



COVENANT
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection

J. Oliver Buswell Jr. Library
12330 Conway Road
Saint Louis, MO 63141

www.covenantseminary.edu/library

This document is distributed by Covenant Theological Seminary under agreement with the author, who retains the copyright. Permission to further reproduce or distribute this document is not provided, except as permitted under fair use or other statutory exception.

The views presented in this document are solely the author's.

**HOW DOES THE SOJOURNER TEACH
THE CHARACTER OF GOD?**

By

Anna Grace Gallant

**A THESIS SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF
COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY**

SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

MAY 2007

APPROVAL SHEET

**HOW DOES THE SOJOURNER TEACH
THE CHARACTER OF GOD?**

By

Anna Grace Gallant

**A THESIS SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF
COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY**

Graduation Date May 18, 2007

Faculty Advisor David A. Klein

Second Faculty Reader John F. Bangs

Director of the Program David W. Chapman

Director of the Library James C. Takala

ABSTRACT OF

HOW DOES THE SOJOURNER TEACH THE CHARACTER OF GOD?

By Anna Grace Gallant

Christians know that this earthly life is not a final destination. We have been redeemed by the true God who has acted throughout history to renew all of creation, and we await that consummation. To understand the transience of the life of God's people from His perspective requires detailed analysis of the Biblical text. The transience is captured by the English term "sojourn," meaning the process of a journey. The most common root in the Hebrew Scriptures for "sojourn" is נָגַד. To date, there does not exist a lexical study on this term that traces its semantic development into the New Testament.¹ There are studies that trace the hypothesized sociological development of the נָגַד, most commonly translated into English as "alien," but these works are built upon a foundation of higher critical scholarship.² This present study assumes the divine inspiration and historicity of the Old and New Testaments, crafted in a milieu of prophetic and apostolic sanction. Relevant principles of linguistics are applied to an exegetical study of the final form of the text in order to understand sojourning as depicted by Scripture.

Concerning methodology, this study is an exegesis of terms in their Old and New Testament contexts, with implications for Christians today illuminated in light of the

¹ While certain theological dictionaries give some semantic data, they are either brief synopses, such as Colin Brown, ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Regency Reference Library, 1986) and Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, eds., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), or they do not follow the linguistic principles outlined in this present study, such as Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976). None give a linguistically based, exhaustive analysis of the concept and field-oriented approaches that this study holds to be crucial for proper interpretation.

² See the work of Christiana van Houten for a history of interpretation concerning the alien in ancient Israel, as well as a comprehensive bibliography of contributing scholarly work on the subject. Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1991).

exegetical conclusions. Chapter one explains the linguistic principles relevant to an exegetically responsible analysis of the lexical sense of vocabulary within Scripture. Chapter two applies the linguistic principles of concept and field-oriented approaches to lexical study in order to understand the sociological place of the sojourner in ancient Israel with respect to the covenant relationship between God and Israel. In chapter three, the Greek equivalents of the terms in the Hebrew Scriptures related to sojourning are identified. This is a crucial bridge chapter to studying sojourning language in the New Testament because of the access to and reliance upon the Septuagint (LXX) by the New Testament authors. The same Greek equivalents are studied in their New Testament contexts in chapter four. Finally, theological inferences are made based upon the exegetical data examined in the Old and New Testaments.

There is semantic discontinuity and continuity between the Old and New Testaments with regard to sojourning. The key to the discontinuity is the recording in Acts 15 of the conclusions reached by the Jerusalem Council in the first century AD; by that time, the most common Greek equivalent for נָכַר, προσήλυτος, had become a technical term for a convert to Judaism. In the New Testament, those outside the covenant who are brought in by the blood of Christ are the πάροικος, παρεπίδημος, and ξένος, equivalent terms for those in the ancient Near East who did not seek inclusion into Israel. Now the people of God are called to go and seek those outside, calling them to repentance and faith in Christ by extending full acceptance and access to God's redemptive work in every sphere of life. This offer of access and acceptance to the stranger is hospitality, which is a mark of appropriated holiness, nurtured by the memory of personal and corporate deliverance from darkness, by which the grace of God brought us into light and

life. We now serve a gracious host, and the memory of our deliverance engenders gratitude that fosters faithful obedience to the call of God upon our lives, reflecting His holiness to our neighbors and to the nations.

Dedication

For my dear friend Susan,

whose steadfast support in friendship and prayer

gave me the courage to persevere with this much-desired endeavor.

What a privilege it has been to sojourn alongside you,

treading the path wrought by the Father's love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ix
Chapter 1 – Introduction and Linguistic Principles Relevant to Lexical Study.....	1
1.1 Lexicology	
1.2 Semantic Transfer	
1.3 Determining Lexical Sense	
1.4 Summary	
Chapter 2 – Sojourning Vocabulary in the Old Testament: Concept and Field-Oriented Approaches.....	17
2.1 Concept-Oriented Study of גֵּר (Syntagmatic Relationships)	
2.2 Field-Oriented Study of גֵּר (Paradigmatic Relationships)	
2.3 English Rendering of Terms and Summary	
Chapter 3 – The Septuagint Translation of the Old Testament: Greek Equivalents for Hebrew Terms.....	51
3.1 Agent: גֵּר	
3.2 Action: גֵּר	
3.3 Summary	
Chapter 4 – Sojourning Vocabulary in the New Testament: Semantic Continuity and Discontinuity.....	65
4.1 Convert	
4.2 Sojourner: Synonymy in Syntagmatic Relationships	
4.3 ξένος: A Broader Semantic Category	
4.4 Conclusions and Implications	
Bibliography.....	80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not exist without the enabling power and guidance of my Father in heaven, toward whom words cannot express my gratitude, love, and devotion. To enable and guide me toward the completion of this thesis, He provided people who have offered invaluable insight and encouragement. Thank you, Dr. Kim, for your willingness to tackle this project when everything about it was unknown. I am humbled by your knowledge as well as the expression of grace you have been. Thank you, Dr. Bayer, for not only agreeing to read my thesis and thereby enable its completion, but for helping to shape my learning these past three years. And thank you, dearest of Libbies, for being my unfailing friend and partner in revision throughout our course of study. My studies have been enhanced beyond measure by your camaraderie. Who would I be without you? I cannot even imagine.

The Scripture passages quoted in this thesis are mine unless followed by the standard abbreviation for the Bible version cited. Scripture quotations marked (ESV) are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved. Scripture quotations marked (NASB) and (NIV) are from The Holy Bible, copyright 1996. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. Wheaton, IL 60189. All rights reserved. Scripture quotations marked (NRSV) are from the New Revised Standard Version Bible, copyright 1989, by the division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA. Used by permission. All rights reserved. All Hebrew text is from the BHS and all Greek text is from the UBS.

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Linguistic Principles Relevant to Lexical Study

Sojourning is a common theme in Christian thought, with the Christian life viewed as a journey, specifically a pilgrimage through this temporal life toward the eternal consummation of the new heavens and the new earth. What does Scripture teach the Christian about this life of pilgrimage? This question is multi-faceted, inviting investigation into the identity of the one who sojourns, the terrain through which the sojourner travels, and the place toward which the sojourner is headed. While intriguing, such pursuits are not the aim of the study at hand. Instead, we will begin to investigate the language used in Scripture to describe those who sojourn, or embark on a journey away from an original home. The historical context of God's people has changed with time and location, but a lexical study analyzing the terms used in Scripture to describe their lives can begin to explain the transience and estrangement they have experienced. By carefully analyzing components of meaning, appropriate applications can be made to Christians today.

1.1 Lexicology

A lexical study employs lexicology, which is a branch of linguistics that examines a word in all its aspects, including, according to Stephen Ullman, “all types of morphemes entering into the composition of words.”¹ Since sojourning is a concept, its

¹ Stephen Ullman, *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 29. A morpheme is the smallest unit of meaning in a word. For instance, “cats” consists of two morphemes—“cat” and “s.” “S” carries the meaning of pluralizing the noun, and therefore it is a morpheme.

scope is broader than one word. Therefore, this study will not be an exhaustive analysis of one particular word. It also will not examine the concept of sojourning in every applicable literary genre.² Rather, the genres included are limited to categories within the Bible. However, this study will employ lexical methodology by observing the meanings of words in their contexts. This enables us to approach an understanding of the meaning intended by the authors.

1.2 Semantic Transfer

This particular lexical study will span Scripture, beginning with an investigation of the forms of נִיר in the Old Testament, since that is the most frequently used term for verbal and nominal forms of “sojourn.”³ The study will then proceed to an examination of the terms used in the Septuagint (hereafter LXX) to translate forms of נִיר into Greek, and will conclude with a study of the Greek terms used by New Testament authors. Throughout this process, we need to be mindful of gaps between the world of the original audience and that of the modern audience. Therefore, caution will be exercised not to distort the linguistic evidence when seeking to bridge the linguistic and cultural gaps between the Hebrew of the Old Testament, Koine Greek of both the LXX and of the New Testament, and modern English. James Barr calls the bridging of these gaps “semantic transference.”⁴ Not only do gaps exist between cultures and languages, but often between authors. Therefore, this study will not bear the assumption that a particular word used at the same point in history in the same geographic location by one author must

² Genre is a means of classifying texts by category, and a particular genre is a category in which the included texts “bear one or more traits in common with each other,” Tremper Longman III, *Literary Interpretations to Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1987), 76.

³ Verbal forms of נִיר occur 97 times in the Old Testament and nominal forms occur 82 times, according to George V. Wigram, *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 303, 314-315.

⁴ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 5.

necessarily be used in the same manner by another author; D.A. Carson cautions against this practice, reminding the exegete that context and audience are crucial to accurate interpretation.⁵

Since it is important to avoid both the assumption that a word always has the same meaning at a given point in time and also the assumption that a word continues to bear the same meaning throughout time, understanding synchronic and diachronic approaches to word study is important. Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, although not the first scholars to distinguish the approaches, define the terms. They explain that a synchronic approach is the study of a word in various contexts at one point in time and a diachronic approach is the study of a word through time.⁶ Taking the use of sojourning vocabulary through Old and New Testament times as well as within the various contexts at each point in time, I will attempt to determine the lexical sense of terms which contribute to the theme of sojourning as it relates to the people of God.

1.3 Determining Lexical Sense

Lexical meaning must be distinguished from discourse usage, also known as contextual sense, with the former meaning the components of meaning listed in a dictionary or lexicon and the latter adding elements from a specific context to the meaning of a term.⁷ Eugene Nida explains that the lexical meaning, or diagnostic components, of a term is what a definition is based upon. The components are the

⁵ An example would be the usage of *παρεπίδημος* by Peter (1 Pet 1:1 and 2:11) and by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 11:13). The usage might be the same, but it would be faulty to assume parallel usage based only upon the fact that they are both in canonical epistles. See D.A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996), 63. Proper lexical analysis is needed in order to draw reasonable conclusions, and such is one of the tasks of this lexical study.

⁶ Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989), 35. They explain that the distinction dates back to the time of Ferdinand de Saussure.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 152, 166.

features that distinguish one word from others in the same semantic domain or field.⁸

The sense of a term is its meaning, but that meaning is not independent of other words, either in its context or in a related category of meaning. As J. Lyons explains, a term's sense is its "place in a system of relationships which it contracts with other words in the vocabulary."⁹ While it is important to keep lexical and discourse sense distinct, it is also important not to exclude one or the other in understanding the sense of a particular lexical unit. Ullman explains that the two approaches to determining meaning, the analytical and operational, which inform the lexical and contextual senses respectively, are complementary. The analytical meaning highlights the relationship between the symbol, referent, and reference of a term. Together these are the components of meaning because "a word symbolizes a thought or reference, which in its turn refers to the feature or event we are talking about."¹⁰ The weakness he finds with this approach is that it neglects the reciprocal and reversible relationship between the components of meaning that involves the speakers of the words in a particular context. It is here, according to Ullman, where meaning lies. In this way the operational meaning, in which a term has meaning by its pragmatic use, complements analytical meaning because it supports the view that cognitive processes are significant contributions to meaning, but also that meaning occurs in context as terms are communicated and understood.¹¹

There is more to sense and reference that needs to be comprehended before embarking on a lexical study. Arthur Gibson, in *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis*, refers to the work of Gottlob Frege in explaining reference further. According

⁸ Eugene Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 33.

⁹ J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 427.

¹⁰ Ullman, *Semantics*, 56.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 57.

to Frege, a referent is the thing to which a term refers; the relationship between a referring term and its referent is reference.¹² A referring term “designate[s] the referent by standing for it;”¹³ it is the symbol by which we represent our schema, or cognitive construct, for a particular entity. Frege asserts that “there is no route back from a referent to the referring term.”¹⁴ In other words, if you start with a particular mental picture of a person, place, or thing, you cannot determine the exact reference that triggered the picture. This may be more obvious with dynamic objects or organisms that could have a myriad of referents. When speaking about those who sojourned in Old Testament times, for instance, while we have a referring term to analyze, such as גַּר, a common term for “sojourner” in the Hebrew Scriptures, we do not always have the referent. Sometimes we do, as in the case of Abraham, who referred to himself as גַּר וְחוֹשֵׁב¹⁵ in Canaan when he sought to purchase a cave for Sarah’s burial (Gen 23:4). From this example it becomes obvious that if we only had the term גַּר as the referring term out of context, we could not trace a route back to Abraham, both because Abraham could be described by a multitude of referring terms, some specific to particular contexts and others as part of his enduring identity, and also because the term גַּר is not narrow enough to point always and only to Abraham when used in isolation.

Concerning the first issue, that one referent may have a multitude of referring terms, Knut Heim explains its relevance to lexical study. Multiple terms within the same discourse could have the same referent without being synonymous, but if they share the same referent and have semantic links between them, they may mutually influence

¹² Arthur Gibson, *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis* (New York: Sheffield Press, 2001), 49.

¹³ Ibid., 50.

¹⁴ Ibid., 53.

¹⁵ Common English translations are: “stranger and sojourner” (NASB, NRSV), “sojourner and foreigner” (ESV), “alien and stranger” (NIV).

meaning.¹⁶ The terms may be coreferential, meaning they have the same referent, if they have similar features, syntagmatic relations (meaning the terms combine to form the context), and connotations.¹⁷ For example, in Prov 31:1-2, the terms “king” and “son” are coreferential because the referent for both, in this context, is Lemuel. If the semantic elements listed are not present, then the terms are not likely coreferential. Since גִּר often occurs in context with other categories of persons, coreferentiality will be a significant element of this lexical study.¹⁸

Concerning the second issue, that a particular term may not be specific enough to point always to the same referent devoid of context, Moisés Silva explains that words exist in a spectrum from fully referential to non-referential. Therefore, not all words can be understood by analyzing their referents.¹⁹ For example, גִּר is a mostly referential term because it represents a concrete object, but not fully referential because the specific referent may not be the same in each context. It is a certain type of person, but the difficulty comes in identifying who this type of person was in ancient Israel. The גִּר is mentioned often in the Hebrew Scriptures, but not defined explicitly. Therefore, the various contexts in which the term occurs are informative in determining the identity and status of the גִּר in ancient Israel. Since גִּר is part of the vocabulary of sojourning, these points will be significant for this lexical study.

¹⁶ Knut Heim, “Coreferentiality, structure, and context in Proverbs 10:1-5,” *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 6:3 (1993): 183.

¹⁷ Ibid., 185.

¹⁸ For instance, in the gleaning legislation of Lev 19:9-10, גִּר is listed with עֲנִי as beneficiaries together of the gleanings from the harvest. Thus the two terms refer to a larger category of persons, namely those who are socioeconomically vulnerable. For further discussion on this component of meaning, see Chapter 2.1.1.1.2.1.

¹⁹ Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1983), 107.

In addition to understanding the elements of reference, sense must also be more fully explained. Cotterell and Turner have a helpful description that points toward a methodology for lexical study. They state that “the sense of a word depends on the availability of other words in the same field of meaning, and on the word’s relationship to the other words (and their respective meanings).”²⁰ The sense of a term cannot be determined in isolation. Silva explains that “each linguistic term derives its value from its opposition to all other terms.”²¹ We narrow down the meaning of a specific term by understanding what that term is not, and its uniqueness is found in what distinguishes it from other terms. In order to do this, relationships between words need to be examined. The largest level of distinction between terms is paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. The former refers to class,²² meaning that because the terms are members of the same class, they could occupy “the same slot in a particular context.”²³ Cotterell and Turner refer to lexical study of words in the same semantic field, which is those in paradigmatic relationship to one another, as a field-oriented study.²⁴

1.3.1 Paradigmatic Relationships: Within paradigmatic relations, there are more specific connections. There are relationships of synonymy and antonymy, as well as cohyponymy, in which two or more terms are a subset of a larger category.²⁵ For instance, “male” and “female” are cohyponyms of the category “human,” and one could also describe “male” (or “female”) as a component of meaning to the larger category of

²⁰ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 155.

²¹ Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 108.

²² Ibid., 143.

²³ Ibid., 119. For example, “animal” could be a class of terms, and a variety of specific animals could be interchangeable in a certain context. However, classes can range in degree of specificity, for “mammal” or “dog” could be classes since each can be a broader category with specific members subsumed under the broader classification.

²⁴ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 154.

²⁵ Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 126.

“human.”²⁶ Components of meaning are the progressively smaller categories, which could be thought of as concentric circles, that together comprise the facets of meaning that define the larger category. Two words having the same referent but not the same meaning are cohyponyms.²⁷ Again, context is crucial, for, to consider the previous example, “male” and “female” do not always have the same referent, but can in certain contexts have the referent “human,” and in such cases are therefore cohyponyms.

