

Citizenship

PAUL ON PEACE AND POLITICS

Citizenship

PAUL ON PEACE AND POLITICS

Gordon Mark Zerbe

CMU Press
Winnipeg, Manitoba 2012

CMU Press
500 Shaftesbury Blvd
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3P 2N2

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Cover: St Paul Preaching in Athens, oil on canvas, by Sir James Thornhill (1675-1734)

Photo credit: Tate, London / Art Resource, NY. Reproduced by permission of the Chapter of St Paul's Cathedral.

Cover and interior design: Annalee Giesbrecht

Printed in Canada by
Friesens Corporation, Altona, Manitoba



Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Zerbe, Gordon M.

Citizenship : Paul on peace and politics / Gordon M. Zerbe.

ISBN 978-0-920718-93-3

1. Bible. N.T. Epistles of Paul--Criticism, interpretation, etc.
2. Paul, the Apostle, Saint--Political and social views. 3. Christianity and politics. 4. Citizenship--Religious aspects. 5. Peace--Religious aspects. I. Title.

BS2655.P64Z47 2012

227'.06

C2012-905376-7

Copyright © 2012
Gordon Zerbe

To my children,

Silvie and Micah,

fellow citizens by choice of the *civitas dei*

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Introduction: Situating Paul (and Ourselves)	1
 PART ONE. LOYALTY	
1 Citizenship and Politics according to Philippians	13
2 Believers as Loyalists: The Anatomy of Paul's Language of <i>pistis</i>	26
3 The Politics of Worship in Paul's Writings	47
 PART TWO. MUTUALITY	
4 The One and the Many, the Part and the All: Unity and Diversity in Messiah's Body Politic	65
5 Partnership and Equality: Paul's Economic Theory	75
6 (Modest) Challenges to Patriarchy and Slavery in Paul	93

7	The Relevance of Paul's Eschatological Ecclesiology for Ecumenical Relations	108
---	--	-----

PART THREE. SECURITY

8	Soldiering and Battling: The Function of Military Imagery in Paul's Letters	123
9	Paul's Ethic of Nonretaliation and Peace	141
10	"Be(a)ware of the Dogs, Evildoers, and Butchery": Text and Theory in the Discourse on Peace and Violence in Paul	169

PART FOUR. AFFINITIES

11	Paul on the Human Being as a 'Psychic Body': Neither Dualist nor Monist	183
12	On the Exigency of a Messianic Ecclesiology: An Engagement with Philosophical Readers of Paul	195
	Notes	217

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapters 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 are newly published articles. The following chapters are revised versions of previously published articles and are reprinted with permission of the publishers. The author and publisher gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of these publishers.

Chapter 1, “Citizenship and Politics according to Philippians,” appeared earlier in *Direction* 38/2 (2009): 193-208.

Chapter 4, “The One and the Many, the Part and the All: Unity and Diversity in Messiah’s Body Politic,” was first published in *Vision: A Journal of Church and Theology* 11/1 (Spring 2010): 77-90.

Chapter 7, “The Relevance of Paul’s Eschatological Ecclesiology for Ecumenical Relations,” was first published in *New Perspectives in Believers Church Ecclesiology*, edited by Abe Dueck, Helmut Harder, and Karl Koop, 30-47. Winnipeg: CMU Press, 2010.

Chapter 9, “Paul’s Ethic of Non-retaliation and Peace,” was previously published in *The Love of Enemy and Nonretaliation in the New Testament*, edited by Willard Swartley, 177-222. Studies in Peace and Scripture 3. Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Chapter 11, “Paul on the Human Being as a ‘Psychic Body’: Neither Dualist nor Monist,” appeared earlier in *Direction* 37/2 (2008): 168-184.

Chapter 12, “On the Exigency of a Messianic Ecclesiology: An Engagement with Philosophical Readers of Paul,” was previously

Citizenship

published in *Paul, Philosophy, and the Theopolitical*, edited by Doug Harink, 254-81. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2010. Used by permission of Wipf and Stock Publishers. www.wipfandstock.com

Chapter 10, “Be(a)ware of the Dogs, Evildoers and Butchery’: Text and Theory in the Discourse on Peace and Violence in Paul,” was prepared for publication in the forthcoming *Struggles for Shalom: Peace and Violence Across the Testaments*, edited by Laura Brenneman and Brad Schantz (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2013). I am grateful for permission to include that essay also in this collection.

