Exclusivism Versus Inclusivism: Citizenship in the Pentateuch and Its Metaphorical Usage in Ephesians[1]

Martin G. Klingbeil, D.Litt.
Helderberg College, Somerset West, South Africa

The citizenship motif in the Pentateuch is developed through a constellation of narrative and legal contexts which demarcate the boundaries of an emerging nation based on YHWH's election. A tension between an exclusive and inclusive approach to this concept appears to be necessary in order to establish a national identity while at the same time fulfilling Israel's missiological objectives. Paul reuses the motif metaphorically in Ephesians and applies it in an ecclesiological context. Both the Pentateuch and Ephesians can be taken as the beginning and end-point of a long journey undertaken by the motif throughout the Old and New Testaments. After introducing the topic and its relevant terminology, the paper addresses the issue by looking at the end of this journey, i.e., the metaphorical usage of the citizenship motif in Ephesians and only then returns to its narrative and legal origins in the Pentateuch in order to verify which conceptual stock Paul built his ecclesiology upon. The study concludes with a contextualization of this ecclesiological motif.

Key Words: citizenship, alien, exclusivism, inclusivism, Pentateuch, Paul, Ephesians, metaphor, intertextuality, reconciliation

1. Introduction

A central motif in biblical theology, both in the Old and New Testaments, is the idea of a people chosen by God and separated from the rest of the world, thus creating an abstract line between this group and other entities.[2]

---

[1]   This study has grown out of a paper presented at the *VI South American Biblical-Theological Symposium,* held in Lima, Peru (July 22–25, 2004).

[2]   The theological concept of election has been described as being at the center of the biblical, and more specifically, OT theology; it views history as revelation and the people of Israel—both literal and spiritual—as the chosen instrument for the fulfillment of God's purposes. See, e.g., George E. Wright, *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital* (SBT 8; London: SCM, 1952), 55. This so-called "biblical theology movement" of the 1950s was criticized for its dependence on vocabulary in order to establish theological concepts, while subsequent theologies focused on the plurality of theological thought in Scripture. For more, see James Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation. A Study of the Two Testaments* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); cf. also Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical*

Normally, these entities are contrasted and described as representing distinct moral concepts. There is *Israel* versus the *Nations* in the OT,[3] and the *Church* versus the *World* in the NT,[4] and the involved terminology is very often dichotomist. Nevertheless, the dividing line is not absolute or rigid and there is a tension created by the juxtaposition of the two concepts which sometimes leads to interpretative difficulties. Comments Ralph Smith:

> On [sic] one hand, God chose Israel and warned her to have nothing to do with the other nations. On the other hand, God chose Israel for service to Him and to other nations. If we concentrate on one aspect of this doctrine, we will misunderstand it, and it becomes untrue.[5]

While there is no clear definition of citizenship in the Old Testament,[6] at least on a semantic level, the concept of Israelite versus non-Israelite is clearly discernable. The citizenship concept can be connected to expressions such as "children of Israel" or "house of Israel" that are often contrasted

---

Theology in Crisis (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972); Dale Patrick, "Election," *ABD* 2:434–35. Nevertheless, more recent theologies have stressed the centrality of the election concept without neglecting the variety of themes that constitute biblical theological thought. Gerhard F. Hasel (*Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* [3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 142) comments: "An OT theology which recognizes God as the dynamic, unifying center provides the possibility to describe the rich and variegated theologies and to present the various longitudinal themes, motifs, and ideas. In affirming God as the dynamic, unifying center of the OT we also affirm that this center cannot be forced into a static organizing principle on the basis of which an OT theology can be constructed." Presently, theologies of the OT treat election as one topic within the various theological themes. Compare, for example, Ralph L. Smith, *Old Testament Theology: Its History, Method, and Message* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1993), 122–38.

3   See, for example, Deut 9:1; Judg 3:1; 2 Sam 7:23; 1 Kgs 14:24; 2 Kgs 16:3; 17:8; 21:2, 9; 1 Chr 17:21; 2 Chr 28:3; 32:17; 33:2, 9; Ezra 6:21; Neh 13:26; Pss 59:5; 78:55; Isa 11:12; 14:2; 49:6–7; 55:5; Jer 9:26; 18:13; 25:15; 28:14; 31:7, 10; 36:2; Ezek 4:13; 28:25; 36:4, 6, 21–22; 37:21–22, 28; 38:8, 16; 39:7, 23; Hos 8:8; 9:1; Joel 3:2; Amos 6:1; 9:9; Zech 8:13.

4   Compare John 16:33; 17:14; Eph 1:22–2:2. For a study of the relationship between the church and the world in John, see Jin-Su Im, "Das Verständnis des κόσμος im Johannesevangelium" (D.Th. diss., Kirchliche Hochschule Bethel, Germany, 1999), 218–22. See also Jörn-Michael Schröder (*Das eschatologische Israel im Johannesevangelium. Eine Untersuchung der johanneischen Israel-Konzeption in Joh 2–4 und Joh 6* [Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie 3; Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2003], 333–45) who also notices the tension in his study on the continuity of the Israel-motif and its eschatological application to the Christian church in the Gospel of John.