Concerning synonymy and antonymy, simply determining if two terms are interchangeable or opposite is not a thorough analysis. Terms can be synonymous in a certain aspect without overlapping entirely. Therefore, one must determine the type of overlap existing between two words.²⁸ Lyons gives a helpful spectrum, in which he explains the opposite ends and the two intermediate positions. A pair of words sharing the same range of contexts, meaning they are interchangeable and therefore commonly called synonymous, are in distributional equivalence to one another. A pair of words that share no common contexts are in complementary distribution. Between these two positions are inclusion and overlap, the former being that one word is a subset of the other and the latter being that the two words share certain contexts in common.²⁹ With regard to a pair of antonyms, technically called binary opposites,³⁰ two words can be graded or non-graded. For instance, as Silva explains, “taller” and “shorter” are graded opposites because there is a range and comparison involved in comprehension of the meaning. A referent labeled as “taller” in one context might be “shorter” in another, depending upon the basis of comparison. In contrast, “married” and “single” are non-

²⁶ Ibid., 134.

²⁷ Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 48.

²⁸ Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meanings*, 123.

²⁹ Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, 70.

³⁰ Ibid., 130.

graded opposites because membership in one category precludes membership in the other.³¹ Words in the same semantic domain can have common features. These are called supplementary components or connotative features.³² They are distinct from diagnostic components, which distinguish one term in a semantic field from the others, in that they are present in the meaning of a term without being unique to the term. One must be cautious to remember that supplementary components can also be diagnostic components, depending upon the words being contrasted. For instance, we will see through this study that “foreign birth,” from the perspective of national Israel, is a diagnostic component of גֵּר, for it is part of the lexical sense of the term and distinguishes it from אֶרֶץ־יִשְׂרָאֵל, which identifies a native-born Israelite. However, “foreigner” is a supplementary component of גֵּר when it is compared with other categories of foreigners in ancient Israel, such as נִכְרִי, נֶזֶר, and חֹשֶׁב. The distinctions are important, but the terms and contexts in question are crucial to heed for accurate understanding.

1.3.2 Syntagmatic Relationships: Syntagmatic relations refer to structure, with syntagms being the combinations that form context.³³ According to Silva, it is the syntagmatic relations that “play the determinative role in language,”³⁴ precisely because the words chosen to form a particular context convey meaning. Barr would concur, as he cautions the exegete against analyzing a semantic unit smaller than a sentence.³⁵ Cotterell and Turner present a challenge to this view from David Hill, who acknowledges that “the context of the sentence gives semantic precision...[but] words themselves have

³¹ Ibid.

³² Eugene Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, 35.

³³ Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 143.

³⁴ Ibid., 120.

³⁵ Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 246.

semantic autonomy.³⁶ Hill's caution helps prevent the semantic value of individual words from being neglected for the contribution they bring to the context. The context as a whole does provide the "semantic precision" necessary to determine the sense of the term in question, but those terms contribute to the overall context and carry meaning in and of themselves.

Syntagmatic relations involve the reciprocal relationship between components of meaning and the speaker in a particular context, which is the complementary relationship between analytical and operational meaning. Cotterell and Turner label this approach to determining meaning concept-oriented.³⁷ The goal is to "determine characteristic and distinctive features of a word in its various contexts,"³⁸ which yields a "verbal description of a set of related elements of meaning that together form a coherent and discrete abstraction."³⁹ The abstraction is a dictionary definition, composed of the diagnostic features of the lexeme. They hesitate to endorse the application of this method to abstract terms, explaining that it is much easier to form mental concepts of concrete objects which can then be brought into any context. The term η and others in its semantic field are somewhat opaque, meaning they have an element of ambiguity. Ambiguity in sense can affect how thoroughly the word can be analyzed phonetically and morphologically, whereas ambiguity in context can generate a change in meaning over time.⁴⁰

If two words are syntagmatically related in a particular context but also have a paradigmatic relationship, the exegete must exercise caution in analysis. Since η often exists in contexts with other terms that refer to groups of people, there are some obvious

³⁶ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 124.

³⁷ Ibid., 146.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 149.

⁴⁰ Ullman, *Semantics*, 80-81, 195.

potential fallacies in studying the term. One is illegitimate totality transfer,⁴¹ in which the exegete assumes that each occurrence of the term bears every nuance of meaning that it has in each context. When it is in a syntagmatic relationship with a certain term, it may have a meaning in that particular context that it does not have when it is in a syntagmatic relationship with another term, hence the challenge of determining the lexical sense of נָסַח based upon its paradigmatic relations with other terms.⁴² The second is to assume complete overlap in synonymy because of the syntagmatic relationships between נָסַח and the other terms with which it shares a context. That would mean the syntagmatic relationship is also a paradigmatic relationship. Thus the ideas of grading and cohyponymy will be significant for a lexical study on the vocabulary related to sojourning.

1.3.3 Relevant Exegetical Fallacies: In addition to the exegetical fallacies associated with paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships, there are a few others that need to be acknowledged and avoided throughout this study. The first is a root fallacy. This is to assume that the existence of a root meaning is “effective throughout all variations given to the root by affixes and formative elements.”⁴³ This could be an issue when studying forms from the root נָסַח in the Old Testament. Barr cautions against assuming that the root meaning is part of every form’s semantic value.⁴⁴ This becomes an issue with the root נָסַח in the area of homonymy, when two or more lexemes have the same spelling and pronunciation but unrelated meanings.

⁴¹ Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 25.

⁴² Recall that meaning and sense are interchangeable terms, but lexical meaning differs from discourse meaning in that the former identifies the components of meaning in a dictionary definition, whereas the latter is the meaning in context (also known as “operational” or “discourse”), 1.3 paragraph 1, pp. 3-4.

⁴³ Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 100. In other words, stem and tense changes cannot be ignored, as they can indicate semantic differences.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

In this study, the linguistic evidence will indicate homonymous uses of נִיר, and thus it will be important not to assume an overarching meaning simply because there is a common root. Barr explains that as with synonymy, homonymy can be partial or complete. Partial homonymy would occur only in certain forms of a word rather than all forms.⁴⁵ Rather than assuming a common meaning, Barr explains that homonymy can sometimes be explained by comparing the language of study to its cognate languages, and finding there that two distinct phonemes did not remain distinct in the other language.⁴⁶ If the phonemes are not distinguished, then neither will the written expression of the phonemes be distinguished. But, “phonological merging”⁴⁷ is only one explanation for homonyms, and even though homonyms exist with נִיר in its root and forms, it is beyond the scope of this study to analyze terms outside the semantic domain of sojourn, and so they will be set aside once identified.

Since the meanings of homonyms are unrelated, narrowing the terms to those related to sojourn in their contexts is appropriate methodology. Cotterell and Turner contrast homonymy with polysemy, the latter being “a single lexeme with a multiplicity of related senses.”⁴⁸ In the case of polysemy, unlike homonymy, it is possible for a

⁴⁵ James Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 131.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 128. A phoneme is a contrastive unit of sound. The sound has meaning in contrast with a different sound. For instance, “bit” and “hit” begin with different phonemes, /b/ and /h/, identified because they convey different meanings. If these two words were translated into another language that did not distinguish between /b/ and /h/, then the two words could become homonyms in the receptor language. They would look the same but in context they would have different meanings, as with “bank” meaning a financial institution and “bank” meaning the slope beside a river in English. This is what Barr means by “phonological merging.”

⁴⁷ Ibid., 129.

⁴⁸ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 136-137. Considering the previous example of “bank,” each lexeme could be considered polysemous. Consider the first lexeme, which is related to money. That basic meaning can have a variety of senses, namely the institution, the building, or the actual funds held by a dealer. These senses are related to one another, but not to the lexeme “bank” that means the slope of ground beside a river. Cotterell and Turner give this example on the same pages cited.

common meaning to exist, but it is inaccurate to assume this to be true in all cases.⁴⁹ One ought to be aware of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy and the temptation toward generalizing meaning, but the details of such an analysis are not pertinent to this lexical study.

The second fallacy is related to the history of usage. Since this study spans a significant period of time, it is important to be aware of dangers associated with analyzing a word in terms of its etymological source. Barr explains that the semantic value of a word in its current usage must be determined by that current usage and not historical derivation.⁵⁰ In order to conclude that the root influences the meaning of a certain word form, the normal usage and context must be understood.⁵¹ Therefore, etymology can be a helpful beginning, but one must realize that it makes a statement about history and not meaning.⁵² Further, the definition of “normal” and “current” usage changes with each time period investigated. It is important to avoid both reading an older definition into a more recent usage as well as reading a more recent use back into an older period of time. The former is semantic obsolescence, rendering the word obsolete,⁵³ and the latter is anachronism.⁵⁴ Since this study spans the time of Moses through the New Testament authors, both of these cautions need to be considered.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ The same authors explain that commonalities can be literal, but could also simply be by “metaphoric or metonymic transfer” (Ibid., 139).

⁵⁰ Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 107.

⁵¹ Ibid., 120.

⁵² Ibid., 107.

⁵³ Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 35.

⁵⁴ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 133.

⁵⁵ Note: I am assuming Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch according to Gleason Archer’s synopsis in *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. He bases his conclusion upon the testimony of Scripture (e.g., Exod 17:14, Num 33:1-2, Deut 31:9, 11, Josh 8:31, 1 Kgs 2:3, Ezra 6:18, Dan 9:11-13, John 5:46-47, Acts 3:22, Rom 10:5), and internal evidence consisting of the author’s eyewitness account of the Exodus and desert wanderings, familiarity with Egyptian culture and language, foreign viewpoint of Canaan, knowledge of archaic customs and phrases, and scholarly qualifications, as well as the unity of the composition as a

The third fallacy concerns the relationship between a word and the cognitive construct behind it. This includes a couple of components. The first is the idea of equating a word with a concept. Barr raises some helpful considerations, namely whether there exists only one word per concept, whether the lexical stock corresponds directly to the conceptual stock, whether the occurrence of a particular word indicates the significance of the entire concept or only part of it, and whether the concept is fully present each time the word appears or only from “the totality of occurrences of the related words.”⁵⁶ He goes on to say that it is an error to use lexical methodology in order to illuminate “the inner world of thought.”⁵⁷ While I appreciate the caution and as a result will not assume that understanding the sense of particular terms in Scripture provides a full understanding of the concept of sojourn, I also think that since people illuminate their thoughts with words, the only way we can understand concepts is to study the words used to describe them. Therefore, I do not think it is out of bounds to consider that a greater understanding of the vocabulary used by the authors of Scripture to describe those who sojourn will also inform conceptual understanding, but I do acknowledge that the conceptual understanding is limited. Barr emphasizes that it is combinations of words that communicate semantic value, of both words and concepts, stating that no linguistic unit smaller than the sentence is appropriate for semantic analysis.⁵⁸ We have already acknowledged the validity of increasingly larger semantic units, while at the same time appreciating Hill’s challenge that individual words with specific meanings comprise these units.

whole. Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994), 117-126.

⁵⁶ Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 209.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 266.

The second component of this concept fallacy relates to contrasting the thought patterns of particular language groups based upon linguistic evidence. Carson describes this in general and Barr in the particulars of Hebrew and Greek. Carson states that the heart of the fallacy which links language and mentality “is the assumption that any language so constrains the thinking processes of the people who use it that they are forced into certain patterns of thought and shielded from others.”⁵⁹ Barr states that, in general, it is not reasonable to expect “a correspondence between grammar and thought-forms,”⁶⁰ and yet it has been the tendency in scholarship to isolate Hebrew and Greek and contrast the two systems of thought based upon linguistic differences. Further, the analysis extends to modern western languages, assuming commonalities between these languages and Greek thought. However, a modern language has been influenced by Greek only as far as that particular language group was affected by Greek expansion and influence.⁶¹ Second, isolating Greek and Hebrew has tended to accentuate their differences, resulting in false dichotomies between them, such as Hebrew being dynamic and Greek being static, or Hebrew being concrete and Greek being abstract, which have not been measured for “adequacy in linguistic comparison.”⁶²

Concerning the language of sojourning, it is described much more frequently in concrete terms in the Old Testament than in the New Testament. There are still concrete, historical descriptions in the New Testament of those who lived transient lives, but the reality is abstracted on occasion (e.g., Heb 11:13 and Eph 2:19). Further, the modern metaphorical idea of life being a journey, and specifically the Christian life being a

⁵⁹ Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 44.

⁶⁰ Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 43.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 29.

pilgrimage toward an eternal dwelling with God, makes it easy to associate the New Testament teaching with the figurative rather than literal sojourn. It is necessary, therefore, not to assume the same dichotomies but rather examine the linguistic evidence and make observations on that basis.

1.4 Summary

This lexical study will be an attempt to understand the meaning of “sojourning” as a semantic domain based upon the linguistic principles explained. This involves examining the structural and class relationships between words related to sojourning in all contexts and between Biblical time periods, synthesizing lexical and discourse sense while responsibly bridging historical, cultural, and linguistic gaps between the periods of the two testaments and between authors, with the linguistic evidence being the filter for interpretation. It begins with an exegetical examination of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships between words in this semantic domain throughout the Old Testament, in order to identify the diagnostic components of נִיר and נִירָ, translated consistently throughout this study as “to sojourn” and “sojourner.” The diagnostic components together comprise the lexical sense of the terms. We will then examine the Greek equivalents of נִיר and נִירָ, as well the other terms yet to be identified in the same semantic field, in the LXX and the Greek New Testament. Once the Greek equivalents are identified and examined in their contexts, diagnostic components can be discerned and the similarities and differences between the Greek and Hebrew terms recognized. Once the scope of the lexical sense of sojourning vocabulary throughout Scripture is in view, conclusions and implications for Christians today can be identified.

Chapter 2 – Sojourning Vocabulary in the Old Testament:

Concept and Field-Oriented Approaches

The Hebrew root נָגַד is the most common root in the semantic domain of sojourning. In order to understand what the writers of the Old Testament meant by the use of that word, it is necessary to examine it both in all of the contexts in which it was used and also in comparison with other words in the same semantic field. We will examine נָגַד in all of its contexts first, which is the concept-oriented approach to a lexical study, analyzing syntagmatic relationships. Then we will examine it in comparison with other terms in the same semantic field (paradigmatic relationships), which is the field-oriented approach to a lexical study.¹ Words chosen for comparison are those used in the same context with the verbal and nominal forms of נָגַד, and also those translated into the LXX with the same Greek words as נָגַד. That does not necessarily mean that the words were always translated with the same Greek terms, but that such occurrences exist. This indicates that the LXX translators recognized semantic overlap between the words. Such an investigation requires caution, however, as we need to realize that some languages have a broader range of vocabulary than others and therefore more specific terms may be selected in a receptor language. This caution will be applied when LXX terms are compared in chapter three. The relevance of the LXX for this chapter is simply support for identifying certain terms as belonging together in the same semantic domain.

¹ Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 35.

2.1 Concept-Oriented Study of גִּיר (Syntagmatic Relationships)

One type of semantic relationship is derivation, in which “an underlying meaning is incorporated into a meaning belonging to a different semantic domain.”² In other words, two words in different semantic domains share an underlying meaning. Such is the relationship between גִּיר and גִּיר. The semantic domain in which גִּיר belongs is a sociopolitical category of persons, whereas גִּיר falls under existence in space. Yet there is a semantic connection between the two terms that will be explored throughout this chapter. Semantic relationships have systematic categories, and the category of derivation applicable to גִּיר and גִּיר is “agent-action.”³ Since this is not simply a grammatical relationship between verbal and nominal forms with syntactical distinctions, but a semantic relationship in which components of meaning are shared, the analysis of both terms and their variations are necessary to understand the central meaning of גִּיר.

According to various lexicons, the root גִּיר has three meanings. They are semantically unrelated, as they exist within distinct semantic domains and do not share any diagnostic components. The first is in the realm of existence in space, specifically dwelling or residing, with the qualifier that the dwelling is as a גִּיר.⁴ Only BDB gives an alternate definition in this semantic realm, which is “to dwell.”⁵ The term גִּיר is listed in relation to only the definition of גִּיר in this first semantic domain, which supports the

² Eugene Nida, *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, 124.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Francis Brown, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 157-8, hereafter BDB; William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 63-64; Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, translated under ed. M.E.J. Richardson, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 vols. (New York: E.J. Brill, 1994), 1:184-5, hereafter HALOT; Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2nd edition (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 121 and 724, hereafter L&N.

⁵ BDB, 157.

assertion of a semantic relationship between the two terms. While the semantic domains differ between the noun and verb forms, in that the former is a socio-political category of persons and the latter a sub-domain of existence in space, indicating state as well as position, the lexicons recognize an element of meaning common to both that is not shared with the other two definitions of נָזַר. This study will investigate the shared lexical sense. The second definition is within the domain of argue or quarrel, which is a sub-domain of communication.⁶ The third is in the domain of attitudes and emotions, specifically fear or terror.⁷ The second and third definitions are beyond the scope of this study, as they are in homonymous relationship to one another and to the first definition of the root but do not have any diagnostic components related to sojourning.⁸ Thus, only examples from the Old Testament in the realm of the first definition of נָזַר, along with forms of נָזַר as a semantic relationship of derivation, will be included in this investigation.

Various forms of נָזַר occur throughout the Old Testament, and scholars have identified that larger semantic units than the term in isolation are necessary in order to fully understand its lexical sense. These semantic units will be included in a concept-oriented study of the term.⁹ Below is a discussion of the term within its various diagnostic components, which were determined by examining both the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships in which נָזַר and נָזַר occur in the Old Testament. The explanation of the exegetical details explains the route from the text to the identification of the diagnostic components. Until the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships have

⁶ BDB, 157; L&N, 388-389.