Special thanks go to Harry Huebner, General Editor of CMU Press, for his support and his encouragement to publish this collection with CMU Press.

I am also grateful for a grant from the Faculty Research Committee of Canadian Mennonite University toward the completion of this project.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABD* *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992
- ANRW* *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: DeGruyter, 1972-
- BAGD Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979
- BCE before the Common Era
- ca. *circa*, around
- CE common era
- CEB Common English Bible
- cf. confer, compare
- DSS Dead Sea Scrolls
- e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
- Gk. Greek
- Heb. Hebrew

Citizenship

KJV	King James Version
Lat.	Latin
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
L&N	Louw, J. P. and E. A. Nida, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains</i> , 2d ed. United Bible Societies, 1999
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, <i>Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement</i> , 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996
LXX	Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible; includes the Greek Old Testament plus Apocrypha
n.	note, footnote
NAB	New American Bible
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> , 3 vols. Edited by C. Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-78
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
passim	here and there
Q	From the German <i>Quelle</i> , “source,” referring to the presumed common source used by the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.
RSV	Revised Standard Version
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 10 vols. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976
TNIV	Today’s New International Version
v., vv.	verse, verses

INTRODUCTION: SITUATING PAUL (AND OURSELVES)

But the Jerusalem above is free; she is our mother. (Gal 5:26)

I swear (or affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen. (Canadian Oath of Citizenship)¹

While retaining the citizenship papers, passport, and privileges of the United States, a citizenship bequeathed to me as an accident of birth (while not having received citizenship in the land of Japan where I was physically born and grew up as a foreigner), I lived as a migrant in Canada during my earlier adulthood, from 1976 until 2002, when I finally swore the Canadian oath of citizenship. To be precise, I “affirmed,” but it was an “oath” nevertheless. And while some inductees were troubled by the monarchist imagery, I found it an appropriate symbol of the claims of state sovereignty. States do make sovereign claims on our being and loyalty (and even “demo-crazy” specifically invokes a form of “ruling power,” *kratia*). According to Canadian doctrine, it is exactly at the moment when one takes this oath (for those not born into it) that one becomes a Canadian citizen and is “welcomed into the Canadian family” (a tribal kinship?), while accepting “the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.”²

So, I now hold dual earthly citizenship. Nevertheless, I do not subscribe to the notion that one can always be a good dual citizen (in

the same way) of Christ's regime now secured in heaven (which is technically a global citizenship anyway) and a particular earthly regime. Just as the United States formally discourages dual citizenship, so as to avoid competing claims on our loyalty,³ I would argue that Paul, Messiah's envoy (*apostolos*) of an alternative politics, would discourage trying to hold Messianic (Christian) and a national citizenship in some kind of equal balance: the former must always trump the latter, when it comes to a competition over our loyalty, and notably when it comes to creating a new, truly international people under Christ's sovereignty, and oriented to God's universal dominion as Creator. And so I was, and still am, troubled by my words to "be faithful" and "bear true allegiance" to a particular (and particularizing) human sovereignty, since there are no qualifications attached to those words of oath. My ultimate allegiance goes to the great mother Jerusalem above, not the great mother Queen of an earthly empire. My "truest allegiance" was declared in oath at the moment of my baptism into Christ, the Christian citizenship ceremony. And it is for this reason that balancing my two earthly citizenships is an insignificant matter, because of my primary commitment to Christ's world-reconciling regime. (And note that, by contrast, no modern state sovereignty is interested in having its subjects or citizens making oaths to a global citizenship—whether construed theologically, politically or ecologically—that trumps narrow state or national interests. But the imperative for such a globally oriented citizenship—what the Stoics called cosmo-politanism—is becoming increasingly critical.)

Politics, I recognize, is a subject that one should avoid, so as not to offend. My hope is that these brief words, offered in the spirit of full disclosure and not for political positioning, have provoked interest (invitingly, not adversarially) in the subject matter of this volume, a revisiting of Paul's theological vision and practical activism around the theme of citizenship.