5   Smith, *Old Testament Theology*, 125.

6   On a semantic level, there is not even an equivalent for the NT πολιτεία "citizenship" in the LXX.

against the "alien" or "foreigner."[7] In the Pentateuch there is material that points toward an exclusivist approach to the idea of citizenship, but there also appear in many instances—at times in an almost contradictory manner—instructions as to how to integrate non-Israelites within the community. The concept of citizenship in the Pentateuch can be approached by looking at the legislation concerning the גֵּר "alien, foreign resident."[8] While the alien in some contexts is treated as a second- or third-class citizen,[9] in others he is treated with more consideration than an Israelite,[10] theologically motivated by the experience of Israel as sojourners in Egypt and Yahweh's concern for the alien (cf. Deut 10:18–19).[11] Knauth concludes: "Out of consideration for their especially vulnerable economic position—that is, not having any inheritance of land or family ties to fall back on in time of crisis—aliens were given rights and privileges similar to or even exceeding those of the native Israelite."[12]

The tension that is created by this continuous play between exclusivism and inclusivism, demonstrates that the concept of citizenship in Israel was

---

7   Robert J. D. Knauth, "Israelites," *DOTP*, 453.

8   The noun גֵּר derives from the verb גּוּר "to sojourn, dwell for a time" and is the main root appearing in the context of the alien-legislation. However, the semantic field also includes זָר "stranger," נָכְרִי "foreigner," and תּוֹשָׁב "sojourner." Cf. Robin J. D. Knauth, "Alien, Foreign Resident," *DOTP*, 26–33.

9   An alien could become a permanent slave (Lev 25:45) and thus could be given as an inheritance (Lev 25:46); he was excluded from debt release (Deut 15:2–3); interest could be charged from him (Deut 23:19–20 [MT 23:20–21]); an alien could not be king (Deut 17:15); and he could be subject to the "ban" (Deut 7:1–4).

10   The alien was not to be mistreated or oppressed (Exod 22:21 [MT 22:20]; 23:9); he was to be loved as an Israelite would love another Israelite (Lev 19:33–34); he had to be given fair judgment (Deut 1:16–17; 24:17–18); his wages had to be paid on time (Deut 24:14); the gleaning after the harvest was to be kept for the alien (Lev 19:10; 23:22; Deut 24:19–22); and along with widows, orphans and Levites he was allowed to partake in the triennial tithe (Deut 14:28–29; 26:12–13).

11   In a recent article José Cervantes Gabarrón ("Legislación bíblica sobre el inmigrante," *EstBib* 61 [2003]: 332) has come to the following conclusion with regard to the motivation of the alien legislation: "Todas las leyes que en el Antiguo Testamento tratan de los inmigrantes velando por su protección y defendiendo sus derechos humanos y sociales están dirigidas a la comunidad de los israelitas, que son los *destinatarios únicos* de las prescripciones legales. Las cláusulas de motivación de dichas leyes dan cuenta de las razones de tales normas. Los dos tipos de argumentación frecuentes en ellas recurren a la *memoria histórica del sufrimiento* de Israel evocando bien sea la experiencia de la emigración en Egipto (Ex 22,20; 23,9; Lv 19,34; Dt 10,19) o bien sea el sufrimiento de la esclavitud en Egipto (Dt 6,21; 16,12; 24,18.22)" [author's emphasis].

12   Knauth, "Alien, Foreign Resident," 32.

possibly not a closed one, but rather one that allowed for the individual to cross the line between the two groups.[13] It is the purpose of the present study to look at particular instances in the pages of the Pentateuch where that line was crossed to see whether they might be able to provide part of the theological rationale for the metaphorical usage of the citizenship motif in the New Testament, and more particularly, in Paul's employment of it in Ephesians.

2. Looking at the Beginning from the End

Looking down the long road of the development of a theological motif throughout the history of Israel and its typological reappearance in the New Testament,[14] we will look at the beginning from the end, i.e., we will focus first on the re-use of the dichotomy between Israel and the Nations in the NT, before returning to the actual citizenship motif in the Pentateuch, in order to see whether the NT interpretation and application of this dichotomy is connected to and anchored in the OT motif. The underlying assumption here is that a certain motif travels and undergoes changes on its journey throughout the OT and beyond,[15] and that one can infer the conceptual stock from which the NT authors drew their ideas.[16]

---

[13]   See, for example, José Loza Vera's ("Universalismo y particularismo en las leyes del Antiguo Testamento," *RevistB* 55.2 [1993]: 90) article in which he recognizes the tension between a universal and particular application of the legal material of the OT. He comes to the somewhat inconsistent conclusion that the validity of Israelite legislation goes beyond the OT period and even beyond Christ, except with regard to the Sabbath commandment.

[14]   Hasel (*Old Testament Theology*, 165–67) opts for a "multiplex approach" to the relationship between the Testaments and mentions seven patterns of historical and theological relationships of which typology is an important one, although carefully separated from allegorical interpretation. A definition of typology understands it as the "study of persons, events, or institutions in salvation history that God specifically designed to predictively prefigure their antitypical eschatological fulfillment in Christ and the gospel realities brought about by Christ." Cf. Richard M. Davidson, "Biblical Interpretation," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology* (ed. Raoul Dederen; Commentary Reference Series 12; Hagerstown: Review & Herald, 2000), 83.