⁷ BDB, 157; L&N, 288-289. There are some examples of fear being that of awe, which could belong to the sub-domain of worship, within the domain of religious activity (BDB, 158; L&N, 531), but this category of meaning for נָזַר is beyond the scope of this study.

⁸ See chapter 1.3.3 on homonymy.

⁹ The list of syntagms has been informed by the list in Abraham Even-Shoshan, ed., *A New Concordance of the Old Testament Using the Hebrew and Aramaic Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker and Ridgfield, 1984), 231; 242-243, and HALOT, 184-185.

been explained, and the various English renderings evaluated in light of the lexical evidence, גֵּר will be consistently rendered “sojourn.”

2.1.1 Agent: גֵּר From the exegetical data, it will become apparent that the גֵּר had a relationship with Israel. A native-born Israelite was called an אֲזִכָּרָה, or אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.¹⁰ With regard to ethnicity, there is no overlap between גֵּר and אֲזִכָּרָה, as the גֵּר was not a native-born Israelite. Thus the two terms are non-graded binary opposites, since membership in one group precluded membership in another. However, this is only with regard to ethnicity, and that distinction is made within the covenant community of God's people. One entered the community by birth or conversion. Once membership is established, the relationship between גֵּר and אֲזִכָּרָה becomes one of cohyponymy, meaning the terms have a different meaning but the same referent.¹¹ This embedded semantic distinction only becomes apparent as exegetical data is analyzed. Therefore, we will examine the exegetical data in light of both the semantic distinction and the semantic overlap with those who were both inside and outside the covenant community, for such is the way the text describes the גֵּר, and therefore such is the means for gaining understanding of the sense of the term as Scripture defines it.

2.1.1.1 Foreign Birth

2.1.1.1.1 Syntactical Markers that Indicate Semantic Distinctions: There are grammatical indications that the גֵּר and the אֲזִכָּרָה were distinct groups. First, the

¹⁰ The term בֵּית is often used instead of בְּנֵי, and the terms are interchangeable. With the first term, the phrase is “house of Israel,” and with the second it is “sons of Israel.” According to Gerald H. Wilson, “בֵּית,” and Chrys C. Caragounis, “בְּנֵי,” in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, ed. Willem A. VanGemeren, 5 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997), 1:672.3, 656 (hereafter NIDOTTE), both בֵּית and בְּנֵי can denote familial relationships, with the former being a larger grouping of a people group or nation, and the latter being the smaller unit of an extended family. In the contexts considered here, the referent for both are members of the nation of Israel.

¹¹ For further information on relationships of antonymy and cohyponymy, see Chapter 1.3.1.

preposition ב occurs before each noun in Exod 12:19, and the preposition ל occurs before each noun in Num 15:15-16, 19:10, 35:15, and Josh 20:9. In the first three uses of ל , the purpose is specification,¹² as both the sojourner and the native are part of the group toward whom instructions concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread are directed and for whom there is to be one statute. In the last two cases the use is advantage, meaning for whose benefit the cities of refuge are intended.¹³ A third preposition, מן , occurs in Lev 17:8-16, in the phrases $\text{אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ and $\text{מִן־הַגֵּר אֲשֶׁר־יָגוּר בְּחֻקְכֶם}$.¹⁴ The syntax here indicates members from two different people groups.¹⁵ The final preposition is כ used in Lev 24:16 and 22. Bruce Waltke explains that the use of this preposition in comparisons of identity often involve a double use of the preposition, as is the case here.¹⁶ It is as if to say that as it is with the native concerning the law, so it is with the sojourner.

In addition to the use of prepositions to distinguish the groups, there are three other syntactical distinctions. First, a conditional clause beginning with כִּי follows the statement in Exod 12:47 that all Israel shall partake of the Passover. Adding the conditions under which a גֵּר could participate in the Passover meal assumes a distinction between a גֵּר and an אֲזִרָה . Second, in Deut 16:11, Exod 20:10, and Deut 5:14, there is considerable distance between the listing of the Israelite and the גֵּר as those included in

¹² Ronald J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), §250, in which the ב indicates the parts of which the whole consists, and Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, §273; Bruce Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §11.2.10d, in which the ל could be rendered “with regard to” in English.

¹³ Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 vols. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2000), §133d, *dativis commodi*.

¹⁴ The phrases are translated “a man from the house of Israel” and “from the sojourner who sojourns in your midst” respectively.

¹⁵ Joüon, §133e explains that מן “expresses primarily separation and distance. It is used in particular to express the idea of provenance.” Thus, the foreign-born v. native-born identity of the individuals from the groups identified is most likely in view.

¹⁶ Waltke, §11.2.9b.

the Feast of Weeks (Deut 16:11) and the Sabbath day (Exod 20:10 and Deut 5:14).¹⁷ In both lists, the Israelite is referred to by the personal pronoun, with the reference having occurred previously in the discourse (Deut 10:12, וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, Exod 19:6, בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and Deut 5:1, אֵל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל).¹⁸ Also, members of the Israelite's household are listed before the גֵּר, as well as that man's livestock in Exod 20:10 and Deut 5:14, and before the Levites in Deut 16:11. Further, in verses 18 and 19 of Deuteronomy 16, Moses refers to the גֵּר in the third person. The final distinctive is the use of the definite article before each term in Lev 16:29 and Lev 18:26. Since each passage with גֵּר and אֲזִיקָה or בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in the same semantic unit contains some grammatical indication that the two groups are distinct, the logical conclusion is that there is no overlap in their diagnostic components.

2.1.1.1.2. Semantic Distinctions and Overlap

2.1.1.1.2.1 *Power Imbalance*: As a result of being born outside the lineage of Israel, a גֵּר did not have a portion of the land inheritance.¹⁹ Therefore, the אֲזִיקָה

¹⁷ Exod 23:12 also includes the גֵּר in the Sabbath rest, and here the injunction for Israel overlaps with ethical obligations, as here the גֵּר is included among those groups who benefit from Israel's obedience by experiencing rest themselves.

¹⁸ "And now, Israel," "sons of Israel," and "to all Israel," respectively.

¹⁹ The subsequent exegetical findings will indicate that the sojourner was highly assimilated into Israelite life, but still did not have a place in the lineage of Israel. William W. Carr, "Charity Under the Covenant as a Reminder of Redemption," *Concordia Journal* 24 (1998): 361 explains that the גֵּר still had no בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל by which to confirm his connection. Thus it is not contradictory to state, as Norman Gottwald supports, in Norman Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE*. (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 285, that the sojourner could be assimilated into a בֵּית-אָב (father's household) and still not have a tribal affiliation. While Ruth's marriage to Boaz and subsequent place in the lineage of Christ might appear to contradict this conclusion, since Ruth was a foreigner in Israel, she was a woman and a widow, who was brought into Israelite lineage by marriage. Further, it appears that the גֵּר referred to in Scripture is male, perhaps as the head of his household. For these reasons, the same conclusions are not likely to apply to Ruth.

Ezek 47:21-23 foreshadows the full inclusion of the גֵּר with the אֲזִיקָה in a future land inheritance in upon construction of the temple that He describes to Ezekiel during the Babylonian captivity. The conclusion after the detailed description of land boundaries is as follows: "and you shall divide this land for yourselves with regard to the tribes of Israel" (47:21). Then the Lord specifies "with regard to the tribes of Israel with: "for you and for the sojourners who sojourn in your midst, who bear sons in your midst" (47:22). He further explains the status of the גֵּר in the land with the conclusion that "they will be to you as the native-born among the sons of Israel." This is similar to Num 15:15-16 in extent and degree of explanation. While there is disagreement among scholars concerning the fulfillment of this prophecy, the

had more socioeconomic power than the גֵּר because he had access to the means of material well-being.²⁰ This conclusion follows from the repeated injunction that the אֲזִרָה not mistreat or oppress the גֵּר.²¹ Leviticus 25 makes it clear that the גֵּר was not forbidden access to the land, but since he did not have a tribal inheritance, he had only temporal access to redeem the land by cultivating it for a period of time. While the גֵּר was unlike the אֲזִרָה in his claim to land in Canaan, he was like every other foreigner to Israel in the same regard. However, as an exegesis of Leviticus 25 will indicate, he was distinct from other foreigners because since he had submitted to covenant membership, he had the opportunity to participate in the redemptive functions of the community.

2.1.1.1.2.2 *Exhortation toward Mercy*: The literary device of repetition is used with regard to the treatment of the גֵּר. Repetition serves the function of underscoring important information that is easily forgotten. While the גֵּר was not the only foreigner who would have interacted with the Israelites, he was the foreigner who chose to dwell among Israel and therefore was most often exposed to the possibility of

passage does teach of a future expansion of inclusion in the eternal inheritance for God's people that stands in contrast to past practices.

²⁰ This follows from the inclusion of the גֵּר in gleaning legislation. The גֵּר is listed with the needy, who are specified in Deuteronomy as the widow and the orphan. This indicates that the גֵּר is in the same vulnerable position as these others, though perhaps not included as a subcomponent of עָנִי. As will be evident from the exegesis of Leviticus 25, while a גֵּר *could be* עָנִי, lexical data indicates the opportunity for prosperity, and therefore the term does not always carry the sense of one who, according to W.J. Dumbrell, is "afflicted by difficult circumstances" and thus "dependent on others for their welfare and livelihood," which is diagnostically characteristic of עָנִי (W.J. Dumbrell, "עָנִי," NIDOTTE, 3:455). While in the gleaning legislation the terms are coreferential, assuming neither group has their own harvest to gather and is therefore at the mercy of the land-cultivating Israelites, the evidence does not indicate that the גֵּר is included in the עָנִי. As with גֵּר and אֲזִרָה, two terms can be coreferential and share supplementary components with another group, while still retaining distinct diagnostic components.

²¹ The following passages contain similar ethical injunctions with a common motivating rationale: Exod 22:21-25, 23:9; Lev 19:9-10, 19:34, 23:22; Deut 10:18-19, 24:17-22, 27:11-26; Job 31:32; Ps 146:9; Jer 7:1-7, 22:1-5; Ezek 22:6-16. The general command is not to wrong or oppress the גֵּר, with Lev 19:9-10, 23:22, and Deut 24:17-22 giving the specific context of gleaning, both for the general harvest (Leviticus) and for the firstfruits (Deuteronomy) as an offering to the Lord. The rationale behind the injunction is that Israel was oppressed in Egypt; they know how it feels to be the one in a vulnerable position, and further they have been rescued by a gracious host in order to reflect His graciousness toward others.

mistreatment. Not only are the Israelites reminded not to mistreat the גֵּר, but they are also exhorted to love him because the Israelites were “sojourners in the land of Egypt,” and as such they know “the heart of a sojourner,” Exod 23:9. Not only can they empathize, but they also must remain conscious of their deliverance in order to maintain a generous posture rather than one that would take advantage of others who are vulnerable. Moses speaks the exhortation before and after the gleaning legislation in Deut 24:17-22. He also reminds the people that they were not only גֵּרִים but also slaves. This reflects back to the prophecy given to Abraham, that his people would be גֵּרִים in a land not their own, and there be enslaved and oppressed 400 years (Gen 15:13).

The expectation of generosity toward the גֵּר by the Israelites carries with it the idea that such generosity is a mark of holiness and thus a reflection of the Lord’s character. This is clear in Lev 19:2 and 20:26, as the command to be holy because the Lord is holy frames the ethical injunctions in that section, including treatment of the גֵּר. Similarly, Deut 10:18 explains that God executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and shows kindness to the גֵּר, and then verse 19 states that, as a result, the Israelite ought to also do the same, with the rationale again following the injunction.

While the rationale does not appear in books outside of the Pentateuch, love for the widow, orphan, and גֵּר is part of God’s merciful character and an indication of whether that same character exists within His people. Concerning the character of God, the psalmist lists several attributes in Psalm 146, and among them are that He keeps the גֵּר and brings relief to the orphan and the widow. Concerning the reflection of this character in the people of God, Job lists hospitality toward the גֵּר as one of the marks of his innocence (Job 31:32). Additionally, Jeremiah lists justice and mercy toward vulnerable

groups as one of the signs of repentance and criteria for remaining in their land, for it indicates that they know the Lord and have not forsaken Him (Jer 17:1-7, 22:1-5). Both Ezekiel and Zechariah cite the mistreatment of the same groups as among the sins of Israel, indicative of having forsaken the Lord (Ezek 22:7, Zech 7:9), which led to their judgment and exile in Babylon.²²

2.1.1.1.2.3 *Leviticus 25*: Throughout this chapter, there is a syntagmatic relationship that needs to be carefully observed. The term גֵּר does not exist on its own but rather in conjunction with another term in the same semantic field, חֹשֶׁב, commonly translated “stranger” or “foreigner” (ESV and NIV respectively). The syntagm first occurs in Gen 23:4 to identify the status of Abraham before the Hittites in Canaan.²³ The phrase appears to be a hendiadys, as together the two terms convey one identity.²⁴ It serves to distinguish Abraham from the Hittites, and seems to indicate that Abraham has the subordinate position in regard to property holdings. A logical inference is that such is the case because of birth origin, since that is the same land which would, in the future, become the inheritance of Abraham’s descendants rather than remain a possession of the Hittites. However, according to Leviticus 25, the status of the Israelites in Canaan remains that of a גֵּר וְחֹשֶׁב. It is the rationale for not permanently selling the land, for the people are its tenants and the Lord is its owner (25:23).²⁵

²² Indeed a lack of justice and mercy is a mark of unrighteousness, as the psalmist laments in Ps 94:4-7.

²³ Specifically, Abraham acknowledged himself to the sons of Heth, the Hittites, as a גֵּר וְחֹשֶׁב when he sought to purchase a cave for Sarah’s burial.

²⁴ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 128, supports this conclusion and summarizes the arguments and general opinion of scholars regarding the use of this phrase.

²⁵ David’s prayer after collecting the offering from the Israelites for the construction of the temple to be built during Solomon’s reign, and two lines in the psalms, indicate that this was a lasting identity of the Israelites before the Lord. In 1 Chron 29:15 David first acknowledges God as owner of all and that even what the people give is actually from what He has given: “because all (comes) from You and from Your hand we have given to You.” David then acknowledges the status of the Israelites before God, “because

The identity as *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* seems to have socioeconomic implications, for it is also used to explain how the Israelites are to care for their poor brothers. They are to support them as they support a *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* (25:35). Further, the syntagm is used in 25:47 to explain that if a *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* becomes more financially prosperous than this poor Israelite, the poor Israelite may sell himself to the *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב*, or to a member of the clan of a sojourner.²⁶ If the poor Israelite sold himself to a *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* or to a member of the sojourner's clan, then a member of his family could redeem him, just as if he had been taken in by another Israelite. If the Israelite is sold to the *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב*, he is to be treated as a *שָׂכִיר* (hired worker), and that is how his redemption price will be determined (25:47-53).

Several observations can be made which indicate that *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* is distinct from *גֵּר* or *חוֹשֵׁב* alone, but has the same discourse, or contextual, usage as *גֵּר*. The syntagm is used as a hendiadys to highlight the socioeconomic standing of an individual or people group; therein lies the difference in discourse usage between *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* and *גֵּר*. The syntagm is also used to identify the standard of comparison for a poor Israelite, as well as the one who might be able to sustain a poor Israelite but is not a "son of Israel." The *הַחוֹשְׁבִים*, whose action is described as *הִגְרִים*, being acceptably taken into slavery (Lev 25:45) occurs between the second and third reference to the *גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב* (vv. 35 and 47 respectively).²⁷ If

we are sojourners before You and strangers, as (were) all of our fathers." While he uses *גֵּרִים* and *חוֹשְׁבִים* interchangeably, that does not weaken the exegetical findings of this paper, for David is still using both terms to convey one concept, and is not using the latter without the former, which is where distinctions between the terms are evident. This is further supported by his use of the terms in Ps 39:12, for that is the basis of his appeal that the Lord be attentive to his cry. Additionally, the psalmist in Ps 119:19 appeals to the Lord not to hide His commands because of this relationship.

²⁶ This is the only use of the syntagm *גֵּר מִשְׁפַּחַת גֵּר* (the clan of a sojourner) in the Old Testament, but it indicates that familial organization for the alien was the same as for an Israelite, perhaps a more broad aspect of ancient Near East sociology.

²⁷ The text does not comment on the morality of slavery, as the context is redemptive economic conditions. However, it is important to observe how Israel's ethic was shaped, namely that they had been delivered from bondage to live in freedom with the Lord who is gracious. In order to reflect His character to the nations, they must extend this gracious freedom to others. Somehow this statement of purchasing

members of that group had complete overlap with גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב then neither the prior reference to the support of the גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב or the subsequent reference to the גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב sustaining a poor Israelite would make sense in the same discourse. There may be a spectrum of meaning between the terms, and the field-oriented portion of this study will further examine the inferences made here.

