III John and Hospitality', in J.H. Elliott (ed.), *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World* (Semeia, 35; Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 171-94.
Marshall, I. Howard, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).
—*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
Marshall, Peter, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (WUNT, 2/23; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1987).
Matera, Frank J., *Galatians* (SP, 9; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992).
Mathews, John Bell, 'Hospitality and the New Testament Church: An Historical and Exegetical Study' (ThD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1964).
Matson, David Lertis, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* (JSNTSup, 123; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
Matthews, Victor H., 'Hospitality and Hostility in Genesis 19 and Judges 19', *BTB* 22 (1992) 3-12.
—'Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4', *BTB* 21 (1991) 13-21.
Mayer, Günter, 'Aspekte des Abrahambildes in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur', *Evangelische Theologie* 32 (1972) 118-27.
Mays, James Luther, *Psalms* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1944).
McCann, J. Clinton, Jr, 'The Book of Psalms: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, IV, 640-1280.
McCarter, Kyle P., Jr, *1 Samuel* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980).
Meecham, Henry G., 'In Praise of Hospitality: A New Testament Study', *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 178 (1953) 94-96.
Meeks, Wayne A., *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).
—'The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism', *JBL* 91 (1972) 44-72.
Metzger, B.M., 'Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?', *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 299-306.

Metzger, B.M., and R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
Michaels, J. Ramsey, 'Apostolic Hardships and Righteous Gentiles: A Study of Matthew 25.31-46', *JBL* 84 (1965) 27-37.
Miller, Patrick, *Interpreting the Psalms* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
Mitchell, Margaret M., '"Diotrephes Does Not Receive Us": The Lexicographical and Social Context of 3 John 9-10', *JBL* 117 (1998) 299-320.
—'New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus', *JBL* 111 (1992) 641-62.
Moiser, Jeremy, 'Rethinking Romans 12–15', *NTS* 36 (1990) 571-82.
Momigliano, Arnaldo, and Tim J. Cornell, 'Cliens', in *OCD*, 348.
—'Patronus', in *OCD*, 1126-27.
Montgomery, James A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings* (ed. Henry Snyder Gehman; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950 [repr. 1986]).
Moo, Douglas, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).
Moore, George F., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895 [repr. 1976]).
Morgan, J.R., 'Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Story', in Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 349-588.
Morgernstern, Julian, 'The Twenty-Third Psalm', *JBL* 65 (1946) 13-24.
Munck, Johannes, *The Acts of the Apostles* (rev. William F. Albright and C.S. Mann; AB, 31; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967).
Neil, William, *The Acts* (Greenwood, SC: Attic, 1973).
Nolland, John, *Luke* (WBC, 35a-c; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989).
Nybakken, Oscar E., 'The Moral Basis of Hospitium Privatum', *CJ* 41 (1945–46) 248-53.
O'Ceallaigh, G.C., 'Dating the Commentaries of Nicodemus', *HTR* 56 (1963) 21-58.
O'Day, Gail, 'The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, IX, 491-865.
Oden, Amy G. (ed.), *And You Welcomed Me: A Sourcebook on Hospitality in Early Christianity* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2001).
Olson, Dennis T., 'The Book of Judges: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', in *NIB*, II, 721-888.
Osiek, Carolyn, *Philippians; Philemon* (ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2000).
O'Toole, Robert F., SJ, 'Luke's Message in Luke 9:1-50', *CBQ* 49 (1987) 74-89.
Parsons, Mikeal C., 'Acts of the Apostles', in Watson E. Mills and Richard F. Wilson (eds.), *Mercer Commentary on the Bible* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1995), 1083-122.
—'"Nothing Defiled AND Unclean": The Conjunction's Function in Acts 10:14', *PRS* 27 (2000) 263-74.
—'"Short in Stature": Luke's Physical Description of Zacchaeus', *NTS* 47 (2001) 50-57.
Patterson, Cynthia, 'The Hospitality of Athenian Justice: The Metic in Court', in Virginia Hunter and Jonathan Edmondson (eds.), *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 93-112.
Pedrick, Victoria, 'The Hospitality of Noble Women in the Odyssey', *Helios* 15 (1988) 85-101.
Pervo, Richard, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).
Pesch, Rudolf, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (2 vols.; Evangelische Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testment; Zurich: Benziger, 1986).

