From ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity
Author(s): David G. Horrell
Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature,* Vol. 120, No. 2 (Summer, 2001), pp. 293–311
Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268296
Accessed: 29/08/2008 06:56

FROM ἀδελφοί TO οἶκος θεοῦ:
SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION IN
PAULINE CHRISTIANITY

DAVID G. HORRELL
D.G.Horrell@exeter.ac.uk
University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4QH, UK

Unser Leben geht hin mit Verwandlung, Rilke says: Our life passes in trans-
formation. This is what I seek to grasp in the theory of structuration.
                    —Anthony Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory*

The purpose of our journey is to attempt to construct a kind of ethnography
of Christian beginnings.
                    —Wayne Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality*

I. Introduction

One of the aspects of social structure commonly investigated by anthro-
pologists is that of kinship.[1] This is true not only of anthropological studies
based on the traditional method of "participant observation" but also of those
based on the study of particular literary or historical texts: the Anglo-Saxon epic

    [1] See, e.g., R. M. Keesing, *Cultural Anthropology: A Contemporary Perspective* (2d ed.; New
York: CBS College Publishing; Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981), 212–50; T. H. Eriksen, *Small
Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology* (London: Pluto, 1995),
82–94. A brief introduction related to NT studies is given by K. C. Hanson, "Kinship," in *The Social*

Beowulf or the novels of Jane Austen, for example.[2] Investigation of the language used to describe kinship patterns and family relationships is important not just because it enables a picture to be sketched of who relates to whom and how, but also because the specific language used both reflects and shapes patterns of social relationships. In the process of what Anthony Giddens calls "structuration"—the "structuring of social relations across time and space," with structure as both "the medium and outcome of the conduct it recursively organizes"—kinship language shapes social relationships and is simultaneously reproduced in the context of those relationships.[3] Over time, both language and patterns of relationships may evolve and change. The fact that sons in Jane Austen's novels always address their father as "Sir," for example, reveals something about the moral ideals of deference and obedience expected among children in that author's era.[4] Contemporary British terms of address are generally different, and both reflect and construct correspondingly different patterns of social and moral interaction.

In this essay I want to consider how some aspects of kinship and household language contribute to the shaping of social relationships within the Pauline churches, and how, if at all, the patterns of language and relationships change over time in the NT period. In line with general, though by no means unanimous, scholarly judgment, I shall include as genuine epistles of Paul: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon.[5] Colossians and Ephesians will be taken as early and closely related

---

Sciences and New Testament Interpretation (ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 62–79.

[2] J. M. Hill, *The Cultural World in Beowulf* (Anthropological Horizons; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995); I. Schapera, *Kinship Terminology in Jane Austen's Novels* (Royal Anthropological Institute Occasional Paper 33; London: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1977). S. R. Barrett notes the recent upsurge in archival and historical research in anthropology in his *Anthropology: A Student's Guide to Theory and Method* (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 194 n. 4.

[3] See A. Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge: Polity, 1984), 374, 376, also xiii–xxxvii, 1–40; idem, *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* (London/Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1982), 28–39. For further references, and an introduction to Giddens's structuration theory in relation to NT studies, see D. G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 45–59, 313; idem, "The Development of Theological Ideology in Pauline Christianity: A Structuration Theory Perspective," in *Modelling Early Christianity* (ed. P. F. Esler; London/New York: Routledge, 1995), 224–36.

[4] See Schapera, *Kinship Terminology*, 2.

[5] 2 Thessalonians, the authenticity of which is often doubted, is not taken directly into consideration, though the relevant statistics are included for information on the table in the appendix. Ἀδελφός-terminology appears somewhat more frequently in 2 Thessalonians than in what I have counted as pseudo-Pauline epistles, but if 2 Thessalonians is pseudonymous, as seems to me most

examples of post-Pauline pseudepigraphy, the Pastoral Epistles as somewhat later additions to the Pauline corpus, written probably around the end of the first century.

There are many familial and household terms used in the Pauline correspondence, and while a number are mentioned briefly in the discussion below my main focus is on the language of brother- or sisterhood (ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή, etc.)[6] and of house or household (οἶκος, οἰκία, οἰκεῖος, etc.).[7] My particular interest in this paper is in the metaphorical uses of these terms to describe and to construct the Christian community and the relationships between its members. In other words, the focus is on what has often been termed "fictive kinship" language and on the designation of the church community as a household (of God), and not on the relations between natural siblings or within actual households. While the language of brother/sisterhood and that of house/household are clearly closely related and overlap in terms of that which they generally describe, they should not simply be treated together as varied forms of familial terminology.[8] We need to consider how the distribution of sibling and house-

---

likely, it is in a somewhat unique position, being clearly based on 1 Thessalonians. That would make the reduction in references to believers as ἀδελφοί (nineteen times in 1 Thessalonians, eight times in 2 Thessalonians) notable, an observation that coheres with the overall argument of this paper.

[6] I have wrestled with the problem of inclusive terminology in this paper, though I am conscious that—lacking in imagination perhaps—I have not satisfactorily solved it. What is clear is that a strategy such as that adopted by the NRSV, where ἀδελφός and אח are regularly translated "neighbor," "member of the community" (e.g., Deut 15:2–3, 7–11), "believer" (e.g., 1 Cor 6:6–8; 7:12; 8:11; etc.), would be entirely inappropriate for this paper. As Scott Bartchy points out, this leads to the original terminology being obscured such that modern readers miss seeing the extent to which sibling-like bonds are being encouraged among the communities addressed by the biblical writers (S. S. Bartchy, "Undermining Ancient Patriarchy: The Apostle Paul's Vision of a Society of Siblings," *BTB* 29 [1999]: 68–78, here p. 70). Since the masculine terms ἀδελφός and ἀδελφοί are those most often used (generically) by Paul, I have also written them frequently. Leaving the terms untranslated may perhaps help to stress that this is ancient (patriarchal!) language which raises problems for modern inclusive translation. To some extent I have followed Bartchy and Aasgaard in using the term "sibling," though I am conscious that this term is much less common in contemporary English than "brother" or "sister."

[7] On the familial terms in particular, see D. von Allmen, *La Famille de Dieu: La Symbolique familiale dans le Paulinisme* (OBO 41; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).