Another inference which will be further analyzed in the field-oriented section is the possibility that חוֹשֵׁב could be paradigmatic with שִׁכִּיר. First, חוֹשֵׁב וְשִׁכִּיר is excluded from the Passover because of uncircumcision (Exod 12:45). Second, חוֹשֵׁב וְשִׁכִּיר is excluded from eating the priest's food because of not belonging to the priest's family, even if abiding in his household (Lev 22:10). Whether this is a syntagm identifying one group or the ׀ is a disjunctive conjunction identifying two groups, per most English translations, is not entirely clear, for the verb is singular and therefore not likely referring to plural categories.²⁸ What is clear, however, from Exod 12:45 and Lev 22:10, is that there is contrast between חוֹשֵׁב וְשִׁכִּיר and גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב, and the coreferentiality between חוֹשֵׁב and שִׁכִּיר that does not exist between גֵּר and שִׁכִּיר indicates a grading of distinction between גֵּר and חוֹשֵׁב as individual words. The poor Israelite being treated as שִׁכִּיר, then, makes sense in Lev 25:53, as one different from the גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב.²⁹

foreigners needs to be understood in that light. Perhaps that was the end goal of what began as an economic transaction, intended to be a way of extending initial care to one in need that would bring about freedom through the merciful behavior of the Israelites.

²⁸ According to Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, when the subject precedes the verb, as is the case with Exod 12:45, there is normally concord of gender and number, and also that if this were a compound subject, the verb would be plural if the subject preceded it, §227, §230.

²⁹ A.H. Konkel's conclusion, "חוֹשֵׁב," NIDOTTE 4:284, that חוֹשֵׁב is often synonymous with גֵּר and yet perhaps less assimilated because of its association with שִׁכִּיר is a bit unhelpful. It might be more accurate to say they are graded synonyms, interchangeable when speaking of birth but graded according to assimilation into Israelite society and cultic practices.

2.1.1.1.3 Summary of Exegetical Findings The גֵר was born outside the lineage of Israel and was identified in Scripture as a category distinct from the אֲזִיקָה with regard to ethnicity. By nature of his foreign birth and therefore limited access to the tribal allotments of land in Canaan, the גֵר was more inclined toward a vulnerable socioeconomic position than the אֲזִיקָה. We can also conclude that the גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב was distinct from and subordinate to those with ownership rights to a particular land, and also supported, at least in part, by the Israelites in Canaan,³⁰ with the freedom to increase wealth and hire workers. This implies that the גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב could have access to the means of wealth and production at this time, which was land. Thus it becomes important to maintain a distinction between rights to land as opposed to permission to acquire land.³¹ It could be that it was not typical for a גֵר to have land but was still within the realm of possibility, which would be support for not subsuming גֵר under עֶבֶר.³² Gen 23:4 is helpful

³⁰ Bernhard Arsen, "From Acceptance to Inclusion: The stranger in Old Testament tradition," and Sonya A. Quitslund, "The Alien Among You," *Bible Today* 26 (1988) take the position that a גֵר was an enemy. Arsen assumed this enemy would become dominant if not cared for, referring to Deut 28:43; Quitslund adds that this enemy is a guest entitled to hospitality upon entering the Israelite community. However, this verse is a prediction of surrounding nations dominating Israel if Israel forsakes the Lord (28:15), not mistreatment of the marginalized being a cause of exile. Mistreatment occurred, but it was a corruption of character, which was an outgrowth of Israel having forsaken the Lord. Love for the sojourner as well as the native was a mark of holiness, according to Leviticus 19, and therefore Israel was to show hospitality in order to reflect the Lord's character, not to appease foreigners who might become hostile otherwise. Arsen assumes that Deut 28:36 implies past Assyrian invasion, perhaps because of the reference to a king in Israel, but the verb for setting the king over Israel is hiphil imperfect (הִקִּים), meaning it is yet to occur, and 27:12 makes the historical setting clear, that this was a charge for the people to keep when they crossed the Jordan into Canaan. But I think that equating the גֵר with an enemy is a problem of false synonymy between גֵר and הָעוֹלָם, for they assume them to be coreferential (Arsen, 27, Quitslund, 81). The evaluation of גֵר in its various contexts shows this conclusion to be exegetically unsound.

³¹ Deut 26:11 is informative here. In the description of the celebration over the dedication of the firstfruits to the Lord, Moses mentions that the Levite and sojourner will rejoice with the Israelite who offers the firstfruits from his land as the head of his household. It is likely that the Levite and sojourner are mentioned here because they would not have produce of their own to offer. Therefore, it is likely that the norm for the sojourner is not to have land of his own.

³² Simply rendering גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב "uncircumcised alien," according to H.R. Cole, "The Sabbath and the Alien," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38 (2000): 223, to make a distinction between the vulnerable and prosperous sojourners is inaccurate because Scripture does not make such a distinction. Abraham identified himself as גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב after his circumcision, which was recorded in Genesis 17. Further, Exod 12:45 does not indicate that this individual was uncircumcised and therefore excluded from the Passover.

here, since Abraham, as a גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב, was able to acquire land but did not presume a right to the land. Another possible implication is that the גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב was taken in by an Israelite family and made part of the father's household, since it appears that the poor brother was to be received in the same way, "and he will be with you" (Lev 25:35).

This phrase, גֵרִים וְחוֹשְׁבִים, is also the expression of the relationship between God and his people. Christopher Wright explains that their theological relationship is described figuratively in socio-economic terms,³³ which then becomes the rationale for the Israelites' treatment of the גֵר in their midst.³⁴ From examining the lexical data, it becomes clear that the Lord expects His people who have greater economic means to treat those of more meager means not only with justice but also with generosity. This was true for the אֲזִיחָה toward the גֵר and vice versa. Those in covenant with the Lord were to do so because they could empathize with the social status of the גֵר. Since the Israelites are told that they are גֵרִים וְחוֹשְׁבִים and therefore understand the heart of a גֵר, it is likely that the syntagm carries the same lexical sense as the single lexeme, and simply has a distinct function in discourse. God's people remain dependent upon a host, but have been rescued from an oppressive host in order to serve a gracious host. They are to be marked by holiness, and their treatment of the less powerful indicates the degree to which they have appropriated the holiness of the Lord.

Additionally, distinguishing the גֵר וְחוֹשֵׁב from the גֵר by dichotomizing civil and cultic life, as Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1991), 120 suggests, is a false dichotomy, as the cultic and civil life of ancient Israel was integrated. Leviticus 19 specifically shows the correspondence between ritual and secular contexts, as Mary Douglas, "Justice as the Cornerstone: An interpretation of Leviticus 18-20," *Interpretation* 53 (1999): 348-9 explains that "everything from day to day and Sabbath to Sabbath involves being obedient to the command to be holy."

³³ Christopher J. Wright, *An Eye for An Eye: The Place of Old Testament Ethics Today* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983), 57.

³⁴ The Israelites were only portrayed as גֵרִים וְחוֹשְׁבִים prior to their settlement in Canaan. There is only one reference to גֵר in relation to the Israelites in exile (Ezra 1:4), and this does not refer to the people as a whole. Therefore the burden of proof is on those who insist on a late date for the books of the Pentateuch to find justification for assuming the גֵר references must relate to exile.

2.1.1.2 Access to Covenant Membership

2.1.1.2.1 Equal Status with the אֲזִכָּרָה: Where overlap occurs between אֲזִכָּרָה

and גֵּר is with supplementary components. There is one standard, מִשְׁפָּט אֶחָד, as there is one direction of instruction, תּוֹרָה אֶחָת³⁵ for both the אֲזִכָּרָה, or the בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the גֵּר.³⁶ In the Old Testament passages involving covenant ordinances, the גֵּר is explicitly included in both the privileges and responsibilities of covenant membership, with the common verdict being one standard of judgment for both the אֲזִכָּרָה and the גֵּר (Lev 24:22).³⁷ Three passages in particular, Deut 29:10-13, 31:12, and Josh 8:30-35, clarify both the coreferentiality of אֲזִכָּרָה and גֵּר as part of the congregation of Israel and also the distinction between them concerning their birth origin. Moses and Joshua address the assembly as one people before the Lord and then specify the various groups within the assembly. In Deut 29:9 (29:10 ET), Moses speaks to the group: “You who are standing here today, all of you before the Lord your God,” then declares that God has delivered them from Egypt and led them through the wilderness in order to establish them as His people, in covenant relationship with Himself: “in order that He may establish you today for Himself as His people, and He will be your God.” (29:12 HT, 29:13 ET). Moses then refers to the congregation as “the people” later in the discourse (31:12), when he is instructing them to

³⁵ תּוֹרָה is built off of the root יָרָה, meaning to direct, teach, or instruct (BDB, 435.5). In the noun form in this context it means direction through codes of law (BDB, 436.2b2). Therefore, it is the direction of the statutes and judgments, which are the collection of codes, which is toward *shalom*.

³⁶ Moses communicates this same idea when he exhorts the people to judge fairly between their brothers and גֵּר, with the pronoun indicating that the sojourner has attached himself to the Israelite (Deut 1:16).

³⁷ Exod 12:17-20 (Feast of Unleavened Bread); Exod 45-48/ Num 9:9-14 (Passover, provided the גֵּר has circumcised all of his males); Lev 16:29-34 (the Day of Atonement as a day of Sabbath rest); Deut 16:9-15 (Feast of Weeks); Num 15:14-31, 19:1-10 (offering sacrifices); Num 35:6-15/Jos 20:1-9 (protected by cities of refuge); Exod 20:10/Deut 5:14 (keep the fourth commandment); Lev 18:24-30 (keep the Lord's statutes and refrain from abominable practices); Lev 24:10-16, 24:17-23 (stoned for blasphemy); 20:1-5 (stoned for giving his offspring to Molech); 22:17-25 (bring only worthy offerings to the Lord, which are unblemished males from the acceptable category for each offering); Ezek 14:6-8 (cut off from the people of God for turning from the Lord to idol worship and then seeking the insight of a prophet).

assemble every seven years in order to hear again the law of the Lord. Later, after the death of Moses and the beginning of the conquest of Canaan, when the people had defeated the inhabitants of Ai and Joshua assembled them in order to read the law of Moses, the text reads that “all Israel” stood before the Lord, and the specification includes *כָּנִי כְּאִזְרָח* (Josh 8:33).

As a result of the common membership and equal status before the Lord, it does not seem necessary to make the distinction between the people groups in these contexts, unless their diagnostic differences would keep the Israelites from understanding that life according to *תּוֹרָה* is for all those willing to submit their lives to the Lord as a member of His people. This seems likely since Moses repeats the declaration in Num 15:16 of one standard for all, with slightly different wording: “one statute for you and for the sojourner who is sojourning” (15:15) and “there will be one standard for you and for the sojourner who is sojourning with you.” (15:16). Recall that repetition underscores information that ought to be remembered, and it was used with the injunctions toward merciful treatment of the vulnerable as well as the reason for showing mercy, namely that the Israelites had experienced the same status in Egypt. Further, between the declarations Moses tells the Israelites that they and the sojourner are alike before the Lord (Num 15:15): “as you (are) so the sojourner will be before the Lord.” The fact that the foreign birth origin of the *גֵּר* did not disqualify him for participation in the spiritual life of Israel but required explicit clarification indicates a tendency on the part of the people to presume exclusion.

However, as Scripture makes clear, the terms can be cohyponomous with regard to

membership in the people of God. There is one covenant with one Lord and therefore the same privileges and requirements apply to all who participate.³⁸

Summary of Exegetical Findings: The lexical data supports a dual semantic relationship between *אֲזָרָח* and *גֵּר*, namely antonomous or hyponymous, depending upon context. The antonomous relationship enables the assertion that one diagnostic component of a *גֵּר* is that he was not born as a native to the land and people group among whom he lived.³⁹ The lexical data indicates a possible inclination of the *אֲזָרָח* not to ascribe the social and spiritual privileges to a *גֵּר* because of birth origin.⁴⁰ Therefore, the implication is that the *גֵּר* could be well assimilated into Israelite lifestyle, although there is the possibility that anyone living in the Lord's land, including a foreigner who had not submitted to covenant membership, was obligated to refrain from practices that would defile it, regardless of assimilation.

Since there is a similarity between the obligations of both the sojourner among Israel and the native-born Israelite in worship, it is likely that *אֲזָרָח* is in paradigmatic

³⁸ While it is possible that Deut 14:21 is an exception to this, as the Israelites were given permission to give meat from an animal that had died naturally to a *גֵּר* or sell it to a *גֵּר*, since it was unclean, this use of *גֵּר* could be a more general meaning, as with 1Chron 22:2 when David gathered all of the *גֵּרִים* in Israel together as workers for the construction of Solomon's Temple, or it could at least mean those who were not circumcised. I am more inclined to assume it is one of the latter two, since that would be consistent with the exegetical evidence concerning the *גֵּר* in cultic contexts, and also an indication that there are components of meaning specific to cultic contexts. The phrase *אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ* (who is in your gates) is in context with *גֵּר* in Deut 14:21 as it is in Exod 20:10, Deut 5:14, 14:29, 16:11, 16:14, and 31:12, the phrase is not used consistently enough to draw exegetically-based conclusions as to its significance.

³⁹ Supported also by the name of Moses' eldest son, Gershom, so named because Moses had been *גֵּר* (Exod 2:22, 18:3), and the fact that the people from the Northern Kingdom who came into Judah when Hezekiah reinstated the Passover were called *הַגֵּרִים* (2 Chron 30:25).

⁴⁰ See Deut 28:43-44 as an illustration of the rise of the *גֵּר* above the Israelite being a consequence of disobedience. This is not to say the *גֵּר* was inferior at all, but that the Lord had chosen Israel and her prosperity in contrast to the nations was an indication of that which perhaps could have been easily misunderstood to be a mark of superiority. See also Isa 14:1, which indicates that the attachment of many *גֵּרִים* to the people of Israel during this time period of migration from Egypt and settlement into Canaan was a mark of God's favor. He had chosen and called them to be His own possession and a light to the nations, and Isaiah mentions that when they are restored after judgment, once again "the sojourners will join them and will attach themselves to the house of Jacob."

relation with *אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל* and shares considerable overlap in meaning.⁴¹ The difference appears to be in emphasis, upon status with the former and origin with the latter. Indeed, A.H. Konkel explains that the function of *אֲזָרָח* “is to emphasize that there is no distinction between native-born and those who join the community.”⁴² We still need to ask with regard to what is there no distinction, as the lexical data indicates a socioeconomic distinction which follows from birth as a foreigner as opposed to a member of Israel's lineage, due to the land inheritance tied to birth affiliation. However, we can agree with Konkel in concluding that there is no distinction with regard to covenant obligations and privileges.

2.1.2 Action: *נָזַח*

Many of the occurrences of *נָזַח* in verbal form are in context with a nominal form, as well. Those instances have already been evaluated.⁴³ Of the verbal syntagms identified, the verb in contexts with *אֶת* and *בְּחוּךְ* always occurs with the agent. The contexts containing the action only are with *שָׁם*, *עַם*, *בְּ*, *לְ*, or without a preposition or adverb. These occurrences can be divided into two categories. The distinction between them is the number of components of meaning evident in the lexical sense based upon usage. Sometimes the action is used to simply describe dwelling or residing. At other times the action involves movement as well as dwelling. The instances of dwelling without mention of movement are examined first.

⁴¹ This does not mean the two terms are entirely interchangeable, but that they share a degree of synonymy that places them in the same family of words.

⁴² Konkel, “אֲזָרָח,” NIDOTTE, 1:345.

⁴³ They are as follows: Exod 12:48-49, 23:9; Lev 16:29, 17:8-13, 18:26, 19:33-34, 20:2, 25:6, 45; Num 9:14, 15:15-16, 26-30, 19:10; Josh 20:9; Ezek 14:7, 47:22-23. In most of these instances, the syntactical combination is the noun followed by the participle. However, in Lev 25:6 and 45 the participle is not preceded by the noun, although the noun occurs in the same discourse. Further, in Num 9:14 and Ezek 14:7, the infinitive follows the noun rather than the participle, but the effect is the same, with the agent performing the action. These references all have to do with the sojourner in relation to the people of Israel, and, as Konkel explains, that is a “common and important use” of *נָזַח* (Konkel, “נָזַח,” NIDOTTE, 1:837).

2.1.2.1 Dwelling: In all of the Old Testament passages in which the discourse sense of נִיר is simply to dwell, the agents are described as dwelling without comparison in quality or duration to any other agent.⁴⁴ Konkel explains that נִיר is sometimes used this way, typically in parallel construction with another verb that has the simple sense of dwelling. Occurrences of this are Jer 49:18.33 and 50:40, in which the prophet speaks of judgment upon Edom, Hazor, and Babylon which will result in such devastation that no one will inhabit the land. Each verse contains two parallel lines, and whether the parallelism is synonymous or climactic might shed light upon the difference in meaning between the two verbs.⁴⁵ Contextually, climactic parallelism is the logical conclusion, as if to say that not only will no one inhabit the land but neither will anyone even pass through temporarily, לֹא-יָשֹׁב שָׁם אִישׁ וְלֹא-יָנִיר בָּהּ, but there are no definitive syntactical markers for this conclusion.

While Konkel's conclusion based upon proximity of semantically related verbs seems logical from the verses cited, I cannot accept it as a conclusion because his exegetical data is selective. Such a decision would need to apply as well to Gen 20:1, since the same verse states that Abraham was both יָנִיר and יָשָׁב. Yet the context of this verse connotes movement as well as dwelling for several reasons. First, both נָסַע and נִיר are used together here and in Genesis 12:9-10 when Abraham traveled from the Negev into Egypt. Second, 21:34 indicates that his stay in Gerar was temporary, "many days." Third, the discourse between Abimelech and Abraham reveals his subordinate status as a foreigner in the land. While יָשָׁב is used interchangeably with נִיר in the passage, cf. 20:15

⁴⁴ Ps 5:4(5 HT), 15:1; Isa 11:6, 33:14; Jer 49:18.33, 50:40.