Pettem, Michael, 'Luke's Great Omission and his View of the Law', *NTS* 42 (1996) 35-54.
Pitt-Rivers, Julian, 'The Stranger, the Guest, and the Hostile Host: Introduction to the Study of the Laws of Hospitality', in J.G. Peristiany (ed.), *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology: Mediterranean Rural Communities and Social Change* (Paris: Mouton, 1968), 13-30.
Plepelits, Karl, 'Achilles Tatius', in Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, 387-416.
Plummer, Alfred, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 5th edn, 1922 [repr. 1953]).
—*An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London: Robert Scott, 1928).
Pohl, Christine Dorothy, *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
—'Welcoming Strangers: A Socioethical Study of Hospitality in Selected Expressions of the Christian Tradition' (PhD dissertation, Emory University, 1993).
Power, Edmond, SJ, *Palestinian Customs Illustrating the Bible* (De Pere, WI: St Norbert Abbey, 1968).
Prusak, Bernard P., 'Hospitality Extended or Denied: Koinonia Incarnate from Jesus to Augustine', *The Jurist* 36 (1976) 89-126.
Purcell, Nicholas, 'Patronage, Non-Literary', in *OCD*, 1126.
Rabinowitz, Peter J., *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987).
—'Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences', *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977) 121-41.
—'Whirl without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism', in G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow (eds.), *Contemporary Literary Theory* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 81-100.
Rad, Gerhard von, *Genesis: A Commentary* (trans. John H. Marks; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972).
Reasoner, M., 'The Theology of Romans 12.1–15.13', in D.M. Hay and E.E. Johnson (eds.), *Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), III, 287-95.
Reece, Steve, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993).
Reines, Chaim W., 'Human Relationships in the Jewish Tradition', *Judaism* 26 (1977) 358-66.
Riddle, Donald Wayne, 'Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission', *JBL* 57 (1938) 141-54.
Robinson, B.P., 'The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke–Acts', *NTS* 80 (1984) 481-97.
Robinson, J.A.T., 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats', *NTS* 2 (1955–56) 225-37.
Rogers, Phillip, 'Abraham', in David Lyle Jeffrey (ed.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Tradition in English Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 9-11.
Roth, Paul, 'The Theme of Corrupted Xenia in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993) 1-17.
Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, 3; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
Rusche, Helga, 'Gastfreundschaft im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und in den Evangelien unter Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zur Mission', *ZMR* 41.3 (1957) 170-86.
—*Gastfreundschaft in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments und ihr Verhältnis zur Mission* (Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1958).

—'Gastfreundschaft und Mission in Apostelgeschichte und Apostelbriefen', *ZMR* 41.4 (1957) 250-68.
Russell, Letty M., 'Practicing Hospitality in a Time of Backlash', *ThTod* 52 (1996) 476-84.
Sahlins, Marshall D., *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine–Atherton, 1972).
—*Tribesmen* (Foundations of Modern Anthropology Series; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice–Hall, 1968).
Sand, Alexander, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986).
Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 13th edn, 1895 [repr. 1911]).
Sandmel, Sameul, 'Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance', in *ANRW* 2.21.1.
—*Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature* (New York: Ktav, aug. edn, 1971).
Sarna, Nahum M., *Exodus* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1991).
—*Genesis* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989).
Scarcella, Antonio M., 'The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels' (trans. Aldo Setaioli), in Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, 221-76.
Schaefer, Konrad, OSB, *Psalms* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001).
Schlatter, Adolf von, *Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinen Quellen erklärt* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Calwer, 2nd edn, 1975).
Schlier, Heinrich, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).
Schmeling, Gareth (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
Schmithals, Walter, *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988).
Schmitz, Leonhard, and William Wayte, '*Hospitium* (ξενία, προξενία)', in *DGRA*, I, 977-78, 981-82.
Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *Die Johannesbriefe* (HTKNT, 13.3; Freiburg: Herder, 1970).
—*The Gospel according to John* (3 vols.; New York: Seabury, 1980).
Schneider, Tammi J., *Judges* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000).
Schrader, O., 'Hospitality (Semitic)', in *ERE*, VI, 816-20.
Schürer, Emil, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; trans. T.A. Burkill *et al.*; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973).
Schürmann, Heinz, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT, 3-4; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1969).
Scott, J. Julius, Jr, 'The Cornelius Incident in Light of its Jewish Setting', *JETS* 34 (1991) 475-84.
Scott, Mary, 'Philos, Philo andXenia', *Acta Classica* 25 (1982) 119.
Segal, Alan F., *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
Shelmerdine, Cynthia W., 'The Pattern of Guest Welcome in the Odyssey', *CJ* 65 (1969) 124.
Sheridan, Mark (ed.), *Genesis 12–50* (ACCS: Old Testament, 2; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002).