[8] As (understandably) in the brief survey by R. Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community* (rev. ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 50–51; and in P. F. Esler, "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal 5:13 to 6:10," in *Constructing Early Christian Families* (ed. H. Moxnes; London/New York: Routledge, 1997), 122–23. Note the comments of K. O. Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family," in *Constructing Early Christian Families*, ed. Moxnes, 150; and K. Schäfer, *Gemeinde als »Bruderschaft«: Ein Beitrag zum Kirchenverständnis des Paulus* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/333; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989), 18–19.

hold language varies within the Pauline corpus and to take account of the ways in which the different terms may reflect different ideals with regard to the construction of social relationships in the Christian communities.

II. The Meaning of the Terms ἀδελφός/אָח and οἶκος/בַּיִת

The term ἀδελφός,[9] like its Hebrew equivalent, אָח, first of all signifies "a person's own blood brother,"[10] but was also used of various relationships where there was some emotional and social bond:[11] between spouses,[12] kinsfolk (see n. 15), tribe members, colleagues, fellow members of an association,[13] and even between a king and a hoped-for ally.[14] In view of the frequent description of the members of the Christian community as ἀδελφοί in the NT, it is important to note that the Hebrew Bible often uses the term אָח, rendered ἀδελφός in the LXX, for kinsfolk and fellow Israelites (members of an extended kin group).[15] This usage in Judaism is continued into NT times and beyond.[16] Despite the widely varied uses of the term, its basic meaning throughout remains that of "brother" (and likewise for ἀδελφή, "sister"). Thus, in its varied contexts, it reflects the existence of, or the desire for, a sibling-like bond between speaker

---

[9] Similar things could be said about the term ἀδελφή, "sister," but because masculine language was used generically, occurrences of ἀδελφός (often plural) are much more common in the NT and elsewhere. Cf., e.g., Job 42:11 (LXX); n. 11 below.

[10] H. Ringgren, in *TDOT* 1:188; cf. LSJ, 20: "son of the same mother."

[11] For more detailed investigation of the diversity of usage sketched here, see K. H. Schelkle, "Bruder," *RAC* 2:631–40; Aasgaard, "'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!'" 119–27.

[12] E.g., *P.Lond.* 42; and for the term ἀδελφή used by a husband of his wife, see *P.Oxy.* 120, 528, 744. See also G. H. R. Horsley, who notes that "[l]etters in the papyri containing ἀδελφός as an address between spouses are commonplace" (*NewDocs* 1:58). Sometimes, however, it is impossible to tell whether it is a spouse or a sibling who is being addressed (letters are also frequently exchanged between siblings), and, given the practice of intersibling marriage in Egypt, it is possible that spouses are sometimes literally a brother or sister (see C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents* [rev. ed.; London: SPCK, 1987], 29).

[13] On the use of ἀδελφός terminology in associations, see LSJ, 20 (ἀδελφός §3); Horsley, *NewDocs* 2:49–50; D. C. Duling, "The Matthean Brotherhood and Marginal Scribal Leadership," in *Modelling Early Christianity*, ed. Esler, 159–82. On the terminology in Greco-Roman religious contexts, see Schelkle, "Bruder," 632–34.

[14] Josephus, *Ant.* 13.45; cf. 1 Kgs 9:13; Jdt 7:30 (LXX). See further LSJ, 20; Ringgren, *TDOT* 1:188–93; H. F. von Soden, *TDNT* 1:144–46.

[15] E.g., Gen 13:8; Exod 2:11; Lev 25:35f.; Deut 15:7, 9, 11–12; 22:1–4. Cf. 2 Macc 1:1; Philo, *De Virt.* 82; Ringgren, *TDOT* 1:188–93; von Soden, *TDNT* 1:145: "There can be no doubt, however, that ἀδελφός is one of the titles of the people of Israel taken over by the Christian community."

[16] See, e.g., Josephus, *J.W.* 2.122 (on the Essenes); 1QS 6:10; 6:22; CD 6:20; 7:2; Str-B 1:276; Aasgaard, "'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!'" 125–26.

and addressee(s).[17] The term itself conveys no sense of hierarchy or superiority, though that may of course be assumed or stated elsewhere in the context where it appears.[18]

The Greek terms οἶκος/οἰκία[19] and the Hebrew term בַּיִת are even more wide-ranging in meaning and use. In both languages the terms are used for both the building (part or whole) in which people live and the human members or material contents that make up the household.[20] בַּיִת and οἶκος may thus designate physical locations such as house, palace, and temple, or rooms or halls within these,[21] and also human groups ranging in scope from the immediate or extended family to the clan, dynasty, tribe, or tribal league.[22] Hence the frequent Hebrew Bible expression "house of Israel" (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל).[23] A particularly

---

[17] Bartchy seems to overlook the extent to which sibling language was widely used outside of family contexts and in the extended kinship group of an *ethnos* like Israel, thus ignoring the extent to which this sibling-like bond was meant to characterize a wide range of relationships. Bartchy suggests that in ancient Mediterranean culture, in relationships outside the family, "both boys and girls were socialized to expect . . . that every male should seek to dominate as many other men as possible . . . traditional male socialization produced human beings who were programmed to pursue a never-ending quest for greater honor and influence" ("Undermining Ancient Patriarchy," 68). Both the widespread use of ἀδελφός terminology and the qualities ascribed to friendship suggest that extra-family relationships were frequently characterized by more than an agonistic contest for honor. Indeed, authors who describe fraternal relations often draw parallels with the qualities and characteristics of friendship. See, e.g., Terence, *Adelphoe* 707–8: *si frater aut sodalis esset, qui magis morem gereret?* ("If he were a brother or a friend, how could he do more to gratify me?"); the well-known saying κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων (Plato, *Phaedrus* 279C; Terence, *Adelphoe* 803–4; Plutarch, Περὶ Φιλαδελφίας 490E). For a comparison between Paul and Plutarch on "brotherhood," see R. Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character," in *Constructing Early Christian Families*, ed. Moxnes, 166–82, and further idem, "'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!'"

[18] See Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," 150; Schäfer, *Gemeinde als »Bruderschaft«*, 37.

[19] The distinction between these two Greek terms (e.g. in Attic law οἶκος designated the whole of a deceased person's estate, οἰκία simply his residence; Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 1.5) is largely lost in the NT (cf. 1 Cor 1:16; 16:15). See O. Michel, "οἶκος κτλ.," *TDNT* 5:131; LSJ, 1203. Note, however, C. S. de Vos, "The Significance of the Change from οἶκος to οἰκία in Luke's Account of the Philippian Gaoler (Acts 16.30–4)," *NTS* 41 (1995): 292–96, where the different nuances of the two words in that specific Lukan context are explored.

