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This volume asks the question to what degree Graeco-Roman notions of citizenship provided a model for ideas of community, solidarity and self-definition. In other words, how did civic institutions, civic life and ideological discourses about citizenship inform the dynamics of identity? Alongside the civic construction of community, other notions could play an important role in defining a group, notions that could complement a membership in a civic community, but also be independent from any form of citizenship. Among these criteria would be a) common descent, whether real or imagined; b) unity under the same ruler, be that ruler human or divine; and c) “voluntary association” with sectarian or philosophical groups.

In this chapter I propose to consider one specifically Jewish conceptualization of boundary-crossing, affiliation, and communal identity: that of the apostle Paul, mid-first century CE, when he worked to incorporate pagans (*ta ethnē*) into the impending messianic redemption of Israel. As our examination will reveal, Paul’s efforts at cross-ethnic “outreach” draw deeply on Jewish scriptural and extra-scriptural customs and textual traditions. And he sees both his native community (Israel) and his eschatological community (the *ekklēsia*) as contrasting sharply to contemporary pagan culture. Yet to a surprising degree, Paul’s ideas on gentile incorporation into Israel’s redemption draws profoundly and specifically on a Roman -- thus, pagan -- cultural practice.

1. *Gods and Humans in Mediterranean Antiquity*

Before I begin, however, I would like to emphasize that in Graeco-Roman antiquity, peoplehood/descent/kinship and relations with divinities were not *alternatives* to constructions of citizenship, but came bundled together *with* them. This was so first of all because, in Mediterranean antiquity, gods and humans together formed family groups. To phrase the same thought slightly differently: from the micro-level of the individual *domus* or *oikos* to the macro-level of the city, ancient gods ran in the blood.[[1]](#footnote-1) There was no word for or concept of what moderns call “religion,” the individual’s assent to certain propositions about divinity based on notions of “belief.” [[2]](#footnote-2) Relations between heaven and earth, from the level of the household to the level of the city and, eventually, beyond, were community concerns, often expressed through inherited protocols, that were maintained through cult. [[3]](#footnote-3)

 In this context, where people-groups, notionally bound together by shared “blood” (*sungeneis* in Paul’s term, Rom 9.4), also shared a family relationship with their god(s), “worship” – enacted fealty to the god – was accordingly imagined as an inheritance, “ancestral custom”: τα πάτρια ἔθη, *mos maiorum*, οἱ πατριοί νόμοι, αἱ πατρίκαι παραδόσεις (Paul again, Gal 1:14). These customs connected humans not only to their gods but, across generations, to each other. Since humans were born into their obligations to their gods, these observations were a piece of their cultural patrimony: cult and ethnicity defined each other. [[4]](#footnote-4)

Ethnicity mapped not only onto heaven but also onto earth, not only in terms of lands and languages but, in the Hellenistic period, more specifically onto the city. Citizens were often imagined as forming a single *genos*/descent group; hence, at Acts 18.24, Apollos is described as “an Alexandrian by γένος,” that is, a citizen. Similarly, some Roman aristocratic families (especially the Julio-Claudians) presented themselves as *Aeneadae*, descendants of Aeneas and, thus, descendants of Venus as well.[[5]](#footnote-5) The city itself, post-Alexander, was thus a kind of family-based religious institution. Urban wellbeing depended on heaven’s beneficence, and thus the organs of city government were in effect media for showing respect to the presiding god(s).

These vertical family relationships between gods, citizens and cities put those Jews residing in the cities of the Diaspora in an awkward position: their god was famously demanding, insisting that *his* people restrict cult only to him.[[6]](#footnote-6) Apion’s question was commonsensical and well-observed: “If the Jews wish to be Alexandrian citizens, why don’t they worship the Alexandrian gods?” (Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.65; cf. the similar complaints from cities in first-century Asia Minor, *A.J.* 12.126). Literary and epigraphical evidence, however, attests to Jews’ serving as ephebes and town councilors (thus, citizens), as athletes and actors, as generals and gladiators. Their activities would have involved them in some degree with showing respect – though perhaps not full cult – to the gods of their cities.[[7]](#footnote-7)

 Gods through their humans operated politically not only within cities; they also operated *between* cities. When negotiating inter-city treaties, Hellenistic and later Roman diplomats would generate genealogies in order to trace back to shared ancestors -- often, ultimately, to a god. The parties under agreement themselves thus became “kin.” Since the Jewish god did not leave human children behind in the ways that Greek gods did, the Hellenistic Judean kingdom under the Hasmoneans had to mobilize the progeny of the patriarchs to break into inter-city diplomacy. An alliance between Sparta and Jerusalem was accordingly effected and stabilized through the distant union of a granddaughter of Abraham’s with the widely-wandering Heracles. “After reading a certain document,” announces a Spartan king to the Jewish high priest, “we have found that Jews and Lacedaemonians [Spartans] are of one γένος, and share a connection with Abraham” (Josephus, *A.J.* 12.226).[[8]](#footnote-8)