Skinner, John, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1930 [repr. 1994]).
Smalley, Stephen S., *1, 2, 3 John* (WBC, 51; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984).
Smith, Henry Preserved, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898 [repr. 1977]).
Snyder, Graydon F., *First Corinthians: A Faith Community Commentary* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992).
Soggins, J. Alberto, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981).
Speiser, E.A., *Genesis* (AB, 1; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964).
Stählin, Gustav, 'ξένος, ξενία, ξενίζω, ξενοδοχέω, φιλοξενία, φιλόξενος', in *TDNT*, V, 1-36.
Stambaugh, John, and David Balch, *The Social World of the First Christians* (London: SPCK, 1986).
Stanton, Graham N., 'Once More: Matthew 25.31-46', in *idem*, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992), 207-31.
Stanton, G.R. 'φιλία and ξενία in Euripides' "Alkestis" ', *Hermes* 118 (1990) 42-54.
Stock, St George, 'Hospitality (Greek and Roman)', in *ERE*, VI, 808-12.
Stowe, C.E., *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible both the Canonical and the Apocryphal* (Hartford: Hartford Publishing, 1867).
Strecker, Georg, *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John* (ed. Harold Attridge; trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996).
Stuehrenberg, Paul Frederick, 'Cornelius and the Jews: A Study in the Interpretation of Acts before the Reformation' (PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1988).
Talbert, Charles H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke–Acts* (SBLMS, 20; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974).
—*Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1997).
—*Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1987).
—*Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1994).
—*Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1982).
—*Reading Luke–Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu* (NovTSup, 107; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003).
—'Tradition and Redaction in Romans 12.9-21', *NTS* 16 (1969–70) 83-93.
Talbert, Charles H., and Perry L. Stepp, 'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity, Part 1: The Lukan Milieu', in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998* (SBLSP, 37; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), I, 148-68.
—'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity, Part 2: Luke–Acts', in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998* (2 vols.; SBLSP, 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), I, 169-79.
Tannehill, Robert C., '"Cornelius" and "Tabitha" Encounter Luke's Jesus', *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 347-56.
—*Luke* (ANTC; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996).
—*The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. I. *The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
—*The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. II. *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990).

Tappy, Ron, 'Psalm 23: Symbolism and Structure', *CBQ* 57 (1995) 255-80.
Teeter, Timothy M., 'Christian Letters of Recommendation in the Papyrus Record', *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 9 (1990) 59-69.
Thiselton, Anthony C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
Thorburn, John, 'Hospitality', in *EGHT*, I, 775-78.
Thornton, Agathe, *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey* (London: Methuen, 1970).
Thunberg, L., 'Early Christian Interpretations of the Three Angels in Gen. 18', *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966) 560-70.
Tiede, David L., *Prophecy and History in Luke–Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
Todd, F.A., *Some Ancient Novels: Leucippe and Clitophon, Daphnis and Chloe, The Satiricon, The Golden Ass* (London: Oxford University Press, 1940).
Tolbert, Mary Ann, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).
Tyson, Joseph B., 'The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture in Acts', *NTS* 33 (1987) 619-31.
—'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10.1–11.18', *Forum* NS 2/2 (1999) 179-96.
VanderKam, James C., *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).
Van Paassen, J., 'Hospitality', in *NCE*, VII, 154-55.
Van Seters, John, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).
Vogt, Ernest, 'The Place in Life of Ps 23', *Biblica* 34 (1953) 195-211.
Wagner-Hasel, Beate, 'Gastfreundschaft', in Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (10 vols.; Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1998), IV, 794-98.
Wenham, Gordon J., *Genesis 16–50* (WBC, 2; Dallas: Word Books, 1994).
Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 12–36: A Commentary* (trans. John J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985).
Wigoder, Geoffrey (ed.), 'Hakhnasat Orehim', in *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Facts on File, 7th edn, 1992), 402.
Wilckens, Ulrich, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament; Düsseldorf: Neukirchener Verlag, 3rd edn, 1974).
Wilson, Stephen G., *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke–Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
Wilson, Walter T., 'Urban Legends: Acts 10.1–11.18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives', *JBL* 120 (2001) 77-99.
Witherington, Ben, III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
Witherup, Ronald D., SS, 'Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again: "Functional Redundancy" in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* 49 (1993) 45-66.
Wolfson, Harry Austryn, *Philo* (2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

Apocrypha/Deutero-Canonical Books

New Testament

Ancient Authors and Works

INDEX OF AUTHORS