SITUATING PAUL: ENVOY OF MESSIAH'S GLOBAL POLITICS

While the specific language of citizenship may not be frequent in Paul's writings, I am increasingly finding it to be a vital framework for understanding Paul's apostolic letters, and for reflecting on the contemporary implications of his legacy. Indeed, whereas discipleship (or "following," German "Nachfolge") has been the core watchword in my own Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition, I find that word easily susceptible to an individualist interpretation or practice. The notion of citizenship, however, not only conjures up the crucial element of personal loyalty and practice, but also that of a social and global-ecological vision, formation,

and identity (even if an identity that confounds prior identities, or undermines the very notion of identity)—that is, altogether, a politics.

In the usage of this volume, politics does not refer narrowly to the business of governing or to relating to a government. Rather, it is used in its more general sense as being and forming a polity, a citizen-community, participating in a social formation, whether as a particular community, or in relation to a society (and its ruling, political structures), or the global neighbourhood more generally. The Jewish historian Josephus (ca. 37-100), a near contemporary of Paul and similarly both a Pharisee and a dual citizen of Judea and Rome,⁴ is the first writer to use the Greek term “theocracy” (*theokratia*),⁵ as a way to describe the distinctive polity of Israel-Judea, relative to other political formations (e.g. kingship, democracy, oligarchy). This notion involves the basic concept of all of life under the rule of God, and is roughly a synonym of “the kingdom of God.”

As with Josephus, the kind of personal and global vision that motivated Paul cannot be subsumed under the constricted category of what we think of as “religion,” having to do with what is specifically spiritual or narrowly supernatural, or that which pertains to matters of personal, private encounter in relation to the divine, as somehow sequestered from other arenas of living and interacting. Instead, the horizon of both Josephus and Paul is much better described as “theo-political,” and in Paul’s case, the particular polity under construction could be called a “christo-cacy”—a specifically Messianic political formation, something that would have made the elite, high-priestly Josephus uncomfortable. Granted, in both Josephus and Paul, the “ruling power” (*kratia*, whence “-cacy”) of God is mediated: for Josephus, it was properly mediated through high-priestly oligarchs (and thus represents what the Greeks called “aristocracy,” the “rule of the best, most worthy”); for Paul, it is mediated directly through Messiah, although that direct rule also requires a kind of interim, provisional mediation (a flexible leadership structure gifted through the Spirit, and otherwise anarchic), insofar as it is socio-political formation, as Christ’s very body, yet to be fully realized. While Josephus and Paul may have agreed in principle on the notion of “theocracy,” their visions diverge dramatically. Paul’s Messianic politics is a world-transforming (not world-ending) vision of politics from below, from the margins, from the inside, or as he also puts it “from above” (“from heaven,” Phil 3:20; “from Zion,” Rom 11:26)—a radical future impinging on the present (1 Cor 7:29-31; 10:11). It is oriented to the “Jerusalem above,” God’s “free city,” the “mother” city (Gal 5:26) of a domain that will one day reunite the entire world (1 Cor 15:24-28; Col 1:15-20). The sacerdotal, high-priestly politics of Josephus is much more a politics as

usual, not needing to embrace the radically disruptive. Still, the common Christian slogan—that the Jews longed for a purely political Messiah, whereas Christ was a merely spiritual Messiah—is actually wrong on both sides of the comparison.

PAUL'S CITIZENSHIP LANGUAGE

The “political” (theo-political, christo-political) resonances of Paul’s rhetoric are palpably evident throughout his letters, though lost in most English translations (or deliberately covered up). In a few crucial instances, Paul uses the specific vocabulary and distinctive notion of the Greek *polis*, “city-state,” or more precisely “citizen-state” or “citizen-community.” It is from this root that the array of English words for “politics” derives (political, politician, polity, policy, police). In Greek, a “citizen” (*politēs*) is literally the (privileged) member of a *polis*, in contrast to (and in exclusion of) those who are merely residents of a location, whether the lower class poor (below the minimal line for citizenship qualification), migrants from other regions, or the non-citizen farmers in the surrounding areas under the control of a *polis*. In his letter to the Messianic assembly in Philippi, Paul appropriates *polis*-language in a dramatic way, first in the opening thesis statement of his exhortation, and then in a climaxing declaration:

Just one thing: *politeusthe* (politicize) in a manner worthy of the gospel of Messiah. (Phil 1:27)

For our *politeuma* (polity) exists in heaven, and from there we await a Deliverer, Lord Jesus Messiah, who will transform the body of our lowliness to be conformed to the body of his splendour, in accordance with the power with which he is able to subject the universe to himself. (Phil 3:20-21)