[15]   An interesting study focusing on the historical development of a metaphor can be found in Werner E. Lemke, "Circumcision of the Heart: The Journey of a Biblical Metaphor," in *A God so Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller* (ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 299–319. See also J. Gordon McConville, "Metaphor, Symbol and the Interpretation of Deuteronomy," in *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. Craig Bartholomew, Colin Greene, and Karl Möller; The Scripture and Hermeneutics Series 2; Grand Rapids: Zondervan; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2001), 333. The author focuses on the Kingship and

I find in Ephesians a destination point for the citizenship motif in the NT,[17] more specifically, Eph 2:14–16, which points to the antitypical resolution in Christ of the tension between Christians and non-Christians through the metaphorical destruction of the dividing wall between them.

> [14]For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. [15]He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace, [16]and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it (NRSV).[18]

Zion, Land/inheritance, Brotherhood and "Circumcision-of-the-heart" metaphors and studies and studies their usage and re-usage throughout the literature of the OT.

16   Another important Pentateuch motif, to which I will return later, is the Exodus which in Pauline theology constitutes an important theme (for example, 1 Cor 1:2–10). Comments Davies: "There is much to indicate that a very significant part of the conceptual world in which Paul moved, *as a Christian,* was that of the Exodus. It is clear that, as for Matthew and other New Testament writers, so for Paul, there was a real correspondence between the Christian Dispensation and the Exodus of Israel from Egypt. The redemption of the Old Israel was the prototype of the greater redemption from sin by Christ for the New Israel" [emphasis in original] (William D. Davies, "Paul and the New Exodus," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning. Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* [ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 443–44). He further notes that Paul's conceptual world was deeply rooted in Rabbinic Judaism and, through that, to the OT rather than to Hellenistic thought. See also Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Greco-Roman Background* (WUNT 44; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987). For an excellent review of this important work, see Wayne A. Meeks, review of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Greco-Roman Background, JBL* 108 (1989): 742–45.

17   I consciously avoid the designation "Epistle" or "Letter" since recent scholarship is almost in agreement that the character of the document is not strictly epistolary. Ralph P. Martin ("Reconciliation and Unity in Ephesians," *RevExp* 93 [1996]: 204) identifies it as an "encyclical document sent around to a group of churches, presumably in Asia Minor," describing the church at worship in terms of an "epistolary catechism." A critique and a perhaps less ecclesiological view is presented by Hoehner who, after reviewing recent scholarship, comes to the conclusion that, while there are various genres present in the document, "Ephesians is an actual letter." Compare Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 77. Hoehner's exhaustive commentary represents the most up-to-date treatment of Ephesians and is based on a wide reading of recent scholarship. For one of the first reviews, cf. Serge Cazelais, review of *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary, RBL,* n.p. [cited 21 June 2004]. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/3077_3355.pdf.

18   Syntactically, the unit of thought begins in v. 14 introduced by the conjunction γάρ "for" and ends in v. 18 with v. 19 introducing a different line of thought by ἄρα οὖν "so then."

Eph 2:14–16 is part of a larger thought unit, 2:11–22, which is usually interpreted as describing the union between Jews and Gentiles in Christ.[19] The passage is characterized by a clustering of various metaphors[20] and, interestingly, all of these metaphors are playing in some way on the abstract concept of uniting two entities that were formerly divided.[21]

---

[19] For a history of interpretation of Eph 2:11–22 see William Rader, *The Church and Racial Hostility: A History of Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22* (BGBE 20; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978).

[20] It is not the purpose of the present study to go into the theory of biblical metaphor. I have recently presented a short survey of the relevant literature on metaphor in the Bible, and more specifically, in the Psalms, which comes to the conclusion that most modern biblical metaphor theories are informed by Macky's intermediate theory of biblical metaphor. Cf. Peter W. Macky, *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought. A Method for Interpreting the Bible* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 19; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1990). Metaphor can only be understood by looking simultaneously at both ends of the metaphorical equation (primary and secondary subject), and focusing on both semantics (meaning) and pragmatics (usage). See for more, Martin G. Klingbeil, "Metaphors That Travel and (Almost) Vanish: Mapping Diachronic Changes in the Intertextual Usage of the Heavenly Warrior Metaphor in Psalms 18 and 144" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the European Association of Biblical Studies, Dresden, Germany, August 9, 2005).

[21] I follow, with some variations, Gerald A. Klingbeil's ("Metaphors and Pragmatics: An Introduction to the Hermeneutics of Metaphors in the Epistle to the Ephesians," *BBR* 16 [2006]: 273–93) metaphor map of Ephesians that is based on a comparison of recent approaches to biblical metaphor theory. Cf. Martin G. Klingbeil, *Yahweh Fighting from Heaven. God as a Warrior and as God of Heaven in the Hebrew Psalter and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography* (OBO 169; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 9–37.