[20] See C. Osiek and D. L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 6: "The Greek *oikos, oikia*, Hebrew *bayit*, and Latin *domus* can all refer to the physical building but can all just as well, and more often do, mean: household, including material goods and slaves; immediate blood family; or family lineage."

[21] E.g., H. A. Hoffner points out that בַּיִת can designate a building or part of a building, including house, palace, temple, or room or hall within these ("בַּיִת," *TDOT* 2:107–16). Michel mentions house, cave, temple, treasure-house, dwelling etc. as meanings of οἶκός (*TDNT* 5:119–20); see also LSJ, 1204–5.

[22] See, e.g., Gen 17:12, 27; 24:27, 38; 34:19; Exod 6:14; Num 2:34, Josh 17:17; 22:14; etc.

[23] E.g., Exod 16:31; Lev 10:6; Num 20:29; Josh 21:45; Isa 5:7; Jer 2:4; etc. The phrase is often

interesting and relevant example of the use of οἶκος is in the late-second- or early-first-century B.C.E. inscription from Philadelphia in Lydia, discussed by Stephen Barton and G. H. R. Horsley. The inscription sets out the regulations for members of a private Hellenistic cultic association and uses the word οἶκος to denote both the (private) meeting room or building and the association (of people) itself.[24]

A number of other related Greek terms also need to be considered along with οἶκος/οἰκία in a consideration of the use of household language to describe the Christian community in the Pauline letters. Some of these relate more to the notion of the οἶκος as a building—οἰκοδομή and οἰκοδομέω, for example—and others to οἶκος as household, such as οἰκεῖος and οἰκέτης. When and where these words are relevant to a metaphorical description of the Christian community as a household has to be decided according to context.

Since there is a range of potentially relevant terms and a basic distinction between οἶκος used of physical locations and the same word used of human groupings, it is more difficult than in the case of ἀδελφός to say something basic about what the term or terms convey and imply. However, it would seem fair to say that when οἶκος is used to describe the human household it often denotes some kind of structured and stratified group.[25] Despite the diversity of real family structures at the time,[26] which often deviated from the "ideal" of an extensive household headed by a κύριος or *paterfamilias*, there are clearly distinctions between husbands and wives, parents and children, owners and slaves.[27] Precisely what size or kind of οἶκος is in view, however, can be determined only from the context of each particular reference. Indeed, it is most important to stress that an assessment of the implications of sibling and house-

---

rendered οἶκος Ισραηλ in the LXX (e.g., Lev 10:6; Num 20:29; Ruth 4:11), though sometimes υἱοὶ Ισραηλ, etc. (e.g., Exod 16:31; Josh 21:45).

[24] S. C. Barton and G. H. R. Horsley, "A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches," *JAC* 24 (1981): 7–41, esp. 15–16, 31–32.

[25] See again Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," 150.

[26] See the important article by D. B. Martin, "The Construction of the Ancient Family: Methodological Considerations," *JRS* 86 (1996): 40–60. On household structures around the time of Christian origins, see D. C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS 71; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 27–81; more generally, Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*; S. Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).

[27] Verner, *Household of God*, 79: "in both [Greek and Roman] societies the household was conceived of as a patriarchal institution, whose male head (κύριος, *paterfamilias*) exercised sweeping, although not entirely unrestricted authority over the other members. These members fell into three main categories, namely, wife, children, and slaves." Hoffner (*TDOT* 2:111) outlines the similar structure of the οἶκος/בּיִת in ancient Greek, Semitic, and Hittite tradition; it comprised "a father, his wife, his own and adopted children, dependent relatives, clients, and domestic servants (i.e. male and female slaves)."

hold language for the structuring of social relationships can be undertaken only by examining the context of specific occurrences, the discourse in which the terms are embedded.

III. The Language of Kinship and Household and the Structuring of Social Relationships

The Authentic Pauline Letters

Let us then turn to a survey of the occurrences of sibling and household language in the authentic Pauline letters, first to the use of the terms ἀδελφός/ ἀδελφή to denote fictive kinship relations between fellow Christians (see appendix).[28] As is well known, Paul uses the term ἀδελφοί frequently in addressing the congregations to which he writes; and he refers to individual believers, specific or nonspecific, as ἀδελφός or ἀδελφή.[29] Robert Banks rightly observes that the designation ἀδελφοί "is far and away Paul's favorite way of referring to the members of the communities to whom he is writing."[30] Leaving aside the uses of ἀδελφός or ἀδελφή to refer to biological kinship relations or to the people of Israel (Rom 9:3), Paul uses ἀδελφοί (and, less frequently, the singular form, both masculine and feminine) to refer to Christian believers 112 times in the seven authentic letters; that is, on average fractionally over once per page of Nestle-Aland Greek text (26th ed.). The prominence of this kinship description would seem to imply that Paul both assumes and promotes the relationship between himself and his addressees, and among the addressees themselves, as one between equal siblings, who share a sense of affection, mutual responsibility, and solidarity. In most of these places, the term ἀδελφοί appears

---

[28] The figures given for the Pauline epistles here differ slightly from those given by Bartchy ("Undermining Ancient Patriarchy," 70) for "Paul's Use of Surrogate Kinship Language." This appears to be due to the fact that Bartchy has wrongly included all appearances of the term ἀδελφός/ἀδελφή, even when they clearly describe a biological kinship relation and not the surrogate kinship of Christian believers (i.e., Gal 1:19; 1 Cor 9:5; and probably Rom 16:15). I have also excluded Rom 9:3, where ἀδελφοί is used by Paul of Israel rather than of the Christian community. See also the table provided by von Allmen, *La Famille de Dieu*, xxvii; discussion on pp.156–65.

[29] Unsurprisingly, Paul uses ἀδελφός much more frequently than ἀδελφή. The lack of parallel in 1 Cor 7:12–13 is striking (εἴ τις ἀδελφός . . . καὶ γυνὴ εἴ τις . . .) but no great significance can be attached to this, given the phrase ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ ἀδελφή in v. 15.