In the first case, Paul uses the verb *politeusthe* in a way that cannot be easily rendered into English: it involves the call both to “be a citizen community” (a body politic) and to “practice the citizenship identity” that members of that community have been “graciously granted” (Phil 1:30), a meaning covered up in standard English translations until very recently (see now TNIV). Emphasized immediately is the alternative foundation, formation, being, and practice of this alternative *polis* (whose foundational “constitution” is “the gospel of Messiah”), its defensive struggle in a hostile environment (its patriotic unity and its resistance to terror tactics), and its non-hierarchical solidarity (Phil 1:27–2:5). In the second text, Paul draws on the imagery of a government in exile—in exile because a hostile, unjust, and illegitimate power is now supreme

in the regime's proper and rightful dominion. It is for this reason that the adherents must wait expectantly and faithfully until the sphere of God's claim is fully liberated. The word *politeuma* in this text refers to the "ruling structures of a *polis*," that is, its "government," and by extension to the "political identity" and "citizenship" of those who place their hope in that regime. Paul is not referring to heaven as the homeland, nor as the destination for the faithful; rather, heaven is the place where God's rule still remains supreme, in a kind of exile, the location from which the global reclamation will finally and imminently emerge. In the interim, citizenship includes, among other things, a commitment to the practice of forbearing reconciliation (Phil 4:5), in the context of a security experienced (literally "guarded") through the "peace of God" (Phil 4:7), ultimately established under the rule of the "God of peace" (Phil 4:9). The final, global victory of that regime (*politeuma*) will mean a dramatic change in the fortunes of its loyal adherents, specifically pertaining to bodily life, but will also embrace the whole cosmos (Phil 3:20-21). Paul's words, in effect, are the declarative counterpart to the prayer that "God's reign be established on earth as it is in heaven" (Matt 6:10).

Paul also draws on city-state imagery in Galatians 5:21-31, and again with the nuances of global politics: the "Jerusalem above," to which the Messianic community gives its allegiance, is "free" (that is, not under the domain of any foreign imperial power), in contrast to "present Jerusalem" which is in bondage (that is, literally to the Roman empire, but symbolically to a Law-oriented regime not governed by direct Messianic rule). Loyal adherence to Messiah's global regime works in the framework only of "freedom" (Gal 5:1, 4, 13; 2 Cor 3:17). In addition, "Jerusalem above" is a "mother" city, taking up the common image of a "metropolis" (literally a "mother-city") that is the centre of a vast domain, and that establishes colonies in far-flung areas.⁶ Citizenship in the ancient world—whether Roman, Judean-Jewish, or Messianic—was always genealogically understood, as descent from, or absorption into, an apical, often eponymous ancestor.⁷ The "Jerusalem above" also represents a "covenant," which here means a particular "world order."⁸ Paul's premise in this argument is that the "Jerusalem above" is a figure of global Messianic rule that one day will reign supreme throughout the world as a truly "international" capital city to which the nations give their voluntary allegiance (cf. Rev 20-22). In this sense, salvation is grounded in a "hope laid up [secured] in heaven," as it is put in Colossians 1:5. As in Philippians, heaven is the place where Messiah's world-reconciling work is secured, as if in exile, not itself the destination.⁹ But, in the comfortable, symbiotic dualism of later Christendom (see Chapter 12), heaven became the soul's spiritual homeland and destination, whereas

Citizenship

the empire could claim the full allegiance of the embodied person on earth.

Resonances with these themes echo in other passages in Paul's writings, even though the imagery shifts from that of the "city-state" to that of the "kingdom":¹⁰

We exhort you (all). . .to walk in a manner worthy of the God who calls you into his own kingdom and [its] splendour. (1 Thess 2:12). Faithful is the one who calls you, who indeed will do it. (1 Thess 5:24).