Metaphor	*Sub-Metaphor*	*References*
Family	God, the glorious *father*	2:18
	Members of God's *family*	2:19
Constructions	Broken down the *dividing wall*	2:14
	We are God's *house*, dwelling	2:20, 22
	Foundation of apostles and prophets	2:20
	Jesus Christ the *cornerstone*	2:20
	God's *holy temple*	2:21
Legal terminology	*Stranger* and *foreigner*	2:12, 19
	Citizens	2:19
	Alienated from the *citizenship* of Israel	2:12
Spatial reference	*Apart* from Christ and excluded	2:12
	In the world=without God=without hope	2:12
	Belonging to Christ	2:13
	In Christ	2:13, 17
	Far away (from Christ)	2:13, 17
Body	Circumcision of *heart*	2:11
	Creation of a new person from both groups	2:15, 16

The selection of this text is motivated by the idea that Ephesians represents a certain climax in the development of Pauline and NT theology and thus can serve as a destination point in the long journey undertaken by the citizenship motif, both literal and metaphorical—or typical and antitypical—since the Pentateuch. I would agree with Hoehner that "the teaching in Ephesians is considered the crown or quintessence of Paulinism because in a large measure it summarizes the leading themes of the Pauline letters."[22] Without attempting an exhaustive exegesis of the passage, I am going to focus on the metaphorical usage of the citizenship concept (Eph 2:12, 19) which is elaborated upon through a number of subsequent metaphors, especially the "dividing wall" metaphor which plays on crossing the line between two entities through breaking it down (v. 14) and the results of that action. On an abstract level the "dividing wall" metaphor invokes the theological concepts of ecclesiological unity ("that he might create in himself one new humanity" [v. 15]) and reconciliation ("and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross" [v. 16]), two major theological themes in Ephesians.[23] The tension between exclusivism and inclusivism can be related to the concepts of unity and reconciliation respectively.

The first question that must be addressed is the identity of the two entities that are divided by the wall and that are to be brought together in Christ. At first glance, it appears to refer to Jewish and Gentile Christians (Eph 2:11). Nevertheless, the identification seems to be ambiguous, especially taking into consideration the preceding context of describing the lost state of humanity before God and the process of redemption (Eph 2:1–6). As Martin asks, "Is the 'hostility' (v. 16) that makes the reconciliation necessary an enmity between men and women and God or between Jews and Gentiles?"[24] He makes a good point in studying the usage of ἔθνος "Gentiles" in

---

[22] Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 106.

[23] Commentators usually mention Ephesian's strong emphasis on ecclesiology due to the fact that the term ἐκκλησία "church" is used nine times in the document (Eph 1:22; 3:10; 5:23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32), usually referring to the universal and not the local church. Schnackenburg discusses the ecclesiology in Ephesians and observes: "In the whole of the NT there is nowhere an ecclesiology which is so extensively structured or which is revealed so effectively as that in the Epistle to the Ephesians." Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary* (trans. Helen Heron; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 293. Against the idea of the document reflecting emergent Catholicism, cf. Clinton E. Arnold, "Ephesians," *DPL*, 248. Cf. also Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 111–12. The theological motif of reconciliation is another major emphasis in Ephesians, and constitutes the basis for unity in Christ. It is founded in God's love (Eph 2:4) and unites God and humanity through the cross (Eph 2:16).

[24] Martin, "Reconciliation and Unity," 219.

Ephesians, as a pointer to the dichotomy between God and humanity: "In the earlier letters Paul uses the term [ἔθνος "Gentiles"] ordinarily of Gentiles in the sense of 'non-Jews,' but in Ephesians it carries more of a negative or pejorative flavor, meaning 'non-Christians' (Eph 3:6; 4:17), called 'the rest of mankind' in Eph 2:3."[25] Consequently, there is a double structure, a vertical and horizontal dimension to the understanding of the dividing wall-metaphor. First there is the vertical dividing line between God and humanity that has been removed in Christ, and second, there are the religious, racial, and cultural differences that separated Jews and Gentiles in the first century C.E., which have been nullified in the cross.[26] Our passage shows that the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles (v. 15) is based on the reconciliation between God and humanity (v. 16). This is confirmed by the somewhat rare use of the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσω "reconcile" in v. 16:

> It must be understood that the reconciliation spoken of here is not between Jews and Gentiles "into" one body, for that would necessitate an εἰς rather than ἐν and the verb would have been διαλλάσσω (cf. Matt 5:24) rather than ἀποκαταλλάσσω. That particular reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles has already been discussed at verse 15. Rather, it is speaking of those believing Jews and Gentiles, who are in one body, as reconciled "to God."[27]

That brings us to the question as to what exactly constitutes the dividing wall in v. 14, since it has to be applicable to both dimensions of the metaphor's interpretation. A close translation of the expression τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ would be the "dividing wall of partition."[28] Taking into consideration the strong emphasis of Eph 2:11–22 on the construction metaphor, with the majority of the metaphors pointing positively to the con-

---

25 Ibid., 205.

26 Comments Martin: "The author wants seemingly to run together the 'reconciliation to God' and the merging into one body in Christ, the church of two early Christian groups who otherwise were kept apart by ethnic and religious barriers as well as by sociological and racial divisions." Ibid., 219.