Kinship and cult articulated family hierarchy. At the “micro” level the bride, entering her husband’s household, assumed responsibility for what were for her new ancestors and new gods. So too with an adopted son: his induction into a new family not only established a pattern of inheritance; it also assured the continuation of family cult. And Augustus, positioning himself as the empire’s *pater*, through the worship of his own *genius,* turned his new political unit into a single, vast, multi-ethnic *oikos* or *domus* or “family” (*gens*). [[9]](#footnote-9)

Finally, proper awareness of and appropriate deference to superiors within this numinous-human hierarchy were deemed *pietas* or *eusebeia*; one’s *pistis* or *fides* expressed one’s loyalty to these bequeathed practices and to the divine-human and intra-human relationships that they articulated*.* Harmonious relations – showing respect, and being seen to show respect – began at the hearth and extended outward to the city, to the larger empire and, thence, to the cosmos itself. Enacting these arrangements at the micro-level was pious common sense; at the macro-level, it was tantamount to safeguarding the *pax deorum.*[[10]](#footnote-10) Kinship and cult were thus not separated from politics: rather, and at a fundamental level, they constituted politics.

Against this “genealogical” model of divine/human relations stands the odd phenomenon of what we would call “conversion to Judaism.” Given ancient divinity’s ethnic embeddedness, the term, and the phenomenon, scarcely make sense. To fully change gods, to make an exclusive commitment to the Jewish god and to Jewish ancestral practices was tantamount to changing ethnicity. A pagan’s “becoming” a Jew in effect altered his own past, reconfigured his ancestry and (as Tacitus complained, *Hist.* V.5.1,2) cut his ties to his own pantheon, family, and *patria.* For this reason, what we call “conversion,” ancients saw as deserting ancestral customs for foreign laws.

The political model of configuring divine-human relations, in other words, shaped the discourse of “conversion.” Philo speaks of what we call “conversion” as forming a new political affiliation, a non-Jew’s entering the Jewish πολιτεία(*Spec.* 1.51). So too Justin, mid-second century CE, describes conversion to Judaism as a person’s entering τὴν ἐννόμον πολιτείαν(*Dial.* 46–47). Celsus, a generation later, sounds the themes of disloyalty shading to treason, criticizing those pagans who have “abandoned their own traditions and professed those of the Jews” (*c. Cels.* 5.41). And Domitian executed some members of the Roman aristocracy for “atheism,” that is, for spurning their own gods on account of treasonable loyalty to “the customs of the Jews” (Dio, *Roman History* 67.14, 1–2).

But pagans in fact had a broad range of different degrees of affiliation with Jews and, thus, with the Jews’ god. A.D. Nock called this species of affiliation “adherence.” Literary and epigraphical data referred to it as “god-fearing.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Pagans were free to add the Jewish god to their own native pantheons, dropping in whether to the diaspora synagogue or (up until 66 CE) to the temple of Israel’s god in Jerusalem. This sort of social/religious mixing marked the Greco-Roman city generally. (By turning up in curiae, circuses, odeons et cetera, diaspora Jews frequented pagan places as well). It was the gentile’s step from adherence to “conversion” that brought with it the momentous consequence, for men, of circumcision, and occasioned the loudest disapproval from pagan observers.

2. *Paul and the Nations-in-Christ*

With this brief introduction to orient us, let us look at what Paul is doing.

Notoriously, Paul not only does *not* preach circumcision; he preaches *against* circumcision – which is another way of saying that he is going to and writing to outsiders, *ta* *ethnē*.[[12]](#footnote-12) Yet he works to incorporate these *ethnē* into a *Jewish* religious institution or association, the *ekklēsia* (“assembly”), dedicated rigorously to the sole worship of Israel’s god (e.g., 1 Cor 8.6). By immersion, these *ethnē* receive the spirit of Israel’s god, or that of his son, the Christ (Gal 4.5-7; Rom 8.9-15). They thereby remain *ethnē*, although *ethnē* with a difference. They must have absolutely abandoned *latreia* to images, and they may no longer worship their native gods. Receiving this spirit in turn enables these *ethnē* to do God’s ordinances, which are themselves part of Jewish culture, what Paul calls the *nomos.*[[13]](#footnote-13)

 Paul does *not* use the language of citizenship to articulate the new relationship that these *ethnē* have with his god. They do *not*, through immersion, thereby become members of Israel. (To do that would require circumcision which, he says, would mean that the messiah was of no advantage to them, Gal 5.2). On the contrary, these *ethnē*, uncircumcised, remain precisely that: gentiles (see, for example, Rom 11.13). How then does Paul construct this new, eschatological non-Jewish Jewish assembly?