⁴⁵ When two lines of poetry are in synonymous parallelism, the second line restates the first. If the lines are in climactic parallelism, the second line heightens the first. Robert G. Bratcher and W.D. Rayburn, *A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Psalms* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1991), 4-6.

where Abimelech invites Abraham to dwell (שָׁב) where it pleases him, the component of movement is also in view. More detailed exegesis of the context in which נָשַׁב, יָשַׁב, and נָר occur is necessary in order to evaluate the paradigmatic relationships, and this will be undertaken in the field-oriented section of this chapter.

2.1.2.2 Journey

2.1.2.2.1 Related to the Patriarchs: While not all of the occurrences of נָר related to the sojourning of the patriarchs indicate duration of stay, all involve a settlement that came to an end.⁴⁶ It may appear that the reference to Lot is out of place, but as the nephew of Abraham he was part of the same sojourning entourage and therefore is appropriately included. It also adds an additional component to the agent נָר, which confirms the need for repetition to exhort the extension of generosity by the host, for the Sodomites show the natural inclination is a subordinate connotation. The Sodomites accuse Lot of acting as a judge despite having come to their land as a sojourner, and as a result desire greater harm for Lot than for his guests.

Despite the impermanence of settlement, it does seem in Genesis 20-21 that יָשַׁב and נָר are interchangeable terms, and the details will be examined in the field-oriented portion of this study. However, if there is considerable overlap between יָשַׁב and נָר, we do need to acknowledge the selection of נָר in Exod 6:4 and Isa 52:4 in reference to the forefathers of Israel; both are explicit reflections upon the sojourning of the forefathers of the nation of Israel. God explains to Moses that the land of Canaan was the land where the patriarchs had sojourned and would be an inheritance for His people (Exod 6:4), and Isaiah writes in 52:4 that the beginning of Israel's presence in Egypt was the result of a

⁴⁶ Gen 12:10, 19:9, 20:1, 21:23, 21:34, 26:3, 32:4, 35:27, 47:4; Exod 6:4; Isa 52:4.

sojourn to that land. The selection of נָזַח in these instances indicates that it communicates a different sense than יָשַׁב.

2.1.2.2.2 Related to the Israelites in Foreign Territory: Though there are some variations among the relevant passages, none contribute to additional components of meaning for נָזַח.⁴⁷ All of the passages except Deut 18:6 seem to contain only movement as a component of the sense of נָזַח without implications concerning the status of the referents; all are traveling through a land not belonging to them and staying for varying lengths of time. The mention of the Levites' sojourn in Deuteronomy 18 is similar to the comparison of the אֲזִיחַ and the נָזַח, for Moses communicates concern for status and inclusion, although here it is in reference to Levites from the towns, מֵאַחֵר שְׁעָרָיו, receiving an equal share of the provisions for the Levites in the central sanctuary, הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, because they have the freedom to do the Lord's work in either place. As Duane Christensen summarizes, God has chosen them for His work and is their inheritance.⁴⁸ It does seem that land inheritance and status are related. Perhaps a share in the inheritance promised to Israel, which at this point in history was the land of Canaan, was a significant factor of perceived inclusion in the people of God. But the Lord does not allow His people to define inclusion by these terms.

2.1.2.2.3 Related to Foreigners in Israelite Territory:⁴⁹ Two of the relevant passages simply communicate transience for a period of time,⁵⁰ while the other three are

⁴⁷ Deut 18:6, Judg 5:17, 17:7-9, 19:1, 19:16; Ruth 1:1, 2 Sam 4:3, 1 Kgs 17:20; 1 Chr 16:19; 2 Chr 15:9, Ezra 1:4; Ps 105: 12, 120:5; Jer 42 and 43; Lam 4:15.

⁴⁸ Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, Word Biblical Commentary (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 6a:393.

⁴⁹ The reference to נָזַח in Job 19:15 is not listed, because although those sojourning are foreigners, they received Job's hospitality in a time before God's people were a nation. Therefore, it does not fit clearly into the categories listed. However, the context indicates that these individuals had become familiar with Job, for he writes that his afflictions have now made him strange and foreign, זָר, and נִכְרִי.

⁵⁰ 2 Kgs 8:1-2, Jer 35:7

in contexts of judgment, although not all of those judged are the ones sojourning.⁵¹ While in three of the passages, Jer 35:7, Isa 16:4 and 23:7, movement is not the only diagnostic component of נָזַח in view, it is the emphasis and therefore most appropriately categorized in this section. In Jer 35:7, the components of dwelling and movement are both present, but the semantic focus is the Rechabites' lifestyle of sojourning.

With regard to the passages of judgment in Isaiah, the component of power imbalance between the sojourner and native might be relevant; the ones who do not typically enjoy the abundance of resources are given the opportunity to partake, and nations forced to sojourn implies the loss of territory and therefore power over other nations. However, the semantic contribution of נָזַח to the discourse in all three cases is the component of movement, as that action thrusts the plot along and contributes to the realization of judgment.

2.1.2.3 Summary of Exegetical Findings The lexical data indicates that נָזַח can describe the action of dwelling without qualifying duration of stay or status of the agent who is dwelling.⁵² The passages which convey this sense of נָזַח do not enable us to narrow this sense to particular referents, for men dwelling among men, men dwelling with God, and animals dwelling together are all represented in the passages. It seems, therefore, that under certain conditions only the diagnostic component of dwelling is present with נָזַח. However, that can be determined only by context and not by syntactical generalizations regarding syntagmatic relationships with verbs in the same semantic field.

⁵¹ Isa 5:17, 16:4, 23:7.

⁵² Supporting BDB, 157.

As this study proceeds, certain conclusions must be delayed until completing the field-oriented portion. The amount of overlap between נָזַח and the other verbs in its semantic field will be significant for determining diagnostic components of meaning.

From the passages analyzed here, נָזַח involves movement as well as dwelling. Movement is often a result of negative circumstances, e.g. famine or invasion, but not so in every case, e.g. the patriarchs, Levites, and Rechabites. It does seem to be consistently be initiated by a source outside the sojourner, however, rather than by the sojourner himself. The dwelling is in a land not belonging to the one who is sojourning, but does not preclude future claim to the land, as with the future inheritance of Canaan by the offspring of the patriarchs. The fact that Israelites could be the referent of a dwelling that involved movement indicates that sojourn was a reality before, during, and after the monarchy. However, the occurrences of נָזַח are not so frequent that one could conclude that sojourning was a way of life for the nation of Israel as it was for the patriarchs. The Levites could be an exception to this assertion, but there is not sufficient exegetical data to make that a certain exception. Status may be a component of the action as it seems to be with the agent, although from only one verse it is difficult to draw exegetically based conclusions. The key might be when agent and action are both in view, and the remaining analysis will consider if that is always the case or if one can occur without the other.

2.2 Field-Oriented Study of נָזַח (Paradigmatic Relationships)

Now we turn to an examination of words in the same semantic field as נָזַח. Since the lexical data of נָזַח in its syntagmatic relationships indicates that having an origin foreign to the place of sojourning is a component of the agent, and dwelling and

movement are diagnostic components of the action, although movement need not be present in every case, we will examine words with these components of meaning. The goal is to evaluate the terms in order to distinguish גֵּר from the rest. The nouns in the semantic field with גֵּר are מְגוּר, חוֹשֵׁב, שָׂכִיר, זָר, and נָכְרִי. Although the first is a place rather than a person, it is built off the same root as גֵּר and so needs to be analyzed; the others involve a component of an individual being foreign to a particular group or context, which is true for the גֵּר with regard to birth origin. The verbs to be analyzed are יָשַׁב, נָסַע, and שָׁכַן, for each has at least one component identified with the action גֵּר. With the nouns it is the degree of attachment or assimilation, and with the verbs it is the degree of movement that is typically the distinction among them. An examination of the exegetical details will reveal the extent of overlap among the terms.

2.2.1 מְגוּר: Of its ten uses in the Old Testament, six⁵³ are in construct with אֶרֶץ (“land”) and refer to the land of Canaan as the inheritance promised to the patriarchs by the Lord. One use of the syntagm refers uniquely to the land of the Israelites’ exile (Ezek 20:38). Interestingly, it is not מְגוּר simply to the Israelites but to those who held them captive. Daniel Block explains that it is to this latter group that Ezekiel refers when he writes that God will purge them “from the land of [their] sojourning.” Besides this exception, the other three occurrences make it possible to consider that מְגוּר has a non-technical meaning. First, Bildad speaks of there being no survivor in the מְגוּר of the wicked (Job 18:19). Also along the theme of wickedness, David writes in Ps 55:15 that evil resides in the מְגוּר of the wicked. While contrasting the wicked by speaking of the righteous, the author of Psalm 119 proclaims that the statutes of the Lord are the content

⁵³ Gen 17:8, 28:4, 36:7, 37:1, 47:9, and Exod 6:4.

of his songs in his מְנוּחָה. In all of these instances, מְנוּחָה is a dwelling place, specific to the agent of whom the author writes, but not one particular locale common to all. Except for the technical sense of the term referring to the patriarchs promised inheritance of Canaan, it is unclear if מְנוּחָה has diagnostic components beyond dwelling place. This is consistent, however, with one sense of נָחַד meaning simply to dwell, and with the indication that the life of the patriarchs had a unique association to נָחַד.

2.2.2 חֹשֶׁב: Since this term is in syntagmatic relationship with נָחַד in Gen 23:4 and Leviticus 25, it will only be re-analyzed in those contexts here as it illuminates the sense of חֹשֶׁב in its distinctness from נָחַד. The other occurrences of the term are Exod 12:45, Lev 22:10, 25:6, 40:45, Num 35:15, 1 Chron 29:15, and Ps 39:12.⁵⁴ In Exod 12:45, Lev 22:10, 25:6, and 25:40 it is in syntagmatic relationship with שָׂכִיר. In those contexts, it is clear that Moses is writing of two different groups of people. They are coreferential in the first two passages, because they comprise the ones disqualified from the Passover and partaking of the food from the offerings for the priests respectively. We can infer from the Passover reference that neither a חֹשֶׁב nor a foreign שָׂכִיר was circumcised,⁵⁵ but further that a person with either status would not be circumcised, for Moses writes that a נָחַד could participate in the Passover if he and his males were first circumcised. Since participation in the Passover signified incorporation into the people of God, we can conclude that neither the חֹשֶׁב nor the foreign שָׂכִיר had the same opportunity to assimilate into the

⁵⁴ I agree with Donald Wiseman's conclusion, in Donald J. Wiseman, *1 and 2 Kings: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 164, that 1Kgs 17:1 reads, הַחֹשֶׁבִּי מִחֹשֶׁבֵי גִלְעָד, as "a Tishbite from Tishbe of Gilead," meaning the birthplace of Elijah. I accept this reading because it does not assume corruption of the text and it coheres with the known geography of the time, namely that there were two Tishbes, and so here the author is distinguishing this one from the Tishbe in Naphtali. Therefore, even though with vowel pointing the text could be translated "as a sojourner of Gilead," I am assuming it to be a proper noun and therefore not part of the analysis of חֹשֶׁב.

⁵⁵ It is necessary to qualify whether or not the hired worker was foreign, as further exegesis of Leviticus 25 will make clear.

people of Israel as the גֵּר. Therefore, it is likely that the גֵּר remained with the people of Israel for a longer period of time, since Scripture indicates that it is participation in the covenant between God and His people that brings someone into Israel, rather than any characteristic of his origin or social status.

In addition to not being incorporated into the people of God, the חֹשֶׁב is also more dependent upon the Israelite than the גֵּר. He is listed last after the slaves and hired workers as those whom the Israelites are to ensure have gathered during the land's Sabbath rest. By inference, these are all groups who by definition need to be given access to the produce in order to gather it. The חֹשֶׁב is the recipient of mercy as a guest of the Israelite rather than a recipient of just wages as the שֶׂכִּיר, who was hired for his services. A poor Israelite is to be treated as both (v. 40). The need of the חֹשֶׁב for mercy is supported by Lev 25:45, as the חֹשֶׁב could be purchased as a slave, reinforcing his position as the one in need of mercy, for he could be cared for as either a guest or a slave.

Leviticus 25 is helpful in distinguishing the חֹשֶׁב from the גֵּר. Since a גֵּר could be incorporated into the people of Israel, the possibility existed for him to access land and therefore the means to prosperity. The חֹשֶׁב was not in this position. The גֵּר is not mentioned in Leviticus 25 until v. 23, when Moses writes of the status of the Israelites before the Lord as a preface to explaining property rights and holdings. The people are given permission to purchase the חֹשֶׁב, but are exhorted to be merciful, as Moses reminds them again in v. 38 that the Lord brought them out of Egypt. Their status has not changed. They are still גֵּרִים וְחֹשְׁבִים, but their host has changed. They are no longer under an oppressive host, but rather a gracious host who has shown them mercy and given them

the freedom to prosper. The Lord exhorts them to respond in kind with those in need of mercy. The גֵּר holds a place between the חֹשֶׁב and the אֲזִיחָה.

This conclusion is supported by Num 35:15, 1 Chron 29:15, and Ps 39:12. In Numbers, Moses lists the beneficiaries of the cities of refuge, listing first the Israelites, followed by the sojourner, and lastly the חֹשֶׁב. It is as if to say, “These cities are a refuge for you, and not only for you but also for the גֵּר, and even for the חֹשֶׁב.” Additionally, David identifies himself with his forefathers by claiming the status of גֵּר for himself in 1 Chron 29:15 and Ps 39:12, and uses the term חֹשֶׁב in an appositional sense. But we have already established that the terms are not entirely synonymous. It seems that a גֵּר is a certain type of חֹשֶׁב, understood by using the Israelites as an illustration. They were guests in Yahweh’s land, but not guests whose freedom was insecure. Rather they were guests given full inclusion into the host’s land, with the freedom to prosper by cultivating its resources. Therefore, “guest” is the English rendering that most closely communicates the sense of חֹשֶׁב in the Old Testament Scriptures.

2.2.3 שָׂכִיר. It has already been established that a שָׂכִיר was a hired worker who was due his wages. If he was a foreigner, he was not assimilated into the cultic life of Israel. However, an Israelite could assume the economic position of a שָׂכִיר, as seen from Lev 25:40, as well as Deut 24:14, which states that no man is to oppress a שָׂכִיר, whether he is “from your brothers or from the sojourners who (are) in your land, within your gates.” Not only does this verse exhort the hiring Israelite to treat the שָׂכִיר justly, but so do Lev 19:13 and 25:40-45, with the former prohibiting the withholding of wages and the latter comparing Jubilee retribution to the calculation of pay for a שָׂכִיר, as well as Mal 3:5, which condemns the man who oppresses the שָׂכִיר, for that is one indication that he has

forsaken the Lord.⁵⁶ However, since there was an exchange of pay for his work, the Israelite was obligated to the שָׂכִיר in a way that he was not to the חֹשֶׁב. The שָׂכִיר was not a separate social class, which is clear from both Deut 24:12 and Num 35:15, the latter of which lists the אֲזִקָּה, גֵּר, and חֹשֶׁב as the distinctive groups. So שָׂכִיר is a socioeconomic status that transcends nationality, as indicated in Leviticus 25 where Moses explains the appropriate behavior toward a poor brother. A גֵּר, therefore, could become a שָׂכִיר, but שָׂכִיר is a term describing a specific economic relationship that could exist between any people living in ancient Israel.

2.2.4 זָר: This adjective, used 71 times in the Old Testament,⁵⁷ has the sense of describing an outsider, either one outside a particular situation or excluded from a particular group, or something out of bounds for a particular group. Examples include those outside the lineage of Aaron (e.g., Exod 30:33, Lev 22:10-13, Num 16:40), those outside a particular family in regard to Levirate marriage (Deut 25:5), a foreign god (e.g., Ps 44:20, 81:9, Isa 43:12), one outside the worshipers of Yahweh (e.g., Job 15:19, Joel 3:17), or one other than the person who is the subject of a particular discourse (e.g., 1Kgs 3:18, Job 19:27, Prov 14:10, 27:2). The word is used in parallel lines with נִכְרִי, which indicates that these two words have a high degree of synonymy. The references are Prov 20:16, 27:13, and Isa 28:21, and in all three cases the repetition serves to emphasize the point made in the text. In the first two, the risk of involvement with the זָר is emphasized and in the third, the unparalleled deeds of the Lord are emphasized. In all cases, that which is זָר is not something one is encouraged, or often even able, to embrace. It means

⁵⁶ The other occurrences use שָׂכִיר metaphorically to describe the fleeting aspect of life (Job 7:1.2, 14:6, Isa 16:14), and once to illustrate the judgment to come upon Egypt, when the hired worker who had been oppressed by the Egyptians will prosper (Jer 46:21).

⁵⁷ Konkel, "זָר," NIDOTTE 1:1143.

foreign in the sense of strange or other, and either ought to remain estranged from the one to whom it is foreign or must, by its definition, be exclusive. This may seem to be extraneous to גֵּר, but since it shares the component of “foreign,” it is important to include here. It turns out to be of little consequence as this study proceeds, since the Greek equivalents of זָר are not the same as those of גֵּר, but the next term, נִכְרִי, has considerable overlap with זָר and also shares a Greek equivalent in common with גֵּר that becomes semantically significant in New Testament contexts. Therefore, it is important to understand its meaning.