27 Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 383. The verb ἀποκαταλλάσσω "reconcile" is only found in the NT in Col 1:20, 22 and appears to have been coined by Paul, which represents another argument in favor of Pauline authorship for Ephesians.

28 Usually, three lines of interpretation are presented: (1) the historical interpretation that understands the division as a reference to the wall in the Herodian temple that was dividing the court of the Jews from the court of the Gentiles; (2) the Gnostic interpretation that proposes the myth of the Gnostic redeemer that ascends to the Father of All through the heavenly regions; and (3) the metaphoric interpretation usually pointing to the Mosaic Law. Compare ibid., 368–71.

struction of a new temple (Eph 2:20 [3x], 21, 22),[29] I would suggest that Paul is formulating his theology against the background of the OT sacrificial system, with Christ's death demarcating its fulfillment, in this way making way for a new temple of which Christ is the cornerstone and the prophets and apostles are the foundation.[30]

An intertextual reading of the metaphors employed by Paul would allow for such a conclusion, though Paul's usage of the OT is not an undisputed issue, but generally the OT background to Pauline writings is underestimated.[31] The dividing wall could thus refer to a misinterpretation of the Law separating God and humanity by obscuring salvation[32] and at the same time hindering Jewish and Gentile Christians from becoming one new man (v. 15) or one body (v. 16).[33] However, the supposed antinomianism in v. 15 is not directed against the Law itself, since Pauline theology normally presents a positive picture of the Law (e.g., 1 Cor 9:21; Gal 6:2), but against the historical misinterpretation of the Law that has created enmity and pre-

---

[29] Cf. footnote 22.

[30] Perrot understands Eph 2:11–22 as a lectionary synagogue reading of Exod 21:1–22:23 and proposes a strong OT background for the passage. Cf. Charles Perrot, "La lecture synagogale d'Exode xxi, 1–xxii, 23 et son influence sur la littérature Néotestamentaire," in *A la rencontre de Dieu; mémorial Albert Gelin* (ed. Maurice Jourjon et al.; Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Théologie de Lyon 8; Le Puy, France: Editions Xavier Mappus, 1961), 223–39. A number of recent studies, focusing on intertextual issues, underline the indebtedness of Pauline writings to the Old Testament. See, for example, J. Paul Tanner, "The New Covenant and Paul's Quotations from Hosea in Romans 9:25–26," *BSac* 162 (2005): 95–110; Troy W. Martin, "The Covenant of Circumcision (Genesis 17:9–14) and the Situational Antithesis in Galatians 3:28," *JBL* 122 (2003): 111–25; Jean Noël Aletti, "Romains 4 et Genèse 17: quelle énigme et quelle solution?," *Bib* 84 (2003): 305–25; C. John Collins, "Galatians 3:16: What Kind of Exegete was Paul?," *TynBul* 54 (2003): 75–86; Joel Willitts, "Context Matters: Paul's Use of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12," *TynBul* 54 (2003): 105–22.

[31] Lincoln suggests that Paul drew on various traditions, one of them the OT, in order to construct his theology. Cf. Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Use of the OT in Ephesians," *JSNT* 14 (1982): 16–57.

[32] For an example of one such misinterpretation, see the *Letter to Aristeas*, 139, which was composed during the intertestamental period: "When therefore our lawgiver, equipped by God for insight into all things, had surveyed each particular, he fenced us about with impenetrable palisades and with walls of iron to the end that we should mingle in no way with any of the other nations, remaining pure in body and in spirit [...] worshipping the one Almighty God." Cf. Martin, "Reconciliation and Unity," 224–25.

[33] Again, one notices an accumulation of metaphors that have church unity as their focal point.

vented peace in both dimensions.[34] The creating of one new man (v. 15)[35] is the result of the resolved tension between God and humanity or between Jewish and Gentile Christians. This new unity only becomes possible through reconciliation (v. 16). Here, Paul's theological reasoning is structured along the lines of Hebrew thinking, where the *result* (unity) precedes the *cause* (reconciliation) effectuated in the cross (v. 16).[36] Paul's indebtedness to OT imagery becomes apparent repeatedly in the passage, alluding to the death/life contrast of Deut 27–32, the prince of peace motif (Isa 9:6; 52:7), the far/near metaphor (Isa 57:19), and Ezekiel's vision of the two sticks made into one (Ezek 37:15–23). Recent scholarship has recognized that the key to understanding Pauline theology lies in the OT and early Judaism, not in Gnostic thought, since the intertextual continuity between his writings and the OT is much stronger than a supposed relationship with Gnostic writings.[37]

[34] An excellent study on the relationship between Paul and the Law, especially with regard to Christ being the end of the Law, can be found in Robert Badenas, *Christ the End of the Law. Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective* (JSNTSup 10; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1985). I would agree with Hoehner and others who suggest that Paul in his usage of νόμος does not make a distinction between moral and ceremonial law. Cf. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 376. Nevertheless, the further double qualification of the Law (τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν "the law of commandments in decrees") points not to the Law itself but to its fencing in, its misinterpretation and misapplication in Israelite and Jewish history.