[30] Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community*, 50–51. Despite this, the notion of the church as "family" is seen as only one of a number of descriptions of the church in Paul, and not as a significant model of the church, by H. Doohan, *Paul's Vision of Church* (GNS 32; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989), 137–69. She privileges the more theological models of the church—"new creation," "body of Christ," etc.—thus bearing out Bartchy's point that the importance of sibling language in Paul has generally been neglected ("Undermining Ancient Patriarchy," 69–70).

simply as an apparently standard and common—though not for that reason insignificant—designation of the Christians Paul is addressing: "I do not want you to be ignorant, ἀδελφοί . . ." (Rom 1:13; 11:25); "I appeal to you, ἀδελφοί . . ." (Rom 15:30; 1 Cor 1:10; 16:15; cf. 1 Thess 5:14) etc. That ἀδελφός is a basic identity-designation of those who are members of the Christian communities is indicated also in 1 Cor 5:11, where Paul warns the Corinthians against association with any so-called brothers (ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος) who are shown by their immorality not to be truly ἀδελφοί, like the sexually immoral man who is to be shunned and expelled from the church (5:1–8). While the various nuances and variations among these many instances could profitably be explored,[31] the texts that seem especially significant for our purposes are those where sibling language is used with an apparently deliberate and repeated emphasis and where it expresses a particularly ethical concern. The passages most worthy of note in this regard are Rom 14:10–21 (where there are five occurrences in eleven verses); 1 Cor 6:5–8 (four occurrences in four verses); and 1 Cor 8:11–13 (four occurrences in three verses).[32]

In each of these places Paul is challenging his readers to give to their fellow Christians a degree of consideration, respect, and care which is currently lacking but which should follow from their identity as ἀδελφοί—hence the reason for the emphatic use of sibling language. In 1 Cor 6:1–8 Paul criticizes those among the Corinthian community who are taking their fellow believers to court; indeed, he explicitly aims to put them to shame (6:5). For Paul their behavior shows a scandalous lack of appreciation both of their status as ἅγιοι amidst the "unrighteous" of the world (6:1–3), and also of the fact that those whom they accuse in court are ἀδελφοί (6:5–8). An emphasis on the identity of their opponents as ἀδελφοί is especially clear in v. 8: "But you yourselves wrong and defraud, and brothers and sisters at that" (καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς).

---

[31] For a comprehensive study, see Schäfer, *Gemeinde als »Bruderschaft«*, 330–52. It is notable, for example, that 1 Thessalonians—addressed to a community with which Paul is pleased and on good terms (1 Thess 1:2–10; 4:9–12)—has the highest incidence of ἀδελφός-language among the genuine Paulines, 2 Corinthians the lowest, reflecting perhaps the difficult relationship between Paul and the Corinthians after the painful visit (2 Cor 2:1). However, the variations between Paul's letters in their uses of ἀδελφός-language cannot be consistently explained on this basis alone, and other factors would have to be explored in any attempt to explain the variations. See further J. M. G. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity," *JSNT* 47 (1992): 49–74; C. S. de Vos, *Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with their Wider Civic Communities* (SBLDS 168; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).

[32] See further the detailed discussions in Aasgaard, "'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!'" 129–332. The list of passages worthy of consideration could be expanded considerably. Note, e.g., 1 Cor 7:12–15, where the marital relationship between an ἀδελφός or ἀδελφή and a non-Christian spouse is the matter of concern, and 1 Thess 4:6, where, as in 1 Cor 6:1–8, Paul's concern is that no one should wrong or exploit an ἀδελφός. On Phlm 16, see below.

In 1 Cor 8:1–13 Paul begins his discussion of food sacrificed to idols by seeking to change the basis on which "the strong" make their ethical decision on this matter. Rather than base their decision—which is currently an assertion of their right to eat without restriction—on their theological knowledge ("there is no idol in the world" [v. 4]), Paul wants them to base it on love, on a concern for the other who may be offended or damaged through their conduct (vv. 1–3, 7–13).[33] He warns them against "destroying" one of "the weak" (v. 11), and strongly insists on the consideration that should be shown toward even these "weak" members of the community. Here, as elsewhere, the ethical appeal of the sibling language is intensified by using the singular form:[34] each single individual is "ὁ ἀδελφός for whom Christ died" (8:11). In that concise phrase both sibling language and the central Christian confession concerning Christ's self-giving death serve as ethical foundations for an "other-regarding" morality, which gives equal value to each member of the community (cf. 1 Cor 12:25–26).[35] Both aspects of that ethical appeal are intensified further in the following verses (vv. 12–13): sinning against οἱ ἀδελφοί, is a "sin against Christ"—this is the only time Paul ever uses this stern and serious phrase. Finally, Paul illustrates the lengths to which he would go in order not to cause a sibling to stumble: he would never eat meat again rather than cause such offense. Notable for our investigation here is his twice-repeated description of such a person as ὁ ἀδελφός μου.[36]

The pattern of ethical argument Paul developed in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 is drawn on again in the related but different context addressed in Rom 14:1–15:13. Here too Paul wants to persuade Christians with different convictions regarding prohibited foods and special days not to judge but to accept and welcome one another (προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους—Rom 15:7).[37] Again there is a repeated insistence that those who are judged and despised are ἀδελφοί: this in itself should apparently reveal such antagonism as utterly inappropriate. Also

[33] For a detailed consideration of Paul's ethical argument in these chapters, see D. G. Horrell, "Theological Principle or Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8.1–11.1," *JSNT* 67 (1997): 83–114.

[34] See esp. Rom 14:10–21; also 1 Cor 6:5–6; 1 Thess 4:6.

[35] On this christologically based pattern of "other-regarding" morality in Pauline ethics, see D. G. Horrell, "Restructuring Human Relationships: Habermas's Discourse Ethics and Paul's Corinthian Letters," *ExpTim* 110 (1999): 321–25.

[36] Note the singular; see n. 34 above.