By appealing to the utterly Roman model of *huiothesia*, son-adoption. Paul charismatically constructs a new lineage for these gentiles-in-Christ as *aldelphoi kata pneuma*. They may remain ethnically distinct from Israel, distinct *kata sarka* (thus, no circumcision). But they become brothers *ek pisteos* (not *ek nomos,* the more “political” model), brothers *kata pneuma*.

Why does Paul use this very Roman idea of adoption? For a very Roman reason: adoption affects these Christ-following gentiles’ status as “heirs.” They too, thanks to spirit, can inherit. Inherit what? An idiosyncratically Jewish patrimony: the *basileia tou theou*.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Paul in fact presents *two* different lineages to account for this gentile inclusion in God’s kingdom. The first, and the one more prominently discussed in New Testament scholarship, is the one traced through Christ back to Abraham (Gal 3 and Rom 4). This new gentile patrimony is not presented consistently. Sometimes Paul positions himself as his gentiles’ father (1 Cor 4.15: “I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel”). Sometimes he refers to “our father Abraham” (Rom 4.1; cf. Gal 3.29: “If you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s *sperma*”). But most dramatically – one of the rare Aramaic outcroppings in New Testament literature – Paul speaks of *God* as the gentiles’ new father, their “Abba” (Gal 4.7; Rom 8.15). Inheriting the Abrahamic promise of redemption *ek pisteos*, out of steadfastness or conviction, these gentiles live by hope. As is the case with all human adoption, they remain distinct with respect to physical genealogy. (They are of different “flesh” from Paul’s *sungeneis*, who already have sonship apart from Christ, Rom 9.4). According to the Spirit, however, they are *adopted* sons, responsible to and for the new patrilineal cult. Thus they are heirs too, according to the promise, legitimate co-inheritors together with Israel of God’s kingdom.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Note, also, how this Roman metaphor resonates with the larger pan-Mediterranean construction of divine/human relations: Gods and their humans form family groups. If these *ethnē* now worship Israel’s god, then they are adopted into that god’s family. (I should add that they worship this god according to the dictates of the first table of his Israelite law: no other gods, and no images).

The other lineage that Paul constructs for these *ethnē* is more biblically traditional, and the salvific function of Christ is accordingly reduced. This lineage is evoked at the crescendo of Paul’s argument in Romans 11:25-26, and he again conjures it as he closes, in Romans 15:9-12, with a cento of citations to the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Paul says in Romans 11, “A hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the fullness of the gentiles comes in, and so all Israel will be saved.” *Plerōma tōn ethnōn* and *pas Israēl*. Paul’s language here echoes that of the Table of the Nations in Gen 10 – traditionally imagined as totaling seventy nations. This idea is reprised in Isa 66:18-20, an incandescently eschatological vision of “all nations and tongues” coming to see God’s glory in Jerusalem. From there this trope threads through Jubilees (8-9), the Qumran Genesis Apocryphon (16-17) and the War Scroll (1 QM 2.10-14), book 3 of the Sybilline Oracles, Josephus (*AJ*  1.120-147), the rabbis and the Targumim: it bespeaks “all humanity.” In this cluster of associations, *Noah* is the primal ancestor. From him come three sons, whose sons have sons who have sons in turn, until, with Johab, the full number reaches 70 (or 72, if refracted through Deut 32.8 MT).[[16]](#footnote-16)

Here Paul nowhere mobilizes his adoption metaphors; and the “Redeemer who comes from Zion” might be as easily read as Israel’s god, not his messiah (Rm 11:26).[[17]](#footnote-17) The *ethnē* are *ethnē*, not *adelphoi*. Their “fullness” together with Israel, is Paul’s way, too, of saying “all humanity” – especially, given the way Isaiah provides the prophetic substructure of the entire letter, “all eschatological humanity.”[[18]](#footnote-18) Reprising his argument in Romans 15, Paul concludes, “Christ became a servant to the circumcised in order to show God’s truth, to confirm the promises given to the fathers, and in order that the *ethnē* might glorify God for his mercy.” The gentiles then praise God together with Israel, and they hope in the messiah, the root or shoot of Jesse (Rom 15:9-12).

What then are the metaphors of outsiders’ belonging within Israel’s redemption that Paul appeals to for his gospel? “Citizenship” does not come into play. Rather, Paul avails himself of two other metaphors, one Roman, thus pagan; the other biblical and, thus, Jewish. With the “Roman” *domus*-model, he speaks of adoption and inheritance achieved through a constructed lineage, though that lineage is effected *kata pneuma* via Christ to Abraham. With the biblical model, Paul speaks of descent from Noah, Genesis 10 – all seventy nations – refracted through Isa 66. Israel and the *ethnē*, together in the charismatic *ekklēsia* that expects imminent redemption, thus do and do not form the same family; they are and are not under the same *nomos* or *dikaiōmata*.[[19]](#footnote-19) But both people-groups hope in the same promised inheritance; and together, under the god of Israel and his son, the messiah, they form a single eschatological community of the saved.
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