[35] Eph 1:19–22 has been called a baptismal hymn, and the imagery here is that of conversion, and not of Gnostic mythology: "In other words, the language of proselyte baptism, conversion, and renewal is lifted out of a narrow mould and given this widest application to Gentiles who become not converted Jews but a new humanity as part of God's cosmic plan to place all things under the rightful headship of Christ (1:10), the renewal (*apokatastasis*) of a reconciled universe. But the author is guarding against the drawing of false conclusions by insisting that reconciliation and renewal in the 'new man' comes about only by a return to God made possible through the cross." Cf. Martin, "Reconciliation and Unity," 227.

[36] Martin understands it the other way around with the unity forming the basis for reconciliation; however, the final focus in v. 15 is rather backward to the cross and demonstrates how Christ's death in reality creates the possibility of reconciliation. Cf. ibid., 218.

[37] Although there is a discussion about the pre-Christian origins of Gnosticism, recent scholarship generally rejects its influence on Pauline writings. Cf. Edwin M. Yamauchi, "Gnosis, Gnosticism," in *DPL*, 350–54. An interesting study on Eph 4:7–11 by Harris on the Hebrew imagery in the passage, relates the descent of Christ to the incarnation and not to his descent to the netherworld after his resurrection, based on a variant reading of v. 9, and combines it with Psalm 68 and other OT and intertestamental imagery. W. Hall Harris, *The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7–11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery* (Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996).

3. Returning to the Beginning

I return now on the typological timeline to the beginnings of the citizenship metaphor to look at its historical manifestations in the Pentateuch, which create the earliest and original backdrop to Paul's use of the concept. For this purpose, it is not possible to limit oneself to semantics only. Rather one must look for texts which reflect the themes that have been identified in Ephesians, though most probably these will appear in a more limited or rudimentary fashion and it must be taken into consideration that typology usually involves a heightened correspondence; namely, the type is usually more limited in scope than its antitype.[38]

3.1. A Citizen Without a Nation

Although Israel was not yet a nation, its earliest citizen was Abraham and so the origins of the citizenship motif go back to the patriarchal narratives, which indicate how the proto-Israelites resolved the tension between exclusivism and inclusivism. It is interesting to note that the term גֵּר "alien, foreign resident" was applied to each of the patriarchs[39] and that their socio-economic status made them the prototype "aliens," providing the historical-theological justification for the alien-legislation once Israel had been established as a nation.[40]

Genesis 14 tells the story of the five Dead Sea kings rebelling against the four Eastern kings (vv. 1–4).[41] They are subdued (vv. 5–7) and, in the following raid on Southern Canaan and Transjordan (vv. 8–11), Abraham's nephew Lot is abducted (v. 12), which causes Abraham and his allies to pursue and conquer the Eastern kings, freeing Lot in the process and re-

---

[38] Davidson, "Biblical Interpretation," 84.

[39] For example, Abraham (Gen 17:7–8), Lot (Gen 19:9), Isaac (Gen 35:27), Jacob (Gen 28:4), Esau (Gen 36:6–7), and Joseph (Gen 47:4, 9). Cf. Knauth, "Alien, Foreign Resident," 28.

[40] See below under section 3.3.

[41] For a brief introduction to the history of interpretation of Gen 14, see Francis I. Andersen, "Genesis 14: An Enigma," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. David P. Wright et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 497–99. While modern scholarship usually interprets Gen 14 as a late addition, Andersen is puzzled by its archaizing language and grammatical features. Compare also J. Alberto Soggin ("Abraham and the Eastern Kings: On Genesis 14," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* [ed. Ziony Zevit et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995], 283–91) who identifies Melchizedek as a Hasmonean king.

turning with a large amount of spoil (vv. 13–16). It is significant that Abraham is described as having integrated so well into the southern Canaanite communities by ways of political treaties (v. 13)[42] that the Canaanites without hesitation follow him on a wild goose chase that is motivated by his family obligations. Waltke observes that the Canaanites had recognized Abraham as "a mediator of blessing."[43] When they return, they are expected, are met by Melchizedek, and the resulting encounter is full of covenant terminology involving a ritual meal and blessing (vv. 18–19).[44] It is interesting to note that the messianic figure of the King of Salem[45] is the one who causes Abraham to be generous with regard to God in giving a tithe of everything he has gained during the military campaign (v. 20) and also, with regard to the king of Sodom, who makes a demand without reason (v. 21), that Abraham consciously distances himself in not wanting to retain any of the spoil (vv. 22–23), except what belongs to his allies (v. 24).

Nevertheless, when it comes to the fulfillment of the promise and to his own descendants, Abraham clearly shows exclusivist tendencies, sending his servant Eliezer of Damascus[46] on a providence-driven journey to secure a wife from the line of promise for his son:

> [2]Abraham said to his servant, the oldest of his house, who had charge of all that he had, "Put your hand under my thigh [3]and I will make you swear by the LORD, the God of heaven and earth, that you will not get a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I live, [4]but will go to my country and to my kindred and get a wife for my son Isaac" (Gen 24:2–4 NRSV).