[37] On the context addressed here, see J. M. G. Barclay, "'Do We Undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14:1–15:6," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1996), 287–308; and most recently M. Reasoner, *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1–15.13 in Context* (SNTSMS 103; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). However, I am not always convinced that the parallels Reasoner finds in Roman literature are very close to the concerns of Paul and his addressees.

notable once again is the use of the singular form of the noun to focus and personalize the appeal: all five occurrences of ἀδελφός in Rom 14:10–21 are singular, four of them followed by σου—ὁ ἀδελφός σου, "*your* brother or sister." One of Paul's very rare references to Christian believers as members of a metaphorical household appears here in support of the same ethical argument: judgment of a fellow believer is inappropriate not only because he or she is an ἀδελφός, but also because he or she is an οἰκέτης (again, Paul uses the singular form) belonging to the κύριος, and the right to judge them is therefore his alone (14:4). Moreover, alongside the emphatic use of sibling language and this one example of "household" language, in both the passage from Romans and that from 1 Corinthians, Paul also uses the language of building as part of his appeal for mutual regard and solidarity among the ἀδελφοί of the congregation.[38]

One final example deserves to be considered, not least because of the comparison it facilitates with a significant passage in 1 Timothy: Paul's letter to Philemon. Paul strengthens the emotional intensity of his appeal to Philemon by twice addressing him directly as ἀδελφέ (vv. 7, 20). Equally significant is Paul's direct appeal that Philemon receive back his slave, without regard for any wrong he may have committed (v. 18), "no longer as a slave, but more than a slave, a beloved brother" (v. 16).[39] That this is meant to imply a real change in the social relationship between slave and owner, and not merely a spiritual revaluation in the sight of God, is strongly suggested by Paul's declaration that their brotherhood exists "both in the flesh and in the Lord" (v. 16).[40]

In all these instances it would seem right to conclude that Paul uses sibling language to promote the solidarity and mutual regard among members of the congregations.[41] His emphatic use of such language when confronting situations in which there is currently a lack of such concern indicates that he sees

---

[38] οἰκοδομέω: 1 Cor 8:1, 10 (used ironically); cf. 10:23. οἰκοδομή: Rom 14:19; 15:2. For the same terms elsewhere in Paul, see Rom 15:20; 1 Cor 14:3–5, 12, 17, 26; 2 Cor 5:1; 10:8; 12:19; 13:10; Gal 2:18; 1 Thess 5:11.

[39] On the implications of this, see further N. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 266–70, 288–89. A. D. Callahan rightly notes: "Fraternal love is a leitmotiv of the epistle" (*Embassy of Onesimos: The Letter of Paul to Philemon* [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997], 49). I find less convincing Callahan's argument that Onesimus was not actually a slave (see pp. 4–19, 44, 47, 69, etc.). See also C. Frilingos, "'For My Child, Onesimus': Paul and Domestic Power in Philemon," *JBL* 119 (2000): 91–104.

[40] It is the phrase καὶ ἐν σαρκί that is especially noteworthy: it seems intended to oppose explicitly any notion that this "brotherhood" applied only to some nonworldly realm in the sight of God. For comparable uses of ἐν κυρίῳ, see 1 Cor 7:22, 39; 11:11.

[41] Also significant are Paul's appeals for φιλαδελφία and ἀγάπη among members of the congregations (e.g., Rom 12:9–10; 13:8–10; 1 Cor 13:1–13; 1 Thess 4:9). See further Schäfer, *Gemeinde als »Bruderschaft«*; Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," 150–65; Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul."

sibling bonds as implying precisely that mutualism which he seeks to foster. In Scott Bartchy's words, "his readers were challenged to practice the general reciprocity and mutual support that characterized the relations among siblings at their best."[42]

However, that should not be taken to imply that Paul's vision is unambiguously that of an egalitarian community. It seems to me that that *is* essentially what Paul implies with the designation ἀδελφοί, but that is not the only designation Paul uses, either of himself or of his congregations.[43] For example, Paul describes the Corinthians as his beloved children (ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητά) and himself as their father (πατήρ), a position from which he can threaten them with the rod (1 Cor 4:14–15, 21).[44] His calling by God to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles and his role as "founding father" give him (he believes) some power and authority over his churches (cf. 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10).[45] What seems clear, nonetheless, is that the frequent use of ἀδελφός language reflects both an established designation for the members of the Christian assemblies and Paul's efforts to ensure that social relationships ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ are structured in a manner appropriate to their description as groups of equal siblings. Yet distinctions can be, and are, made among the ἀδελφοί (cf. Gal 6:6; 1 Thess 5:12), and Paul certainly does not restrict himself to a role as an ἀδελφός among equal siblings.

The use of οἶκος/οἰκία language in Paul's letters is hard to assess in any meaningful way with statistics, since there is a range of relevant terms that may or may not be used in a manner pertinent to our present concern. As indicated above, the terms and their uses fall into two broad groups (not always clearly distinguishable), according to whether they are describing the act or object of

[42] Bartchy, "Undermining Ancient Patriarchy," 77. Bartchy, however, strongly disagrees with the labeling of such relations as "egalitarian," largely because sibling language belongs within the sphere of kinship whereas the term egalitarian belongs within the sphere of politics. However, given the use of kinship language in various social and political settings (see above, with nn. 11–17) this distinction in the spheres to which the two respective sets of terminology belong seems to me hard to sustain. Cf. also Plutarch, Περὶ Φιλαδελφίας 484B–E.

[43] The status differentiations that might be introduced between elder and younger brothers and between brothers and sisters are largely excluded because Christ is himself the firstborn son (Rom 8:29) and both male and female believers acquire the status of <u>υἱοὶ</u> θεοῦ (Rom 8:14; Gal 3:26).

[44] See also 2 Cor 12:14; Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:11. His juxtaposed descriptions of Onesimus as his child (Phlm 10) and as a brother (Phlm 16) show that these labels are not a fixed description of a certain pattern of relations but a field of metaphors, used to shape relationships in various ways. Nonpatriarchal images are also found, such as when Paul describes himself as the Thessalonians' wet-nurse (τροφός, 1 Thess 2:7; cf. 1 Cor 3:2).

[45] E. Best raises some important questions concerning the common assumption that Paul's authority is basically to be understood as apostolic authority. Best argues that "Paul claimed to be an apostle. . . . But he only used the title when others disputed it or might dispute it. Basically he considered himself the parent of those to whom he wrote." A better term than parent, Best suggests, is "founding father" ("Paul's Apostolic Authority —?" *JSNT* 27 [1986]: 3–25, here p. 17).