We speak boastfully in the assemblies of God for your endurance and loyalty in all the persecutions and pressures that you are enduring, a sign of the righteous judgment of God, so that you will be deemed worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are suffering. (2 Thess 1:4-5)¹¹

We have not ceased to pray for you. . .so that you may walk in a manner worthy of the Lord, toward all that pleases (God)—bearing fruit in every good work, increasing in the knowledge of God, being strengthened with every power according to the power of his splendour, toward all endurance and longsuffering, and we give thanks with joy to the Father, who has qualified us for a share of the inheritance of the saints in light,¹² and who has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son. . . . (Col 1:9-13)

Citizen-state imagery, along with peace themes, reappears in the letter-essay now known as Ephesians, which articulates Paul's theological vision in the generation after Paul's death. Here citizen-state imagery is applied to the extension of Israelite citizenship rights and privileges to former foreigners from the nations, through the person of Christ, in whom the entire universe will be reunited in one global body (1:10, 21-23; 2:15-18):

Therefore remember that formerly those of you who were born among the nations. . .were at that time separate from Messiah, excluded from the polity (*politeia*) of Israel and foreigners to the covenants of promise. . . . But now in Messiah Jesus you who formerly were far off have been brought near by the sacrificial death of Messiah, for he himself is our peace, who made both (into) one and broke down the dividing wall of the barrier, deactivating the enmity. . . . So then you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but you are (fully) co-citizens (*sympolitai*) with the saints

[Israel] and you are God's household members (*oikeioi*)¹³. . . , a holy sanctuary in the Lord. (Eph 2:11a, 12-14, 19, 21)

THE ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

The chapters of this volume, some of them previously published (see Acknowledgements), have been arranged according to the citizenship themes of Loyalty, Mutuality, and Security. These topics are neither exclusive nor exhaustive citizenship categories, but they are arguably core themes in the broader domain of what we might consider in relation to citizenship. Essays in the first section, "Loyalty," draw attention to the fundamental personal and corporate dynamics of citizenship in the context of Paul's ecclesial politics. The second section, "Mutuality," is centred mainly on the internal characteristics of the Messianic assembly as a citizen community, including its approach to social diversity and economic disparity. The concluding essay in this section pushes mutuality to its limit, exploring Paul's hope of universal inclusion through God's unending and merciful embrace of all peoples. The third section, "Security," includes essays that investigate the questions of violence, peace, and warfare in and pertaining to Paul's writings. A last section, "Affinities," engages Paul's perspective with broader conversation partners beyond the fields of biblical and theological studies. Both of these last essays address crucial questions relevant to Messianic citizenship that emerge from contemporary reflection on Paul.¹⁴

AVOIDING HISTORICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ANACHRONISMS IN THE STUDY OF PAUL

I should also admit at the outset that I am committed to understanding Paul in his historical, linguistic, and cultural particularity,¹⁵ and believe that only after this hard work of un-domesticating Paul can we reflect coherently on the implications of his legacy. In other words, it is necessary to understand Paul first in his foreignness before (and as) we try to bring him into our present. Here's where translations can be exceedingly misleading, because they can leave the impression that Paul speaks our language and uses our concepts. He doesn't. When it comes to translating Paul, therefore, I tend to avoid renderings that have come to be merely church words, giving the impression that Paul used a kind of narrowly religious language (sin, salvation, church, righteousness, glory, apostle, Christ, etc.). When put in his own linguistic environment, however, it becomes quickly apparent that Paul used words used in common discourse, words that have a variety of deliberate political and

social resonances. For instance, *christos* in Paul is always a theo-political title as Israel's deliverer, not a name, and thus captured better by the translation Messiah (since Anointed doesn't have currency anywhere) than the transliteration Christ. And *ekklēsia* is properly "assembly," not church, regularly used for the body and gathering of citizens of a *polis* to enact citizen business. In this volume, all translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

A further problem with our translations and usual labels is that they can imprison Paul within a series of anachronisms. The later conclusions and assumptions of Christendom are thus retrojected back onto Paul. The most obvious example here involves the use of "Christian" or "Christianity," as opposed to "Jew" and "Judaism." Paul, in fact, lived and worked before Christianity,¹⁶ that is before "Christianity" came to be understood as a movement and as a set of doctrines and practices distinct from and separate from "Judaism" (which itself also evolved dramatically during the first few centuries after the second temple period).¹⁷ The term "Jew," then, is also misleading, since it conjures up the polar opposite to "Christian" in religious terms, and since it does not adequately render the historical sense of *ioudaios*, which literally means "belonging to Judah," with a geographical, ethnic-peoplehood, national-citizenship, and religious sense all in one. "Jews," wherever they are living in the ancient world, are properly "Judeans," those who affiliate with the land, people, religion, and polity of Judea (just as Romans belong to Rome wherever they live). Historically, then, it is best to regard Paul both as a self-identified Judean,¹⁸ and a Jesus-Messianist, with all the tensions that that entailed (Rom 9-11; Phil 3:2-11).¹⁹ As Krister Stendahl demonstrated, Paul understood all "Christians" (or Gentile Messiah loyalists) to be, in effect, honorary Jews (Judeans), attached by adoption into the root of Israel through Messiah.²⁰