2.2.5 נִכְרִי : Based upon the explanation of זָר, it is clear that זָר and נִכְרִי have overlap. Both terms share the diagnostic component with גֵּר of foreign origin. However, these terms have an aspect of exclusion because they are either not permissible or not attainable. This is different from the גֵּר, who could experience inclusion, although there were some limiting factors.

The noun נִכְרִי occurs 36 times and the adjective נִכְרִי occurs 45 times, all with the sense of being alien as well as excluded.⁵⁸ The foreign ones are either people or gods, often hostile or dangerous, but at root the exclusion seems to be based upon remaining outside the covenant relationship between God and His people (e.g., Gen 35:2.4; Exod 18:3; Deut 14:21, 31: 16; Josh 24:20.23; 2 Sam 22:45-46; Neh 9:2). The גֵּר was outside of the covenant relationship initially, but could be brought in through circumcision, e.g. Exod 12:43, and therefore did not remain נִכְרִי. The danger of a נִכְרִי was his existence outside the covenant relationship, and therefore a נִכְרִי presented temptation toward idolatry or immorality for the Israelite. Informative for recognizing this diagnostic

⁵⁸ Konkel, “נִכְרִי,” NIDOTTE, 3:109.

component and therefore distinction from גֵּר is Isa 56:3.6, 60:10, and 61:5. Here, God assures the נָכַר of his place in the people of God and therefore is the object of God's love and faithfulness, but Isaiah speaks first of a time in the future and second of a foreigner who "has joined himself to the Lord." Those in covenant relationship with the Lord all have the same status before Him. The analysis of terms thus far has supported this conclusion. Therefore, what distinguishes נָכַר from גֵּר is that historically in ancient Israel the former term identified someone or something that was to remain excluded because of deliberately remaining outside the covenant between God and His people. Despite the narrow overlap with גֵּר, as with זָר there is the common component of "foreign," and unlike זָר the Greek equivalent has semantic significance with גֵּר.

2.2.6 נָסַע: This verb is typically translated "journey," and while נָזַח usually carries the sense of movement, the emphasis is not on the setting out and traveling, as it is with נָסַע.⁵⁹ Not only is the emphasis distinct, but the diagnostic component of dwelling that is always present with נָזַח is not a diagnostic component of נָסַע.⁶⁰ The verb is most often used to describe the actions of Abraham and Jacob (e.g., Gen 12:9, 33:17), as well as the Israelites while migrating from Egypt to Canaan (e.g., Num 10:5-25). It is also used in the Hiphil to identify a causing to go forth, such as when God compels Israel's movement by the cloud and fire (e.g., Exod 15:22), when He sends quail to feed them (e.g., Num 11:31), and when He withdraws His anger (causing His anger to "go forth" from them) upon their repentance (e.g., 2 Kgs 19:36). While journeying contributed to having the status of a גֵּר, because a sojourner was not native to the land through which he traveled, journeying is not necessary to qualify one to be a גֵּר, nor is it a perpetual characteristic of

⁵⁹ Cornelis Van Dam, "נָסַע," NIDOTTE, 3:117.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

a גר. While the question of גר and נסע being interchangeable arose from analyzing contexts that included both גר and נסע, such as Gen 20:1, we can now see from understanding the emphasis of נסע that the verbs described different stages of Abraham's movement.

2.2.7 יָשַׁב. While the component of dwelling is a central component of גר, it is only a component of יָשַׁב by extension, with the primary sense of יָשַׁב meaning “to sit.” Gerald Wilson explains that all other uses are derived from this component.⁶¹ As such, the idea of dwelling in this verb emphasizes “the stability or duration of residence...perhaps derived from the idea of sitting down as one's intention to remain.”⁶² So while there are contexts in which it seems to convey the same meaning as גר: Gen 24:37 (referring to Abraham's stay in Canaan), Exod 12:40 and Num 20:15 (summarizing the 400 years of slavery for the Israelites in Egypt), Josh 24:2 (giving a synopsis of Israel's history beginning with Terah), and Judg 17:11 (describing the sojourn of a Levite in Ephraim), that does not mean the verbs are interchangeable. Forms of יָשַׁב occur with high frequency in the Old Testament, and a very small percentage of those uses overlap with גר. An intention to stay does not preclude an eventual leaving, and humans who sojourn and dwell are not privileged to the workings of providence which affect the duration of their stay in a given location. There still remains a distinction between יָשַׁב and גר, in that stability of residence is not a diagnostic component of גר as it is with יָשַׁב. It seems that what is stable for the one who sojourns is the relationship that prompted the sojourn, rather than the ability of the one who sojourns to establish residence.

⁶¹ Wilson, “יָשַׁב,” NIDOTTE, 2:550.

⁶² Ibid.

2.2.8 *שָׁכַן*: This verb does have a diagnostic component of dwelling, but the emphasis is on “relative rest and stability *after* a period of movement.”⁶³ The memory of movement is always in view, and thus *שָׁכַן* is more temporary than *יָשַׁב*.⁶⁴ Wilson explains that it may be more permanent than *גָּר*, but his conclusion is tentative. The element of movement in both verbs may be the complicating factor. Movement is more often an element of the past with *שָׁכַן*, and with *גָּר* there is an ongoing sense of transience when movement is present in a particular context. A further distinction is that quite often God is the subject of *שָׁכַן*, whereas only once is He the subject of *גָּר*. When God is the subject of *שָׁכַן*, He allows for His presence to be among His people while maintaining His freedom and transcendence. The degree of dissimilarity between the verbs is illustrated by the fact that, as with *יָשַׁב*, there are very few occurrences of *שָׁכַן* that convey the same sense as *גָּר*. These are Ps 94:17 and 120:5, and in the latter passage *שָׁכַן* is in parallel construction with *גָּר*. The comparison between *גָּר* and *שָׁכַן* indicates that *גָּר* does not carry the same freedom of movement. There is an event or commitment that compels the action of the one sojourning.

2.3 English Rendering of Terms and Summary

From the above analysis of terms within the same semantic field as *גָּר* and *גֵּר*, a conclusion concerning diagnostic components and most appropriate rendering of the terms in English is needed. Concerning the agent, we have seen that a *גֵּר* is foreign-born, but that neither socioeconomic nor covenant status can be determined from the use of the term alone. Some authors contend that other characteristics are true of the “sojourner” in every context. These assertions include Wright’s conclusion of immigrant

⁶³ Wilson, “שָׁכַן,” NIDOTTE, 4:110.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

workers or descendents of the old Canaanite population,⁶⁵ Roland de Vaux's assertion of refugees from the northern Kingdom after the Assyrian invasion,⁶⁶ or Rolf Rendtorff's conclusion of remnants from the scattered tribes still living in Canaan during and after exile.⁶⁷ Authors such as Christiana van Houten, who assume the accuracy of the Documentary Hypothesis, particularly that the priestly document of Leviticus was written near or during the exile in Babylon, conclude that the identity of the גֵּר developed over time, from outsiders ethnically in need of assistance to those fully integrated into the Israelite community, with a progression of focus from civil to ritual obligations.⁶⁸ However, this word study shows different conclusions. First of all, there is no Scriptural support for the identity criteria postulated. Therefore, all attempts are speculative. Exod 12:38 states that a "mixed multitude" went out of Egypt with the Israelites, thus a description of who may partake in the covenant institution of the Passover follows. But no further description is given. The analysis of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships has shown a grading of terms within the semantic field of agents born outside the nation of Israel, but still with variation in both covenant and socioeconomic status.

The host was expected to extend justice and generosity, as well as full inclusion privileges to the גֵּר who joined himself to Israel. Indeed, that coheres with the mission of Israel, which was to be a light to the nations by reflecting God's holiness so that the nations might see, be drawn in, and receive the blessing of God (c.f. Gen 12:3, Deut 4:5-8). Becoming participants in the covenant relationship between God and His people was

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and its Institutions* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1961), 75.

⁶⁷ Rolf Rendtorff, "The Gēr in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch," in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett (Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1996), 86.

⁶⁸ Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, 176.

open to all who were willing to submit their lives to the Lord's authority. While that was open to all, the evidence of Scripture indicates that a גֵר, though not a native-born Israelite, and therefore not part of Israelite lineage, could be, and often was, assimilated into Israel such that he would participate in the covenant institutions and share in covenant responsibilities. Renderings such as "alien," "resident alien," "immigrant," "foreigner," "stranger," or "guest" carry additional connotations that are only conclusive based upon context. We have seen that duration of stay, dependence upon the host, and assimilation into the lifestyle of the host are all variable, even though there are certain tendencies. However, tendencies vary with context and need explanation. Therefore, "sojourner" communicates the sense of the term without confusing it with other field-related terms. Even though "alien" is the most common English rendering of גֵר in the Old Testament, I contend that "sojourner" is most appropriate, with a reliance on context to fill out the identity in particular situations.

Concerning action, "sojourn" is an appropriate rendering of נָגַד. While this choice complements "sojourner" grammatically and therefore communicates the agent/action relationship, it also communicates the diagnostic sense of the term. There is a risk, however, in using "sojourn" in the context of modern English, as it has become somewhat archaic. Even people who are familiar with the word tend to assume it describes someone who is currently on a journey. So even though an element of its lexical sense in modern English is that the duration of residence is precarious, which does not presume constant movement, it is still open to misunderstanding. Since dwelling is always part of the sense of נָגַד, the English rendering needs to communicate this. Therefore, despite the possible need for clarification, I contend that "sojourn" best

encapsulates the lexical sense of גֵּר. “Sojourn” is the typical translation of גֵּר, and only varies for clarification in certain contexts. The dwelling and movement of one who is sojourning is externally compelled, relying on the stability of relationships which will sustain the sojourner rather than stability of circumstances or one’s own volition, and these factors distinguish it from other field-related terms. As with the description of the agent, I contend that the variations in duration and stability given a particular setting are best filled out by the context surrounding גֵּר in a given discourse.

We will now turn to the Greek terms for the various uses of גֵּר and גֵּרָא chosen by the translators of the LXX. This will help clarify variations in meaning based upon context, as well as distinguish the diagnostic components of meaning from the supplementary components. Further, studying the LXX renderings of גֵּר and גֵּרָא will form a bridge to studying sojourning vocabulary in the New Testament, whose writers had access to the Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Chapter 3 – The Septuagint Translation of the Old Testament: Greek

Equivalents for Hebrew Terms

The words chosen to translate גֵּר and גֵּרָא into the Greek version of the Old Testament are significant to consider because of the influence that the LXX had on the authors of the New Testament. According to Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva, Greek became the common language for Diaspora Jews, as well as the language of commerce for all living under Hellenistic influence from the time Alexander the Great conquered the Near East, c. 333 B.C., into the early years of the Roman Empire.¹ This included Palestine in the first century A.D. The Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures is the primary version, and in most cases the only version, with which Jews would have been familiar, as most Jews spoke Greek from about 200 B.C.² Therefore it was natural for the apostles to appeal to the Greek Old Testament, most commonly referred to as the Septuagint and hereafter abbreviated as LXX, to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, even if they were familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures.³ In light of such knowledge, this chapter will present the Greek terms used to translate גֵּר and גֵּרָא in their Old Testament contexts in order to form a bridge to the uses of the same terms in the Greek New Testament.

¹ Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000), 20.

² Ibid., 82.

³ The LXX is commonly understood to refer to the entire Old Testament canon, though the seventy elders who participated in the translation in Alexandria, Egypt translated the Pentateuch only, around 250 BC. The remaining scrolls were translated separately by various translators over the next 200 years (Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 29-31). In this paper, LXX will refer to the entire Greek Old Testament, according to popular understanding.

3.1 Agent: ַא

3.1.1 *προσήλυτος*. In all but four passages, ַא is translated *προσήλυτος*. According to Liddell and Scott, this term can mean either a sojourner or a convert to Judaism.⁴ This supports the general exegetical conclusions that a ַא was not born native to the people among whom he sojourned, and that when occurring in passages with ַאִס, the terms are coreferential for those in covenant relationship with the Lord. The same is communicated by the term *προσήλυτος*, for an individual who converts to another faith submits himself to the privileges and obligations of that faith. There is, therefore, a recognition among the LXX translators that the identity of a ַא varied with circumstances, and they used the term *προσήλυτος* consistently to denote “proselyte” rather than “sojourner,” thereby confirming that a ַא could experience a high degree of assimilation, although that was only possible and not certain.

In all but one passage pertaining to ethical behavior ַא is translated as *προσήλυτος*. All that has been said about the historical critical position asserting the identity of the ַא in ancient Israel as a sociological development over time is relevant here and need not be repeated. One point concerning the referent for *προσήλυτος* could be informative for its meaning, however. Each time Moses gives the Israelites the rationale for treating the sojourner with justice and compassion it is because they were sojourners themselves in Egypt. What do we know about the lives of the Israelites in relation to the Egyptians while they were living in Egypt? We know that they were enslaved after the ascension of a Pharaoh who did not know Joseph (Gen 15:13, Exod 1:1-11) and that they were known as Hebrews, living separately from the Egyptians and not assimilated into their culture.

⁴ Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1513.

The word chosen by the LXX translators to identify the status of the Israelites in Egypt is προσήλυτος. What are we to conclude from this? It is another caution against over-interpretation. As Liddell and Scott give “sojourner” as a definition for the term, so we ought to recognize that it does not denote convert, with all the implications of conversion, in every circumstance. The translators are acknowledging that there are some among the Israelites who have a parallel identity to that of the Israelites while they were in Egypt, and further that which they will continue to have before the Lord in Canaan. The Israelites know what it is like to be at the mercy of another, and now that they have before them the contrast between an oppressive host and a gracious host, they are challenged to imitate their gracious host in their treatment of those at their mercy.

3.1.2 γειώρας: The Aramaic term גִּיּוּרָא, meaning “sojourner,” is transliterated once in a context where the reader would expect to find προσήλυτος, in Exod 12:19. Diagnostically it is possible for these two words to have complete overlap, as both terms can mean “sojourner.” However, γειώρας does not have the alternate definition of proselyte or convert, and therefore προσήλυτος may technically be considered a subset of γειώρας; the terms have a relationship of inclusion.⁵ The term γειώρας is an example of “semantic borrowing,” described by Jobes and Silva as a linguistic phenomenon occurring in bilingual environments when there is some degree of semantic correspondence between the foreign term and a term in the native language, with only a minor semantic change required.⁶ Given that the common language of Jews in Egypt before adopting Greek was Aramaic, then, as J. Lee explains, “it follows that if the Greek

⁵ For further information on the spectrum of synonymy, see chapter 1.3.1.

⁶ Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 108-109.

spoken by the Egyptian Jews was affected by the idioms of a Semitic language, that language must have been Aramaic.”⁷

Concerning the reasoning behind the LXX translators choosing γειώρας instead of προσήλυτος to translate גֵּר, the lexical evidence does not point to absolute conclusions. It could be that the translators recognized a certain Hebrew syntax to indicate גֵּר having the more specific meaning of convert. Most occurrences of προσήλυτος are in contexts with a relative clause including the action following the identification of the agent. However, this is not true in every case. Lev 22:18, 24:16, and 24:22 are the exceptions. In all three situations, Moses simply states that the injunction applies to the sojourner as well as to the native. We can infer that he means one who has joined himself to Israel, but the same could be said of Exod 12:19, in which the sojourner could only be included in the Passover celebration if he and all his males were circumcised, which signifies their initiation into the covenant. Not only do these passages in Leviticus prevent us from reading too much into the text, but so does Isa 14:1, in which the LXX translators use γειώρας to translate גֵּר. While grammatically there is no relative clause following the agent, contextually Isaiah is writing of sojourners who will attach themselves to Israel. He is describing those originally outside the covenant people of God joining themselves to Israel, which is what the term προσήλυτος conveys.

3.1.3 *πάροιχος*: In the previous chapter, I used Gen 23:4 to support my inferences concerning גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב as a syntagm with a socioeconomic nuance in discourse usage. However, the LXX translators chose a different pair of terms to translate גֵּר וְחוֹשֵׁב in Gen 23:4 than in Leviticus 25. The phrase in Gen 23:4 reads *πάροιχος καὶ παρεπίδημος*,

⁷ J.A.L Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 16.

whereas throughout Leviticus 25 it is προσήλυτοι καὶ πάροιχοι. Does that mean that the phrase in Gen 23:4 does not have the same meaning as the phrase throughout Leviticus 25? Not necessarily. The contexts have not changed, and therefore the exegetical findings concerning the meaning of the phrase remain the same. Also, the LXX translators could simply have translated the individual words without considering if the phrase had a slightly different connotation. It is possible that they did not want to allow for the possible misunderstanding that Abraham was a proselyte to the people among whom he sojourned; the syntagm in both cases is still a hendiadys to communicate one identity.⁸

This leads to the third, and perhaps most important point. We need to consider what we have discerned so far about the meaning of προσήλυτος. It can simply mean “sojourner.” With this being the case, it can have an equivalent meaning, in certain contexts, with πάροιχος, if “sojourner” is the only diagnostic component in view. Therefore the terms can be interchangeable, depending upon context. Just as Abraham was not a convert of the Hittites nor Moses of the Midianites, neither were the Hebrews converts of the Egyptians. There certainly were differences in status, but the element of convert was not present in either relationship.