building, on the one hand, or the human beings who comprise a household on the other. Paul not infrequently urges the "building up" of the members of the congregation (e.g., Rom 14:19; 15:2; 1 Cor 14:3–5, 26; 1 Thess 5:11) and refers to the community as a building or a temple (1 Cor 3:9, 16–17; 2 Cor 6:16).[46] However, none of these references conveys the image of the church as a human household. There are a number of references to actual households (1 Cor 1:16; 16:15) or to the assembly that meets in so-and-so's house (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Phlm 2), but the terms οἶκος and οἰκία are never used by Paul to describe the Christian community.[47] Despite the appearance of the word οἰκία, 2 Cor 5:1–2 does not seem strictly relevant, since Paul is there describing the contrast between an earthly home (i.e., the human body) in which we dwell and a heavenly home not made with hands; he indicates the longing he has to inhabit the latter. The concern is with death and the transformation that then occurs and with the assurance that despite the body's death, the Christian will not be naked or homeless. The image of believers as members of a spiritual or fictive household is glimpsed briefly on two occasions, one of which we have already mentioned: in Rom 14:4 a Christian is portrayed as an οἰκέτης belonging to the Lord, and in Gal 6:10 Paul describes fellow believers as οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως. There is, then, little evidence of the household image providing a structuring model for relationships ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.[48] That is not to deny, however, that there were people in positions of leadership and power, both resident members of the congregations and itinerant leaders such as Paul himself.[49]

Colossians and Ephesians

The frequency of sibling language is strikingly low in Colossians and Ephesians compared with the authentic Pauline epistles: ἀδελφός terminology

---

[46] On this imagery in the Corinthian letters, see J. R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (Studies in Biblical Literature 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1997).

[47] See G. Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden, οἶκος-Ekklesiologie und monarchischer Episkopat," *JAC* 31 (1988): 82. The distinction between assemblies meeting in houses and the church as modeled on the household is too frequently blurred, as Schöllgen makes clear (pp. 77–84). See, e.g., H.-J. Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (SBS 103; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), 12, 21: "die sich hausweise konstituierende Kirche" (cf. pp. 101–2 etc.); Barton and Horsley, "Hellenistic Cult Group," 31 with n. 112.

[48] See Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden," 82.

[49] On leadership patterns, see D. G. Horrell, "Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity," in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (ed. D. G. Horrell; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 309–37. Schäfer is rather too concerned to downplay the evidence concerning the exercise of power and authority (*Gemeinde als »Bruderschaft«*, 335, 369–85, 407–18, etc.): in his thorough investigation of the brotherhood language and concept, he overstresses the extent to which "brotherly" equality characterized the Pauline congregations.

appears only seven times in Colossians and Ephesians (that is, on average 0.36 times per N-A[26] page). Every one of the seven letters of Paul, including Philemon, has more uses of fictive-sibling language applied to Christians than either Colossians or Ephesians. Indeed, leaving aside the references to named and prominent believers as ἀδελφοί—Timothy, Tychicus, and Onesimus[50]—the members of Christian congregations are described as ἀδελφοί only three times in the two epistles (Col 1:2; 4:15; Eph 6:23). No particular ethical implications are drawn from the sibling language.

Language connected with the image of building appears once in Colossians (ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ [2:7]) and a number of times in Ephesians (2:20–21; 4:12, 16, 29), almost always connected with the depiction of the Christian community as a body or building in which Christ is central—either as head or as cornerstone (Eph 4:15–16; 2:20–22). The image of the congregation as a household appears only once, in Eph 2:19, where the image is used to give the addressees a real sense of belonging: instead of being strangers and aliens (πάροικοι) they are now citizens (συμπολῖται) with the saints and members of the household of God (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. Gal 6:10: . . . πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως).[51]

An important and relevant feature of Colossians and Ephesians is their interest in the proper structuring of the household, an interest expressed in the so-called household codes (Col 3:18–4:1; Eph 5:21–6:9). While these codes are concerned with relations in actual individual households and not with the church itself as a household,[52] their explicit concern with the management of relations between parents and children, masters and slaves, is a significant innovation for which there is little precedent in Paul. Paul is certainly concerned with sexual morality, and therefore with the issues of sexual relations in and outside of marriage, divorce, betrothal, remarriage, and so on (see 1 Thess 4:1–8; 1 Cor 5:1–13; 6:12–20; 7:1–40), and also with issues concerning the identity and relations of men and women (1 Cor 11:2–16).[53] However, he seldom, if ever, gives any direct instruction concerning the appropriate behavior required from other social groups within the household (slaves–masters, fathers–children), as is clear in the household codes.[54] Paul's ethical concern is with rela-

---

[50] See Col 1:1; 4:7, 9. The reference to Tychicus in Col 4:7 reappears verbatim in Eph 6:21.

[51] Cf. also 1 Pet 1:17; 2:5; 2:11; 4:17. On this theme in 1 Peter, see J. H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (London: SCM, 1982)—though note the criticisms raised by Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden," 83–84.

[52] So Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden," 83.

[53] I take 1 Cor 14:34–35 to be an interpolation; for detailed argument, see Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 184–95.

[54] 1 Corinthians 14:34–35, if authentic, would be the only place where Paul calls for the subordination of one social group (women or wives to men or husbands), though a secondary place in a created hierarchy may well be implied for women in 1 Cor 11:2–9. In 1 Cor 7:17–24, Paul gives his

tions among ἀδελφοί, and between ἀδελφοί and outsiders (e.g., 1 Cor 6:1–8; 7:12–15; Rom 13:1–7); it is fundamentally as relations among ἀδελφοί that he seems to envisage the relationships among the members of the congregations. Colossians and Ephesians, however, demonstrate a concern to give ethical instruction to these ἀδελφοί (as they are still occasionally called) according to their social position within the human household.

The Pastoral Epistles

As in Colossians and Ephesians, so too in the Pastoral Epistles, the use of sibling terminology to describe the members of the Christian community is comparatively rare: there are five such occurrences in the three epistles (that is, on average 0.28 times per N-A[26] page), of which three represent a general description of all believers as ἀδελφοί (see 1 Tim 4:6; 6:2; 2 Tim 4:21). In the case of the Pastoral Epistles, this might be thought to be attributable to the fact that these letters are, at least ostensibly, addressed to individual church leaders —Timothy and Titus—rather than to whole congregations. However, comparison with Paul's short letter to Philemon, which has more uses of ἀδελφός terminology than all three Pastoral Epistles added together, indicates that this is not a complete or satisfactory explanation. Nevertheless, statistics can provide only a crude and cursory overview of the picture, and examination of the ways in which such language is used in context is most important for determining its significance for the structuring of Christian social relationships.

Of particular note are the places in 1 Timothy where some qualification of the basic designation of all believers as ἀδελφοί is evident. In 1 Tim 5:1–2, Timothy is urged, presumably because of his young age (1 Tim 4:12) to exhort an elder man as a father, younger men as ἀδελφοί, elder women as mothers, and younger women as ἀδελφαί.[55] The elder figures in the community—senior in faith as well as age and perhaps social standing[56]—are set above those whose junior status enables Timothy to address them as ἀδελφοί. In terms of familial terminology, these elders, like Paul before them, are in the position of fathers and mothers within the congregations.