Although the patriarch had become integrated with the people among whom he was living, through alliances, reconciliation, and through being a blessing to them, nevertheless he did not altogether assimilate with them

---

[42] The use of בְּרִית "covenant" is an important indicator of the type of relationship Abraham enjoyed with his allies.

[43] Bruce K. Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 232.

[44] Elgavish identifies the ritual as a covenant ceremony which, interestingly, involves also the first account of the giving of a tithe. Cf. David Elgavish, *The Encounter of Abram and Melchizedek King of Salem: A Covenant Establishing Ceremony. Studies in the Book of Genesis* (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters, 2001).

[45] For the Messianic application of Melchizedek through Ps 110 and in the NT, cf. Steven J. Andrews, "Melchizedek," *DOTP*, 564.

[46] Another alien that was close to Abraham's heart and who would have been in line for inheritance if Abraham would have remained childless (cf. Gen 15:2).

and intermarry with them, in order to maintain his allegiance to God and to the covenant which God had made with him.[47]

3.2. A Nation Moving Out

The whole exodus tradition appears to be a story of exclusivism: a people moving out from exile in Egypt,[48] away from slavery and polytheism to form a nation under YHWH's guidance, and receiving his legislation in Sinai. While I have already pointed out that the Exodus-motif plays an important role in the metaphorical realization of the citizenship-concept in Ephesians,[49] it is interesting to look closely at the theological motivation that lies behind the Exodus. Exodus 3:7–10 repeatedly mentions the contrast between oppression by the Egyptians and deliverance through YHWH, based on election ("my people," v. 10) and the covenant promise ("bring them up out of that land to a good and broad land," v. 8). Arriving at Sinai, one can notice the struggle with religious assimilation, which Israel had experienced during their stay in Egypt, epitomized in the worship of the golden calf (Exod 32:1–6). This symbolic return to Egypt plays an important role in the subsequent desert narrative (Num 11:5, 18, 20; 14:2–4), and finds its way into the NT (Acts 7:39). In an interesting text in the legal material, Egypt as well as Canaan serve as important negative role models in order to create a theological boundary around Israel: "You shall not do as they do in the land of Egypt, where you lived, and you shall not do as they do in the land of Canaan, to which I am bringing you. You shall not follow their statutes" (Lev 18:3).

However, one can also find inclusivist language in the Exodus account. According to Exod 12:38, Israel moved out of Egypt together with a multitude of strangers, possibly Egyptians, that adhered to the Passover prescriptions which expressly provided for aliens residing with the people of Israel (Exod 12:48). In the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20:22–23:33), the legal position of the alien is further developed (Exod 22:20; 23:9, 12) and his protec-

---

[47] De Pury sees in the coming together of the two family branches (Abraham and Laban) when Jacob returns with his wives to Canaan, an example of interreligious tolerance and suggests that both families were worshipping different gods. Nevertheless, although Gen 30:19 indicates polytheistic tendencies in Laban's family, Gen 31:53 indicates that originally they followed the God of Abraham and his grandfather Nahor. Cf. Albert de Pury, "L'émergence de la conscience 'interreligieuse' dans l'Ancien Testament," *Theological Review* 22 (2001): 7–34.

[48] For the motif of "Exile" in the Pentateuch, see Martin G. Klingbeil, "Exile," *DOTP*, 246–49.

[49] Cf. footnote 16.

tion is always motivated by Israel's experience in Egypt, thus creating a
point of identification between Israel and the nations that were accompany-
ing them. Furthermore, the aliens that lived among the Israelites seemed to
have been in some way dependent on them.[50]

3.3. A Nation Reaching Out

As mentioned in the.introduction, the legal material of the Pentateuch cre-
ates a tension with regard to the treatment of the alien between a privileged
and a subordinate position.[51] While it is not in the interest of the present
study to analyze the different legal propositions and to harmonize them
with each other, one needs to understand what kind of a relationship was
thus created between the Israelite and the alien resident or, later on, with
the surrounding Canaanite nations.[52]

It is interesting to note that the LXX normally translates גֵּר "alien, foreign
resident" with προσήλυτος "proselyte," indicating that the perception of
the alien's status in early Judaism was of a non-Jewish person that had ac-
cepted the faith of Israel.[53] The etymology of προσήλυτος "one who has

---

[50] "The book of the covenant [...] stresses fair treatment for the *gēr* in legal disputes,
proscription of oppression and benefit from the sabbath rest (as also in Ex 20:10). It
then offers a clear justification of identification: 'Do not oppress the alien [...] for you
were aliens in the land of Egypt' (e.g., Ex 23:9). Here, as commonly in Leviticus, the
law assumes the *gēr* to be living as a dependent within an Israelite household." Cf.
Knauth, "Alien, Foreign Resident," 28–29.

[51] Cf. footnotes 9 and 10.