Most often πάροιχος translates חֵזָק, and from the field-oriented study of Hebrew terms we noted the differences between גֵּר and חֵזָק. They do, however, share the same diagnostic component of foreigner, at least foreign birth origin. The fact that a גֵּר was in a position to potentially assimilate into Israel and a חֵזָק was not is not in view when either

⁸ This is consistent with the lexical data in Exod 3:22, namely that Moses considered himself a πάροιχος in Midian. Here πάροιχος also translates גֵּר, and it seems to have the same connotation as Gen 23:4, given the contexts. It is not in syntagmatic relationship with another term in the same semantic field, and therefore the socioeconomic nuance would not be in view, but the estrangement from one’s homeland is in view.

πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος or προσήλυτοι καὶ πάροικοι is used. What is in view is the subordinate position of one seeking access to resources and experiencing the freedom to prosper without presuming upon the grace extended by the owner of the property. For these reasons, the two different rendering of נָךְ in the LXX do not invalidate previous exegetical conclusions.

3.1.4 ξένος: Another Greek equivalent of נָךְ, the one exception to προσήλυτος in an ethical context, is ξένος. Since it only translates נָךְ once in the Old Testament, it would be difficult to come to conclusions concerning the reasoning. The verse is Job 31:32, and Job uses the example of extending hospitality to the stranger, ξένος, as part of his defense before the Lord and his friends concerning his innocence. The term ξένος usually translates נָךְ, but it doesn't have the same element of exclusion as נָךְ.⁹ The ξένος could be a stranger who wanders or one who receives hospitality (cf. Matt 25:35.43). It could also refer to the host (cf. Rom 16:23).¹⁰ Most often in the case of נָךְ, the LXX translators used a form of ἄλλότριος, which seems closer diagnostically to נָךְ, since it means strange in the sense of belonging to another, either to another person or nation, with the logical deduction being that it is unsuitable and possibly, though not necessarily, hostile.¹¹ Both Greek terms, along with προσήλυτος, do fall within the semantic field of “foreign,” and we need to exercise caution when drawing conclusions on the reasons translators may have selected one term over another. In the case of Job, he is describing

⁹ Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1189.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Walter Bauer, F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 47, hereafter BDAG. There is overlap between נָךְ and נָךְ by the use of ἄλλότριος, and between נָךְ and נָךְ by the use of ξένος, but there is no overlap in Greek terminology between נָךְ and נָךְ.

a simple guest-host experience, and perhaps ξένος, since it can mean either, is the best term to convey this understanding.

3.1.5 Conclusion Concerning the Agent: In all but four instances, the LXX translators render נָכַר as προσήλυτος. In three of these contexts, Gen 23:4, Exod 3:22, and Job 31:32, the identity of the נָכַר is perhaps further clarified by the use of πάροικος and ξένος. But we have seen that all three terms are within the semantic field of “foreign,” and the predominant choice of προσήλυτος can mean either “sojourner” or “convert,” depending on the context. Thus the LXX provides an additional rendering of נָכַר. However, I would contend that “sojourner” is the preferable way to understand the term as a single lexeme. With a broader context, “convert” can be appropriately used.

In addition to providing a caution against over-interpretation of diagnostic components, the use of γειώρας and προσήλυτος in particular confirm earlier conclusions that the lexical evidence does not support a sociological development of the identity of the נָכַר in Israel and thus a late dating of the priestly documents.¹² The assumed progression of development is from an immigrant to resident alien to proselyte, asserting that the use of προσήλυτος in the priestly writing confirms this progression of identity. All it actually indicates is contextual differences that are synchronic in nature rather than diachronic. There are occurrences of προσήλυτος in Deuteronomy, which proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis consider to be an earlier document than Exodus through Numbers. Also, proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis assume that προσήλυτος in proximity to πάροικος, often used to translate נָכַר, indicates a less assimilated identity.

¹² I am following Jay Sklar, *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), ix by using the phrase “priestly documents” to mean the writing related to the cultic activity of Israel and not the P document as asserted by proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis.

Therefore, when the terms occur together in the allegedly later documents of priestly legislation, as in Leviticus 25 and Numbers 35, scholars assume the passages to be later insertions or to convey an “earlier sense” of the identity. The entire argument seems to force a historical explanation upon the text rather than cooperate with the contextual difference that need not indicate different time periods. Theophile Meek, whose explanation of the translation of גֵּר in the Pentateuch summarizes the development view, acknowledges that “Greek translators were well aware of the fact that the גֵּר had different meanings in different contexts.”¹³ But then he concludes that this must be indicative of the Pentateuch being written in different historical periods. This logically does not follow from the exegetical evidence, nor does it allow the exegetical evidence to stand, as it is compelled to offer explanations for divergent examples. It seems much more logically sound to recognize the differences and understand them within their contexts, as an indication that an individual born outside of Israelite lineage could attach himself to Israel and thus come under covenant privileges and obligations between Israel and the Lord, but that was not necessarily the situation of every גֵּר in ancient Israel.

As we observe the use of Greek terms in the semantic field of sojourning throughout the Old Testament, we can notice a semantic shift from the Hebrew to the LXX. That shift is with regard to the terms used for the agent-action relationship of derivation related to “sojourn.” It is to this that we now turn. For the action גֵּר is most often rendered in Greek by a form of παροικέω. However the agent, or noun form, πάροικος, is most often used to translate חֹשֶׁב. This relationship needs to be further

¹³ Theophile James Meek, “The Translation of GER in the Hextateuch and its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49:2 (1930): 180.

investigated in order to understand if there is a semantic difference between the Greek and Hebrew meaning of “a sojourner who is sojourning.”

3.2 Action: נִר

3.2.1 Agent and Action as a Semantic Unit: When the sojourner is followed by a relative clause, either “who sojourns among you,” or a version of “who is with you,” the LXX translators use a verb meaning to come, live among, or attach themselves except in one instance.¹⁴ The exception is Ezek 47:22. This verse reads τοῖς προσηλύτοις τοῖς παροικοῦσιν ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, “the proselytes who sojourn in your midst.” There is no indication that the use of παροικοῦσιν, meaning “sojourn,” indicates less than full assimilation into the covenant people of God. In fact, Ezekiel is prophesying that the sojourners will be as the native-born with regard to an inheritance in the new Israel after exile. In all other passages, the LXX translators communicate a different action from sojourn by using forms of προσέρχομαι, πρόσκειμαι, προσγίγνομαι, or προσηλυτεύω. However, Ezek 47:22 communicates the same degree of assimilation. Further, twice in Leviticus 25, verses 6 and 45, the agent is πάροικος, originally פֶּתוּחַ in Hebrew, and is described as being with the Israelites. Thus the syntax does not distinguish the προσήλυτος. In conclusion, the word choices in Greek for translating נִר in a relative clause modifying the agent are outside the semantic domain for sojourning in most cases. But since that is not true in every case, and the same syntax is used to describe the פֶּתוּחַ in some instances, it does not distinguish the προσήλυτος nor give unique meaning to the term in such contexts.

¹⁴ The passages that fit the pattern are: Exod 12:48,49; Lev 16:29, 17:10-13, 18:26, 19:33,34, 20:2; Num 9:14, 15:15-29, 19:10; Josh 20:9; Ezek 14:7.

3.2.2 *Dwelling*: The Greek word παρoικέω can mean both “to dwell” and “to dwell as a stranger,” just as the term גר in Hebrew.¹⁵ However, for all but two of those passages in which גר has the meaning of simply dwelling, the LXX translators chose words other than παρoικέω. The two occurrences of παρoικέω are Psalms 5 and 15, which support the inference that a diagnostic component of גר is dwelling. The LXX translators ask the question of who may dwell with the Lord through the use of παρoικέω. This also supports the conclusion that גר does not always carry the connotation of movement, further clarified by the selection of Greek terms in other semantic domains to translate גר when it simply means “to dwell.”¹⁶

A context which illustrates this conclusion is Jer 49-50. Jeremiah writes of judgment upon certain nations, namely Edom, Hazor, and Babylon respectively, and the LXX translators use ἐνοικέω, καθίζω, κατοικέω, παρoικέω interchangeably, all communicating the sense of dwelling.¹⁷ In all three situations the judgment is the same, that no one will live in the mentioned nation, neither will a son of man reside there. καθίζω is used in parallel with both κατοικέω and ἐνοικέω, but in chapter 50 Jeremiah uses κατοικέω instead of καθίζω to state the first part of the judgment. Since παρoικέω is used instead of κατοικέω once in the second part of the judgment, and κατοικέω had been

¹⁵Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1341-42, specifically define παρoικέω as dwelling beside or dwelling as a πάροικος, whom they define as either a neighbor or an alien/foreigner, 1342.

¹⁶ One such choice is σὺμβόσκομαι, meaning “to feed with” in Isa 11:6. The choice here seems obvious, as only in this case is the subject of גר an animal, and so with the availability of a word more specific to animal behavior that was a logical choice for semantic clarity. Support for this is the word choice in Isa 5:17, where the LXX keep animals as the subject throughout the verse instead of letting sojourners occur in parallel construction with lambs. We need to realize, however, that Isaiah may have had a specific reason for choosing גר to describe the peaceful co-existence of predator and prey under the reign of the Righteous Branch, but we can still acknowledge the logic of the LXX translators’ choice.

¹⁷ These could generally be understood on a spectrum from most to least transient: παρoικέω, ἐνοικέω, κατοικέω, καθίζω, with καθίζω having the same sense as יָשַׁב of dwelling being a meaning by extension, conveying one’s intention to settle down since sitting or causing to sit is the primary sense (Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1342, 571, 928, and 854).

used in place of καθίζω, we can conclude that all four words convey the same sense in this context. The judgments are given in succession and the interchange of words seems to cause no semantic confusion. This indicates that all four words are within the same semantic field, with differences among them as with the verbs in the semantic field with גר, but also with the possibility that they do share the diagnostic component of dwelling and so can be used to communicate such action.

Overall, it seems that the LXX translators recognized גר as being distributionally equivalent to παροικέω, but in certain cases where the sense could be more specifically conveyed other terms were chosen. This could be a result of more terms in Greek from which to choose than were available in Hebrew, and therefore a term with a more narrow lexical sense will most clearly convey the intended meaning.¹⁸

3.2.3 Journey: Of the 32 passages which communicate a sense of movement by use of the word גר, only nine of them have been translated into Greek with a verb other than παροικέω. This indicates that movement, or at least impermanence of settlement, is the primary sense of παροικέω. Every passage referring to the sojourn of the patriarchs calls their action παροικέω.

Highlighting some of those different Greek terms helps to illustrate semantic overlap. Concerning the Israelites in foreign territory, Elijah speaks of the widow in Zarephath as the one μεθ' ἧς ἐγὼ κατοικῶ, “with whom I am dwelling,” and three different verbs, ἐνοικέω, οικέω, and κατοικέω are used interchangeably in Jer 42-43, describing the remnant left in Jerusalem after the siege by Babylon who are

¹⁸ The exception in this category is the translation of גר in Isa 33:14, where the translators use ἀναγγέλλω to convey the sense of the fire being reported rather than being dwelt among. But this is an issue of interpretation, as they are communicating a different meaning of the passage rather than conveying the sense of the Hebrew with certain Greek terms.

contemplating a sojourn to Egypt. In those two chapters, גֵּר and יָשָׁב are used interchangeably in the Hebrew. This supports the previous assertion of semantic overlap between these verbs, and does not preclude transience or living as strangers, for both elements are clear from the context.

For the remaining verses in which the Hebrew describes the sojourning of Israelites in foreign territory¹⁹ the LXX translators have chosen a form of παρoικέω. This general tendency supports the conclusion that the primary sense of παρoικέω, as גֵּר, is dwelling as an impermanent resident, but the exceptions extend the caution that the meaning is dependent upon context.

Further support of dependence upon context is the translation of גֵּר where the referent is a foreigner in Israelite territory. Of the six passages, three of them are translated with a form of παρoικέω (Judg 19:16, 2 Kgs 8:1-2, and Isa 16:4), one has a semantically related term, διατρίβω, meaning to spend time²⁰ (Jer 35:7), and the other two are verbs in different semantic domains that reflect the translators interpretation of the context. In one (Isa 23:7), the translators use παραδίδωμι, communicating that Tyre had handed itself over to this distant place toward which its people migrated. The other passage (Isa 5:17) has already been explained, as it contains an animal referent just as Isa 11:6. We can see from the ways in which גֵּר was translated into the LXX that the translators paid attention to context and chose terms that would best communicate the sense of each discourse. There are indeed parallels between גֵּר and παρoικέω, indeed the lexical definitions based upon diagnostic components are identical, but the fact that a

¹⁹ As a reminder, they are: Deut 8:6, Judg 5:17, 17:7-9, 19:1, 19:16; Ruth 1:1, 2 Sam 4:3, 1 Chr 16:19; 2 Chr 15:9, Ezra 1:4; Ps 105:12, 120:5; Lam 4:15.

²⁰ Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 416. The verb can also mean, negatively, to delay, hinder, or thwart, but that is not in view in this context and so therefore not given as the lexical sense.

form of παροικέω was not chosen for every passage in which the Old Testament authors used a form of גר indicates that there was not complete overlap from one language to the next. As implied previously, it could also indicate a more extensive vocabulary in the receptor language, such that more specific vocabulary could be chosen. For these reasons, it is important to keep the differences in view as we examine occurrences of παροικέω in the New Testament.

3.3 Summary

Greek lexicons identify an agent-action relationship between πάροικος and παροικέω. Because this is the relationship of derivation recognized by Greek lexicographers and because παροικέω is the most frequently chosen verb to translate גר in the LXX, this will be the word pair of focus in studying sojourning vocabulary in the Greek New Testament. All Greek equivalents for Hebrew terms in the semantic domain of sojourning will be investigated in the New Testament, but we will also be following the agent-action relationship in order to see if and how it continues. Throughout the investigation, we must keep in mind that it is a semantic shift from Hebrew, in that πάροικος was the preferred term for תושב rather than גר. However, the basic diagnostic components of גר appear to be present in πάροικος. Therefore, we also must be cautious not to err on the side of drawing rigid distinctions.

The next chapter will examine προσήλυτος, ξένος, πάροικος, and παρεπίδημος as sojourning agents, and παροικέω as the act of sojourning.²¹ Since it appears from the lexical data in the LXX that παροικέω is the only Greek action word in the semantic domain of “sojourn” used in Scripture, the only possible agent-action relationship of

²¹The one term that will not be subjected to further analysis is γειώρας, because it is not used by the New Testament authors.

derivation is πάροικος from παροικέω. We can anticipate the agent terms contributing more to our understanding of the lexical sense of “sojourn” than the action terms because of the broader range of vocabulary, but we will need to examine the terms in their New Testament contexts in order to come to conclusions. It is to that task that we now turn. The ultimate goal of the analysis is to consider appropriate applications to believers today, who are still under this administration of the covenant between God and His people.

Chapter 4 – Sojourning Vocabulary in the New Testament: Semantic Continuity and Discontinuity

Throughout the Old Testament, there is an evident agent-action relationship of derivation between גַּר and גֵּר. Once those terms are translated into the LXX, an agent-action relationship still exists within the semantic domain of sojourning, but there is a semantic shift in terms. The agent-action relationship is communicated with the terms πάροιχος and παροικέω. In the LXX, forms of παροικέω typically translate forms of גֵּר, but πάροιχος typically translates חֵטֵב, which can refer generally to an individual born as a foreigner to Israel, but more specifically is distinguished from a גַּר as not entering into covenant relationship with Israel. Therefore, although the lexicons indicate a parallel relationship between גַּר/גֵּר and πάροιχος/παροικέω, we need to keep the semantic difference in view in order to accurately interpret the Scriptures.¹

Given the above observations, it is logical to examine the agent-action relationship of πάροιχος and παροικέω. However, πάροιχος is only used to translate גַּר twice in the Old Testament. Most often προσήλυτος is used, and occasionally ξένος. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the lexical sense of these terms in the New Testament and not to exclude them because they are not part of an agent-action relationship of derivation. The purpose of this study, as stated in chapter one, is to

¹ BDB 157-158; Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1342.

understand the meaning of sojourning vocabulary throughout Scripture and not to merely trace one particular type of semantic relationship.

Further, to focus only on the relationship of derivation in the New Testament would not be particularly fruitful, as there is an imbalance of agent-action occurrences; the agent is prominent, with various apparently synonymous terms, but the action is practically non-existent.² Perhaps one reason is that the sociological phenomenon of temporary dwelling has changed. However, minority groups experienced dispersion during the time of the Roman Empire. Another shift that became indirectly sociological was the changing demographic of the people of God. With the establishment of the Christian Church, becoming a member of the people of God no longer meant conversion to Judaism. The result of a change in lexical data shifts the task from analyzing an agent-action relationship to observing semantic differences in apparently synonymous terms and drawing inferences accordingly.³ Close examination reveals a relationship of inclusion, which will be evident as the lexical data is presented.

The action of sojourning will not be neglected in this chapter, but it will not occupy a prominent place in the analysis due to the scarcity of lexical data, and is primarily subsumed by the use of the noun *παροικία*, which means “a sojourn.”⁴ Rather, the lexical data lends itself to a field-oriented study of agent terms within the semantic domain of sojourning with a comparison of the exegetical findings. The degree of overlap between terms will be discernable through field-oriented analysis. There are two

² The action *παροικέω* is used only once in the Greek New Testament. In Luke 24:18, the two disciples on the road to Emmaus when they did not recognize Jesus and presumed him to be sojourning through the land and therefore unaware of the recent crucifixion.

³ There is one term in the semantic field, *προσέλυτος*, which shifts fields entirely in the New Testament. That will be explained in the examination of lexical data.