---

general advice that people should stay as they are; they do not need to change their social position (an argument that relates to the wider discussion of being married or single). In the case of slaves, however, they are urged to take the opportunity of freedom if it comes their way (for this interpretation of 7:21, see Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 162–66). On all these passages and the wider issues, see Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 158–98. In Philemon, Paul gives instruction to a slave owner (though not to any slaves), but this is a specific and personal request.

[55] Even if—as seems to me likely—the address to Timothy is part of the device of pseudepigraphy, the pattern of relationships according to seniority within the church is nonetheless presented as exemplary.

[56] See further R. A. Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994).

A clear acknowledgment of the fact that Christian slaves and Christian masters are ἀδελφοί is found in 1 Tim 6:2, but, in contrast to the appeal Paul made to Philemon on behalf of Onesimus (see above), here slaves are warned *against* drawing from this fact any ideas about the restructuring of the social relationship between slaves and masters (δεσποταί).[57] They are not to "despise" (μὴ καταφρονείτωσαν) their masters "because they are ἀδελφοί" but rather to serve them all the more (ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν) because they are beloved fellow believers. The verb καταφρονέω here clearly expresses a view from above, from the perspective of the slave owners: what Christian slaves are likely to do specifically on the basis that their masters are ἀδελφοί (ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν) is not exactly to despise them, but rather to act in a way subversive of the master–slave relationship, treating them more like equal siblings, as ἀδελφοί. For the author of the Pastorals this is in effect to treat them —or rather, their social position—with contempt: it is the opposite of serving them well. The contrast with Paul's use of ἀδελφός language should be clear. Paul on several occasions, not least in his letter to Philemon, urges Christians to consider the fact that they and their fellow believers are ἀδελφοί, to draw from this fact appropriate conclusions, and to restructure their social relationships accordingly. The author of the Pastoral Epistles does not (and could hardly) deny the firmly established belief that fellow Christians are ἀδελφοί. But he does warn slaves *not* to draw social consequences from this. On the contrary, he adds Christian legitimation to the notion that slaves should serve Christian owners willingly and well (ὅτι πιστοί εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοί).

This concern for the "proper" and traditional structuring of social relations between household members—the concern central to the household codes of Colossians and Ephesians—appears elsewhere in the Pastoral Epistles, though nowhere is there a concise and complete domestic code comparable to those found in Col 3:18–4:1 and Eph 5:21–6:9. Notable in the Pastoral Epistles is the emphasis on teaching directed toward the subordinate social parties—women and slaves—that urges these people to remain quietly and submissively in their place (1 Tim 2:9–15; 6:1–2; Titus 2:1–10). The male heads of households are urged to govern their households well—keeping their children submissive, and so on—and thus to qualify as potential leaders over the church itself (1 Tim 3:4–5, 12–13).

The imagery of building does not appear prominently in the Pastoral Epis-

---

[57] Clearly some of the differences may be explicable on the grounds of the different situations and addressees. Nevertheless, it remains significant that in Philemon Paul does not make any comments (or promises) about Onesimus's return as an obedient and submissive slave (and Phlm 16 may imply quite the opposite), whereas the author of 1 Timothy makes no comments about the obligations of slave owners (e.g., to treat their slaves decently; see Col 4:1; Eph 6:9).

tles,[58] but the image of the church as a household clearly does. It is true that the description of the church as an οἶκος, specifically the οἶκος θεοῦ, appears only once (1 Tim 3:15). But the context in which that statement is made reveals that the hierarchical household model has become an important one for the structuring of church life.[59] The preceding verses have discussed the qualifications necessary for leadership in the church and have repeatedly made it clear that those who seek to be ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι must be male heads of households who manage their own households well (see 1 Tim 3:4–5, 12).[60] Women are permitted a leadership role only in relation to other women (1 Tim 2:11–15; cf. Titus 2:3–5).[61] Competent leadership of the human household is an essential prerequisite for competent leadership of God's household, and only those who are in a position to do the former can legitimately undertake the latter. The image of the church as a household appears also in 2 Tim 2:20–21. Urging his readers to rid themselves of wickedness, the author speaks of a μεγάλη οἰκία in which there are various kinds of vessels for various uses, some honorable, some dishonorable. Applying this metaphor to the church, the author assures his readers that those who cleanse themselves from evil will become honorable vessels, useful to the master (δεσπότης). The οἶκος θεοῦ is an οἶκος that, like its earthly counterparts, is hierarchically ordered and stratified, with God as its supreme δεσπότης.[62]

Thus, while the designation of believers as ἀδελφοί is represented in the Pastoral Epistles, the model of the household has become significantly more important as a model for the structuring of social relationships within the

---

[58] Ὀικοδομέω and οἰκοδομή do not appear. Note, however, στῦλος and ἑδραίωμα in 1 Tim 3:15, which show that the οἶκος image in that verse contains the idea of the house-building as well as of the household members. Cf. also 2 Tim 2:20.

[59] N. Brox describes 1 Tim 3:15 as "[D]ie zentrale ekklesiologische Stelle der drei Briefe" (*Die Pastoralbriefe* [RNT 7; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969], 157). Quoted with approval by Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche*, 67 (see 66–68). See further Verner, *Household of God*, 147, 186 et passim.

[60] See also Titus 1:7, where it is said that the ἐπίσκοπος must be ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον. Since the term οἰκονόμος originally designated a person with responsibility for household management, this passage may also reflect the model of the church as household. However, the term οἰκονόμος has a wider meaning in NT times and cannot by itself be said to convey a specific link with a household: see Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 9:17; Gal 4:2; BAGD, 560; C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (3 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 2:568–75.

[61] The exhortation to younger widows οἰκοδεσποτεῖν (1 Tim 5:14) seems, in context, to be an instruction that they should take up their proper place in the household structure ("bear children etc.") rather than gadding about as idle gossips (5:13). They should "manage their own households," or "keep house" (cf. Titus 2:5 [οἰκουργός]; I. H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999], 604).