THE CHALLENGES OF CONTEMPORARY APPROPRIATION

Paul's voice should not, however, just stay in the past. Even some historical materialists are now seeking to recover Paul's theory (Chapter 12). And indeed, translations of Paul for the sake of liturgy (in its broad, inclusive sense; see Chapter 3) should aim for contemporaneity, a fusion of horizons (in contrast to establishing distance, as I just proposed). Indeed, this undertaking of a necessary translation of a different sort is faced with significant challenges. Let me draw attention only to a few things to be taken into account. The reality is that the ever-present "kyriarchic Messianism"²¹ and "eschatological millenarianism" poses such a foreign sensibility to Western liberal democratic perspectives that it is nearly

impossible to engage in a direct conversation between these outlooks. Some questions that might be posed are: (a) Does Paulinism give too much over to Messianic agency, letting the redeemed community sit back and wait, preoccupied with its own purity and distinctiveness? (b) Can Paul's "kyriarchalism" (explicit "lordship," hierarchical, sovereignty language), a point of offense to some, be made relevant to modern (or post-modern) sensibilities?²² (c) Does not the continued non-event of the full Messianic *parousia* (presence, arrival; Latin, *adventus*) cause us to question our commitment to this visionary world of universal reconciliation? I touch on these matters along the way, and can give no easy answers.

Wrestling with Paul may not be easy, but is absolutely essential for the journey—a life of devoted citizenship in alignment with the hope of the realization of Messiah's global *polis*, the *civitas dei*.

NOTES

Introduction

1 See the website of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/citizenship/cit-ceremony.asp>, accessed 22 May 2012.

2. Ibid.

3. From the website of the United States Embassy in Ottawa, Canada: “The U.S. Government acknowledges that dual nationality exists but does not encourage it as a matter of policy because of the problems it may cause. Claims of other countries on dual national U.S. citizens may conflict with U.S. law, and dual nationality may limit U.S. Government efforts to assist citizens abroad. The country where a dual national is located generally has a stronger claim to that person’s allegiance.” http://canada.usembassy.gov/consular_services/dual-citizenship.html, accessed 22 May 2012.

4. As with Paul, he had two names for his dual identity: in Hebrew, Yosef ben Matityahu, anglicized to Joseph son of Matthias [Matthew]; in Latin, Titus Flavius Iosephus, taking the name and tribal name of his patron. Roman citizens were set apart as having “three names,” and only they could use the privileged *tria nomina*.

5. Josephus, *Against Apion* 2.164-6. On the high-priestly politics of Josephus, see further Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 205-13.

6. In the ancient world, cities and nations were regularly symbolized as feminine. For a similar merging of city (Babylon and New Jerusalem) and female personification, see also Rev 17-22.

7. Thus, all new Roman citizens were inducted into one of the Roman tribes, normally that of the patron. In the same way, Japanese citizenship until very recently meant joining a family registry, which is why I did not receive that citizenship, even though born there. For Paul’s Judaic citizenship identity and status, see Phil 3:4-5.

8. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 244. While this allegorical text is part of the rhetoric against Torah-oriented, and

Jerusalem-based opponents, its meaning is lost when the geo-political dynamics that undergird the argument are left out of consideration. The imagery of “freedom” and “slavery,” and the notion of a city as one’s “mother” draws on geo-political realities, even as Paul applies this to a specific debate over matters of Torah.

9. See N. T. Wright, *Surprised by Hope: Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church* (New York: HarperOne, 2008).

10. The relatively rare phrase “kingdom of God” appears in Paul in (a) warnings about not inheriting it, based on gross immoral conduct (1 Cor 6:9-10; Gal 5:21; cf. Eph 5:5), (b) brief depictions of its crucial values or power (Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; cf. 1 Cor 15:24), or (c) assertions of its significance for the security, identity, and conduct of its adherents (Col 1:13; 4:11; 1 Thess 2:12; 2 Thess 1:5).