[52] Bennett reads the Deuteronomic Law as a reflection of ninth century B.C.E. conditions
in Israel under the reign of Omri. According to him the legislation concerning widows,
strangers, and orphans "were part of a larger politico-economic program that estab-
lished and legitimized sources for the material endowment and sustenance of cultic
functionaries in the Yahweh-alone sect, a major camp in Israel during the ninth cen-
tury B.C.E. Consequently, the present analysis arrived at this conclusion: the laws rep-
resented in the text used a category of socially weak but politically useful persons as
pawns in a scheme to siphon off percentages of produce and livestock from overbur-
dened peasant farmers and herders in the biblical communities during the Omride
administration." Cf. Harold V. Bennett, *Injustice Made Legal: Deuteronomic Law and the
Plight of Widows, Strangers, and Orphans in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,
2002), 173. Apart from the debatable dating of the texts, Bennett applies a socio-
political interpretation based on Critical Legal Studies that appears to be more evoca-
tive of the twenty-first century than of the Pentateuch. For a critical review, see Gerald
A. Klingbeil, review of *Injustice Made Legal: Deuteronomic Law and the Plight of Widows,
Strangers, and Orphans in Ancient Israel*, HS 45 (2004): 101–4.

[53] Exod 12:48, 49; 20:10; 22:20; 23:9, 12; Lev 16:29; 17:3, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33, 34;
20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47; Num 9:14; 15:14–16, 26, 29, 30; 19:10; 35:15;

come over, arrived at" fits well with the idea of the crossing over of lines.[54] Thus, at least by the time of the intertestamental period, the alien had become a possible object of conversion which is another indicator that the line between exclusivism and inclusivism was a flexible one and that there existed an open invitation for it to be crossed. As McConville observes, "Deuteronomy's view of the people of Israel is nowhere more clearly expressed than in its notion of it as a brotherhood."[55] This becomes apparent in the treatment of the alien and the slave (e.g., Lev 25:39–46) and the inclusion of women as belonging to the brotherhood of Israel: "If a member of your community, whether a Hebrew man or a Hebrew woman, is sold to you and works for you six years, in the seventh year you shall set that person free" (Deut 15:12). The designation for the fellow Israelite and in extension the alien and the woman, is אָחִיךָ "your brother" — clearly inclusive in character.

4. Conclusions

There are a number of relevant conclusions arising from the study of the citizenship motif in the Pentateuch and its metaphorical repercussions in Ephesians via the dividing-wall imagery.

(1) God's election of Israel automatically resulted in a tension between exclusivism and inclusivism, since Israel had to draw a line between themselves and other nations while at the same time serving them and inviting them to get to know YHWH.

(2) The concept of citizenship in Israel was not a rigid one in that it exhibits both exclusivist and inclusivist characteristics.

(3) There are a number of incidents in the Pentateuch where individuals and whole groups cross the imaginary line between Israel and the nations.

(4) The Pentateuch presents a theologically ideal paradigm for the citizenship concept in Israel and thus forms a beginning point for the typological motif timeline that ends in the NT.

(5) During the history of Israel, the tension between exclusivism and inclusivism was apparently not always resolved positively and repeatedly led

---

Deut 1:16; 5:14; 10:18, 19; 12:18; 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:14, 17, 19-21; 26:11–13; 27:19; 28:43; 29:10; 31:12. In Genesis, with reference to the patriarchs, the LXX uses πάροικος "alien, stranger, exile" instead of προσήλυτος.

54   Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), s.v. προσήλυτος. Cf. also Nahum Levison, "Proselyte in Biblical and Early Post-biblical Times," *SJT* 10 (1957): 45–56.

55   McConville, "Metaphor, Symbol," 337.

to extremes, resulting in either assimilation or separation. This is less of a conclusion, and more of a hypothesis since further work needs to be done on the issue aside from the evidence presented here for the Pentateuch.

(6) Consequently, a dividing wall of separation was constructed that separated the different entities with increasingly fewer possibilities of crossing that dividing line.

(7) The NT and Pauline theology creates a possible destination point for the citizenship motif and the accompanying tension between exclusivism and inclusivism.

(8) The entities that are separated are primarily God and humanity. Consequently, that separation results also in a dichotomy between Jews and Gentiles and, by extension, between races and cultures.

(9) The typological resolution of the tension between exclusivism and inclusivism is found in the metaphorical breaking down of the dividing wall which Christ's death on the cross presents.

(10) For Paul, Christ serves as the only possible bridge between exclusivism and inclusivism, creating and maintaining unity through reconciliation. In this way, a new identity, a new citizenship is achieved, resulting in being "citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God" (Eph 2:19).

5. Epilog: An Ecclesiological Contextualization

In retrospect, some further considerations will be presented in order to initiate a discussion along the lines of an ecclesiological contextualization of the evidence which has been presented.

First, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the twenty-first century is experiencing the same tension between exclusivism and inclusivism, between unity and reconciliation. Second, cultural multiplicity requires an inclusivist response, while theological pluralism is challenging the notion of exclusiveness. Third, only in and through Christ may we be able to break down the walls of separation and at the same time maintain a unique identity as the remnant church.