[62] Notably, in his desire to strengthen the position of the bishop, Ignatius declares that the bishop is the "type" of God the Father, the earthly embodiment of divine leadership (see Ignatius *Eph.* 6.1; *Magn.* 6.1). See further Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden," 87–88. The term δεσπότης does not appear in the genuine Pauline epistles, nor in Colossians and Ephesians.

church.[63] The socially subordinate are specifically warned against expecting their identity as ἀδελφοί to have an impact on conventional social relations. The church is a stratified and hierarchical community led by those men who lead their human households well. The hierarchy of social relations found in the human household is presented as the structuring ideal for the church too: slaves should serve their masters well, especially if they are believers (1 Tim 6:1–2; Titus 2:9–10); women should be submissive to their husbands and good workers in the home (Titus 2:5).

IV. Conclusion

What conclusions can we draw from this investigation? First, it is clear, both from the relative frequency with which the designation ἀδελφός appears and from the ways in which this terminology is used, that the prominence of sibling language as a model for social relationships in the churches decreases notably in the pseudo-Pauline epistles compared with those by Paul himself.[64] Paul on a number of occasions stresses repeatedly the believers' identity as ἀδελφοί in order to appeal for a degree of solidarity and mutual care that is currently lacking. None of the pseudo-Pauline letters contains anything comparable; indeed, almost the opposite is found in 1 Tim 6:2, where slaves are warned against drawing social consequences from the fact that all believers are ἀδελφοί.

Second, alongside the decreased emphasis on the reality and consequences of being ἀδελφοί, the model of the hierarchically structured household becomes increasingly significant as the structuring pattern for the church community. An important moment in this ongoing process of the structuration of the early Christian communities would seem to be the introduction of the

---

[63] Both Georg Schöllgen and Ulrike Wagener argue convincingly "daß der οἶκος als ekklesiologisches Leitmodell weder bei Paulus noch in den Deuteropaulinen Kolosser- und Epheserbrief eine entscheidende Rolle spielt. Die Pastoralbriefe erweisen sich so als das älteste Zeugnis für die Erhebung des οἶκος zu ekklesiologischen Leitmetapher" (U. Wagener, *Die Ordnung des "Hauses Gottes": Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* [WUNT 2.65; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994], 236; cf. Schöllgen, "Hausgemeinden," 82–85).

[64] Von Allmen ignores the significant variations among the Pauline epistles when he writes: "le sens 'figuré' de ces mots [sc. ἀδελφός/ἀδελφή] est extrêmement fréquent, et son usage est assez régulièrement réparti sur l'ensemble des épîtres, à l'exception de Tite" (*La Famille de Dieu,* 156). This conclusion also raises some questions about Bartchy's suggestion (drawing on the work in a dissertation by Joe Hellerman) that "both the brother-sister rhetoric and sibling values continued to characterize a wide variety of Christian groups throughout the Roman empire for more than 250 years" and that it was Constantine who was essentially responsible for introducing "a virulent form of hierarchy and patriarchy" into Christianity ("Undermining Ancient Patriarchy," 76–77). The significant changes evidenced within the Pauline corpus indicate that, in at least some strands of early Christianity, moves in this direction should be traced back into the NT period.

household codes in Colossians and Ephesians. These codes do not reflect a model of the *church* as household, but are an important step in enabling that model to emerge; they formalize a concern for the proper ordering of the human household, which in the Pastorals becomes a model for the proper ordering of the church itself.[65]

We might then broadly characterize this change as one from the model of an egalitarian community of ἀδελφοί toward the model of a hierarchical household-community, a community with masters and subordinates, structured according to the relative positions of different social groups. It would be misleading, however, not to qualify that conclusion somewhat, for the genuine Pauline letters both assume and urge the recognition of certain people—primarily Paul himself—as being in positions of power and authority. If the Pauline churches develop, as they seem to do, from a loosely organized sectarian-type movement where the language of brotherhood predominates, into one that is more structured and "churchlike," which mirrors the conventional household hierarchy in its own internal organization, then we should perhaps speak of changes in the *form* of authority and power, rather than implying that we simply move from egalitarianism to authoritarianism. In Weberian terms, we move from a charismatic form of domination toward a traditional form.[66] Nevertheless, this transformation implies both that the Pauline churches become more hierarchically structured over time and—crucially—that this structure increasingly mirrors the established and conventional social order, following the stratified household model.

Giddens's structuration theory requires, however, that we appreciate the intertwining of continuity and change, rather than simply emphasizing one or the other:

> Every act which contributes to the reproduction of a structure is also an act of production, a novel enterprise, and as such may initiate change by altering that structure at the same time as it reproduces it—as the meaning of words change in and through their use.[67]

Continuity is evident in the fact that the designation ἀδελφοί is used of Christian believers in all of the Pauline epistles, and also that the image of believers

---

[65] On this, see further Horrell, "Development of Theological Ideology," 230–35.

[66] The language of sect and church here owes much to the typology formulated by Ernst Troeltsch (see *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, vol. 1 [London: Allen & Unwin, 1931], 331–43). On these broader perspectives and their implications, see M. Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (SNTSMS 60; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Horrell, "Leadership Patterns."

[67] A. Giddens, *New Rules of Sociological Method* (London: Hutchinson, 1976), 128; see also idem, *Central Problems in Social Theory* (London/Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979), 210: "with a conception of structuration, the possibility of change is recognised as inherent in every circumstance of social reproduction."

as members of a household appears occasionally throughout. However, as this language and imagery are taken up and reproduced in new contexts, significant changes are also apparent that have considerable implications for the structuring of social relationships among the members of the Pauline congregations. Without forgetting, then, that believers are described both as siblings and as household members throughout the Pauline corpus, the character of this significant degree of transformation may nevertheless be epitomized in the phrase "from ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ."

APPENDIX

Ἀδελφός/ἀδελφή as Fictive Kinship Terms
Referring to Fellow Christians

Letter	Plural, or Nonspecific	Concerning a Specific (Usually Named) Believer	Total
1 Thess	18	1	19
Gal	10	0	10
1 Cor	37	2	39
2 Cor	4	8	12
Rom	16	2	18
Phil	8	1	9
Phlm	0	5	5
Totals	**93**	**19**	**112**
Col	2	3	5
Eph	1	1	2
Totals	**3**	**4**	**7**
1 Tim	4	0	4
2 Tim	1	0	1
Titus	0	0	0
Totals	**5**	**0**	**5**
2 Thess (see n. 5 above)	7	1	8

Frequency of Fictive Sibling Terminology
(Given as Average Number of Occurrences per Page of Nestle-Aland [26th ed.] Text)

Paul's letters	1.00
Colossians/Ephesians	0.36
Pastoral Epistles	0.28