11. For the privilege of “suffering” for allegiance to Messiah’s polity, see also Phil 1:30.

12. Alluding again to the notion of salvation and citizenship that is secured in heaven, but not destined there.

13. The imagery of a household (*oikos*) was regularly applied to the Roman empire and the entire inhabited world (*oikoumenē*) as its domain. Thus, the image of “residents of God’s household” too is distinctly theo-political.

14. Interested readers may also want to check out two related essays that I have published elsewhere: “The Politics of Paul: His Supposed Social Conservatism and the Impact of Postcolonial Readings,” *Conrad Grebel Review* 21/1 (Winter 2003): 82-103; reprinted with minor revisions in *The Colonized Paul: Paul through Postcolonial Eyes*, ed. C. Stanley (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 62-73; and “Constructions of Paul in Filipino Theology of Struggle,” *Asia Journal of Theology* 19/1 (April 2005): 188-220; reprinted with minor revisions in *The Colonized Paul*, 236-55. In the former essay I discuss Paul’s counter-Roman posture (despite Romans 13 and against the grain of received interpretations) under three topics: (1) the underlying millenarian script of God’s sovereign reclamation and renewal of the entire creation; (2) the regular use of politically loaded words in Paul’s social environment to describe Messiah, Messiah’s new community, and the liberation and deliverance that comes through Messiah’s agency; and (3) Paul’s own experience of arrest, imprisonment, torture, and eventually execution at the hands of the Roman empire. For a treatment of Paul’s ecological perspective, see my “Ecology according to the New Testament,” *Direction* 21/2 (1992): 15-26; available online at <http://www.directionjournal.org/article/?763>, accessed May 27, 2012.

15. A consequence of respecting Paul’s historical particularity is carefully working with sources. Scholarship on Paul has come to recognize seven “undisputed letters” in regard to their authorship by Paul: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon. In addition to these, I tend to treat Colossians and 2 Thessalonians also within the group of letters directly authored by Paul, considering the arguments against the Pauline authorship of these letters to be equivocal. But I am quite convinced that the Pastoral Epistles (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus) were written sometime after Paul’s death, perhaps even a generation later, and that Ephesians is also written after

Paul, though much closer to the historical circle and perspective of Paul in comparison to the Pastoral Epistles. As for the Book of Acts, I do not consider its accounts of events and its speeches from the lips of Paul to represent verbatim records of precise historical details, although I tend to see Acts as relatively reliable in historical terms when judged according to ancient standards. Its use as a source for Paul must be appreciated in light of its own theological and literary aims.

16. See George Shillington, *Jesus and Paul before Christianity* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011).

17. For a provocative perspective on this complex story, see Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

18. For a compelling argument that Paul's Messianic Judaic commitments also included a hope for a corporeal "political" renewal extending from the land of Israel (while disavowing any specific relevance to the state of Israel founded in 1948), see Mark Reasoner, "On Earth, Not in Heaven: Paul's Scriptures and the Political Salvation of Israel in Romans 9-11" (paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November 18, 2006, Washington, D.C.); available online at <http://www.thepaulpage.com/on-earth-not-in-heaven-pauls-scriptures-and-the-political-salvation-of-israel-in-romans-9-11/>, accessed May 29, 2012.

19. See Chapter 10, however, for a re-reading of Phil 3:2-3.

20. Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

21. For the notion of Paul's comprehensive "kyriarchic" conceptuality, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 13-29, 82-109, 149-93.

22. For these first two challenges, see Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 157-61.

Chapter 1

1. It is a delight and privilege to be able to honour my first significant mentor in biblical scholarship through this essay. I am deeply indebted to John for inspiring and drawing me into the field of biblical studies, and more specifically the study of Paul. This chapter is based on a presentation at the John E. Toews Symposium, Fresno Pacific University, March 28, 2008.

2. John E. Toews, *Romans*, Believers Church Bible Commentary (Scottsdale/Waterloo: Herald Press, 2004), 345, 368; see also pp. 38-42, 46-48, 62-63, 318, 342, 349-49, 362. This thesis could be extended further in reference to Rom 8:18-39; 11:25-36; and 15:14-32.

3. Now published as John E. Toews, "Righteousness in Romans: The Political Subtext of Paul's Letter," in *The Old Testament in the Life of God's People: Essays in Honour of Elmer A. Martens*, ed. Jon Isaak (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 209-22; and "The Politics of Confession," *Direction* 38/1 (2009): 5-16.