⁴ BDAG, 779; literally the stay of one who is not a citizen in the land in which he is staying.

distinct semantic fields that emerge with the vocabulary identified from the LXX. These are the fields of “convert” and “sojourner.” In the New Testament, there is no longer semantic overlap but rather complementary distribution, meaning there are no common contexts of usage.⁵ The details are examined below.

4.1 Convert

Although προσήλυτος was the most frequent translation term for נִכְּחִי in the LXX, its range of meaning narrows in the New Testament and it becomes a technical term for a convert to Judaism. Whereas προσήλυτος and other Greek translation terms for נִכְּחִי are sometimes used interchangeably in the LXX, προσήλυτος in the Greek New Testament is not once used interchangeably with other terms previously identified in the semantic field of sojourning.⁶ By contrast, the other terms are at times used interchangeably with one another in the New Testament.

In all four New Testament passages containing προσήλυτος, the referent is a convert to Judaism. First, Jesus condemns the Pharisees for converting someone to their own distorted perceptions.⁷ Although Old Testament Scripture indicates Gentiles more commonly seeking entrance into Israel than Jews seeking converts from among the Gentiles,⁸ John Nolland explains that Jewish literature does claim efforts to convert

⁵ For further information concerning relationships of synonymy, see chapter 1.3.1.

⁶ Those other terms are γειώρας, πάροικος, παρεπίδημος, and ξένος, although the first does not appear in the Greek New Testament, and so cannot be examined further in this chapter. For further explanation, particularly concerning the προσήλυτος not always being a foreigner to Israel, see Lev 19:34 and Deut 10:19. In those passages, Moses motivates compassion for the προσήλυτος by reminding the Israelites that they were προσήλυτοι in Egypt. Perhaps this was for the sake of maintaining the rationale of identification, although, based upon the exegetical data, it seems that during the time of the LXX translation προσήλυτος still had a broader denotation of “sojourner;” context was crucial for discerning conversion as a diagnostic component of the referent.

⁷ Matt 23:15.

⁸ According to God’s intention for the life of the Israelites as a light to the nations, Deut 4:1-8, and evidenced from the condition of the נִכְּחִי in ancient Israel, beginning with the “mixed multitude” that left

Gentiles despite contrary evidence; Jesus could be referring to such an event in this passage.⁹ It is also possible, however, given the dramatic nature of the language in the passage, that Jesus is speaking figuratively. Further, Scot McKnight concludes that although the Jews were “integrally related to the non-Jewish society in which they were related,” “...Judaism never developed a clear mission to the Gentiles that had as its goal the conversion of the world.”¹⁰ In either case, he is referring to a person who entered into Judaism by conversion.

The other three occurrences are in the book of Acts, and certain discourse markers make it clear that Luke is identifying converts to Judaism by his use of the term προσήλυτος. The first occurrence is 2:11. The narrative unit begins in verse five, with “Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem.” Thus all of the groups subsequently listed in the passage are Jews, either by birth or conversion, including the προσήλυτοι in verse 11. Second is the προσήλυτος listed among the selected deacons in 6:5. The chapter begins with the mention of a dispute among the Hellenistic Jews and the Hebrews, which indicates that the concept of a proselyte is still in the context of Judaism. As yet, the apostles had not expanded their witness beyond the Jews.

While expansion went next to the God-fearers, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, and this began with Cornelius as recorded in chapter 10, the mention of προσήλυτοι in 13:43 still refers to Jewish converts. There are both syntactical and theological reasons for this assertion. Regarding syntax, Paul addresses two distinct groups, “men of Israel and you

Egypt with the Isrealites (Exod. 12:48). The inclusion of the π into Israel by circumcision is further evidence. See chapter 2.1.1.

⁹ John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 933.

¹⁰ Scot McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 116-117. The investigation of this issue is beyond the scope of this study.

who fear God,” in a synagogue in Pisidian Antioch, recorded in 13:16; προσήλυτοι were considered full members of the present covenant community, per Old Testament teaching summarized in chapter two.¹¹ Therefore, while they may not have had land rights by lineage, they had full covenant privileges and would be included in “men of Israel.” By contrast, I. Howard Marshall explains that οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν were uncircumcised Gentiles who were therefore not considered members of the covenant people of God.¹² At this historical point in the spread of the gospel, only proselytes to Judaism were considered full converts. Members of the covenant community, therefore, were circumcised Jews who recognized Jesus as the promised Messiah. The narrative is moving toward the climactic turning point of the Jerusalem Council, where a foreigner who entered the covenant between God and Israel would no longer be distinguished by physical circumcision from those who remained outside, but as yet προσήλυτοι would not carry the connotation of including uncircumcised Gentile believers.

From the contexts described, it is clear that προσήλυτος had become a technical term for a convert to Judaism, and so the meaning had narrowed from its original sense in the LXX. Confirmation of this is the reference in Stephen’s speech to the captivity of the Israelites in Egypt. While the LXX translators call the Israelites προσήλυτοι in Egypt, Stephen calls them πάροις. This indicates that, whether or not the LXX translators were maintaining a parallel relationship between the Israelites in Egypt and the sojourner in their midst, the use of προσήλυτοι did not create any semantic confusion, even though the Israelites did not become converts to Egyptian culture during their captivity. But the fact that Stephen uses a different term indicates there would have been semantic

¹¹ See chapter 2.1.1.2.

¹² I. Howard Marshall, *Acts*, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 183.

confusion if he had used προσήλυτοι.¹³ This combined with the lexical data of προσήλυτος in its New Testament contexts point toward it being a technical term for convert to Judaism during New Testament times.

4.2 Sojourner: Synonymy in Syntagmatic Relationships

The other Greek terms used in the LXX to translate נָכְרִי contain both a relationship of distributional equivalence and a relationship of inclusion in the Greek New Testament.¹⁴ This is illustrated by the syntagms in Eph 2:19, 1 Pet 2:11, and Heb 11:13, which are syntactically parallel to נָכְרִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל in the Old Testament in that each passage uses a hendiadys to convey the identity of the referent.¹⁵ In Eph 2:19, it is ξένοι καὶ παρόικοι that describes the status of those once outside the covenant brought into it permanently. Although the passages represent three different authors, and we have noted the potential fallacy identified by D.A. Carson of disregarding authorial distinction, the lexical sense of the terms in context indicates their semantic overlap.¹⁶ The similarities in context will make that clear. In Heb 11:13, it is ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί that describes the perspective of those with faith in God upon the temporal reception of eternal promises. In 1 Pet 2:11, it is παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους that describes the rationale for avoiding destructive passions. In all three contexts, as will be subsequently explained, there is incompatibility between the referent and the setting, and by logical deduction the referent ought to remain excluded.

¹³ Stephen also uses πάροικος in the same speech to refer to Moses in the land of Midian. The LXX translators also used πάροικος, but its consistent use by Stephen indicates that the people of God who were distinct from surrounding neighbors and nations were understood as πάροικοι and not προσήλυτοι by Greek-speaking Jews in the first century.

¹⁴ For further information on relationships of synonymy, see chapter 1.3.1.

¹⁵ See chapter 2.1.1.1.2.3.

¹⁶ For further information, see chapter 1.2.

With regard to Eph 2:19, the result is the scandalous nature of the gospel, which gives those who were not seeking entrance and conversion into the people of God a permanent position and inheritance. Even the προσήλυτος under the Old Covenant did not have an inheritance with Israel; he had access to the means of prosperity, but only to serve a redemptive function for a period of time.¹⁷ Even though he was to be treated as a full member of Israel, he did not share in the tribal inheritance since he was not born into the line of Israel. By contrast, with his chosen terminology Paul reminds the Gentile Christians that they were outside the covenant and yet are now brought near to God through the blood of Christ.

The ξένοι καὶ πάροιχοι were further outside than a προσήλυτος, for they were uncircumcised. The background for this group are the Old Testament contexts containing נָכְרִי and חֹשֶׁב, two Hebrew terms translated in the LXX as ξένος and πάροιχος respectively.¹⁸ These were excluded because they had not submitted to the covenant requirements and therefore posed a threat to Israel's commitment to serve the Lord exclusively. Any introduction of idolatry or immorality was excluded from the cultic life of Israel, and typically the נָכְרִי and חֹשֶׁב represented people who had neither pledged allegiance to the Lord and His people through the covenant rite of circumcision nor submitted themselves to the Mosaic law, although the חֹשֶׁב was more often shown hospitality.¹⁹ This is evident in Paul's explanation of the miracle of God's saving grace bestowed on those "being estranged from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise" (Eph 2:12) because they were "called 'uncircumcision' by what is called 'circumcision.'" But the circumcision made without hands has come

¹⁷ Lev 25:47. For further explanation, see chapter 2.1.1.1.2.

¹⁸ See chapter 3.1.4 for a distinction between ξένος and ἀλλότριος.

¹⁹ For further explanation, see chapter 2.2.2 and 2.2.5.

through Christ, and thus those who previously were excluded are now included by means of grace through faith in His death and resurrection.²⁰ This is the reason for the acknowledgement by the Jerusalem Council, recorded in Acts 15, that it was no longer necessary for someone to submit to physical circumcision as a sign of conversion. This distinction between a convert to Judaism and a convert to Christianity is the key to semantic disunity with regard to προσήλυτος between the Old and New Testaments.

In contrast to the Gentile believers in Eph 2:19, the referent of ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι in Heb 11:13 is the Old Testament believer who trusted in the faithfulness of God to keep His promises. Specifically named prior to their identification as ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι are Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Sarah, followed by a host of others named and unnamed beginning in verse 20. In this context of faith in God's covenant promises, those who lived according to this trust by faithful obedience are called ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι with regard to the temporal fulfillment of those promises. They are outside the paradigm of fulfillment indicated by accomplishment within one's lifetime because they participate in the means toward a greater end that spans the entire course of human history and extends beyond.

Interestingly, Peter's choice of words appears redundant on the surface, but actually confirms the hypothesis of distributional equivalence in syntagmatic relationships between παρεπίδημος and πάροικος, with these terms subsumed under the more general lexical sense of ξένος. Diagnostically, ξένος conveys a more general sense of "strange," whereas παρεπίδημος and πάροικος denote a specific type of person, namely

²⁰ Cf. Col 2:11.

a sojourner, strange to his environment.²¹ However, the contexts examined have indicated that New Testament authors used ξένος in conjunction with either παρεπίδημος or πάροικος to convey together the sense of a sojourner, estranged from the setting of the discourse in some manner. This is reflective of the use of גר וְחוֹשֵׁב as a hendiadys in the Old Testament. The diagnostic component of being foreign-born complements the lexical sense of ξένος in that it conveys the sense of always being identifiable as one who at least began as a stranger to the group which he entered. Further, παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους is the same phrase used by the LXX translators to convey Abraham's identity as גר־וְחוֹשֵׁב among the Hittites.²² Perhaps Peter is drawing a connection here, as these are the only two occurrences of this Greek phrase in the Old and New Testaments. Just as Abraham had not yet received the promised inheritance and so was a sojourner in the same land that would be received by his descendents, the Christians to whom Peter writes are sojourners upon the earth, the land Jesus promised to his people.²³

Peter identifies his audience as ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, “chosen sojourners,” which reinforces the synonymy between the terms πάροικος and παρεπίδημος, for he is strongly urging his audience whom he loves, “ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ,” to abstain from destructive passions in light of their identity, which is παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, namely ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις. Further support for semantic consistency is Peter's use of παροικίας to identify the idea of sojourning in 1:17.²⁴ The term παρεπίδημος occurs only these two times in 1 Peter, once in Heb 11:13, and as a translation for גֵּר in Gen 23:4. Given its meaning in context, and the fact that πάροικος is the common translation

²¹ Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1189, 1337, 1342.

²² Gen 23:4. See the discussion in chapter 3.1.3.

²³ Matt 5:5; Rom 4:13.

²⁴ Paul uses the same term to describe the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, Acts 13:17.

for חֹשֶׁב, it is reasonable to infer that the terms are distributionally equivalent and convey the sense of “sojourner.” The people of God have been called out to live in a world that embraces practices which are contrary to the direction God intends for His people and so they are exhorted to remain strange to these ways.

From the analysis of these phrases, we can see the overlap between ξένος, παροίκους, and παρεπιδήμους, as well as the distributional equivalence of παροίκους and παρεπιδήμους. Every context of πάροικος and παρεπίδημος has been mentioned and analyzed. However, the examined uses of ξένος have all been in syntagmatic relationship with either πάροικος or παρεπίδημος. Attention needs to be paid to its use as a single lexeme in other New Testament contexts, in order to determine if its lexical sense varies with context, as חֹשֶׁב juxtaposed with נָח has a distinct lexical sense from its use alone in the Hebrew Scriptures.²⁵

4.3 ξένος: A broader semantic category

The uses of ξένος independent of πάροικος or παρεπίδημος show continuity in lexical sense from the Old Testament as a translation of נָכְרִי primarily and נָח once.²⁶ First, it simply means those who are outsiders in a community. This is clear from Matt 27:7, in which the silver given to Judas for betraying Jesus is used to purchase a burial plot for τοῖς ξένοις. This confirms that they were outside the covenant people Israel, for they had no land in which to bury their dead. The other instance with this meaning is Acts 17:21, in which the ξένοι were foreigners in Athens. Second, while still referring to outsiders, the focus is on their need for mercy from the one challenged to show hospitality. Bruce Malina in Colin Kruse’s commentary on the Epistles of John, remarks that the nature of

²⁵ For further explanation, see chapter 2.2.2.

²⁶ For further explanation, see chapter 2.2.5.

hospitality is kindness extended toward strangers,²⁷ which aligns with Jesus' teaching that mercy extended toward the ξένος was a mark of true discipleship. This mercy toward the stranger is hospitality, and a Scriptural example of its embodiment is Gaius' reputation for his behavior toward τοῦτο ξένους in his community.²⁸ As was mentioned in Chapter 3.1.2, the ξένος could also be the host, as Paul refers to his host as “ὁ ξένος μου” in Rom 16:23. Finally, the referent can not only be a foreign person but a foreign god or substance.²⁹ The record of Paul's visit to Athens in Acts chapter 17 states that the Athenians speculated Paul advocating the worship of ξένων δαιμονίων (“foreign deities”),³⁰ and Peter admonishes his audience to recognize that trials are not to be received ὡς ξένου (“as foreign”), for they are actually part of the Christian experience rather than foreign to it.³¹ Based upon this data, we can see that the meaning of ξένος retains its lexical sense in syntagmatic relationships with πάροις and παρεπίδημος, and also gives a nuance to the referent that might not be evident from πάροις or παρεπίδημος alone.

4.4 Conclusions and Implications

As a result of analyzing the lexical data surrounding the contexts and semantic fields of נָכַר and נָכַר, as well as the Greek equivalents, several conclusions can be drawn and applications inferred. Some of these conclusions and applications illustrate

²⁷ Matt 25:35-44. Bruce J. Malina, in Colin Kruse, *The Letters of John*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), explains that hospitality, as understood in the world of the New Testament, was extended to strangers, for it was “the process by means of which the outsider's status is changed from stranger to guest” (215). Thus it was reciprocated not by persons, for a guest is no longer a stranger, but by communities (Ibid.).

²⁸ 3 John 1:5.

²⁹ This parallels the meaning of נָכַר. See chapter 2.2.5 for further explanation.

³⁰ Acts 17:18.

³¹ 1 Pet 4:12, cf. Matt 5:10-12.

continuity of the semantics across the Old and New Testaments, while others indicate discontinuity with the expanding demographics of the people of God.

The elements of continuity and discontinuity are intertwined in each concluding point. First of all, New Covenant Christians have the same position before God as the Israelites under the Old Covenant. It is a secure relationship characterized by grace and initiated by God through deliverance. The Israelites were exhorted to remember their status in Egypt, for they had been rescued and this memory ought to engender gratitude reflected in love toward God and neighbor. It not only closes the gap between the sojourner and the Israelite by “depicting the [sojourner] as a person who now occupies the position that their forbears had,”³² but also requires a reflection and retelling in order to shape and perpetuate their ethic.³³

This crucial role of memory in fostering faithful obedience continues for God’s people. We have been delivered from darkness and death and brought into relationship with our gracious host.³⁴ As underscored in Chapter 2, sections 2.1.1.1.2.1 and 2.2.2, the Israelites had an advantage over the foreigners in their midst because of their access to land and therefore a means of economic prosperity. Moses repeatedly reminded the Israelites that they were to behave mercifully because the situation had been reversed in Egypt and the Lord had delivered them from oppression in order to bring them into freedom characterized by His rule over their lives. Reminders of God’s character, faithfulness, and promises “stimulate the response of gratitude and obedience consistent with such undeserved favor.”³⁵ By contrast, disobedience begins with forgetting.

³² Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, 54.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Col 1:13-14.

³⁵ Christopher J. Wright, *An Eye for An Eye*, 27.

Forgetting leads to a lack of gratitude and then to disobedience, which jeopardizes the relationship, not because we gain God's favor by obedience but our obedience reflects the character of God. This enables His light to spread to the nations and thus His kingdom expands as others submit their lives to His authority. We do well to remember that God has set His love upon us and offered us the way of life simply because of His own gracious intention.

This leads to the second point, namely the call to hospitality as a mark of holiness. Jesus clearly carries this through, and though most New Covenant believers are ethnically those who were outside Israelite lineage, once we are brought into the people of God we are exhorted to share the love which has been set upon us and indwells us; that is, we are to live a life in keeping with our baptism. Recall the power imbalance, discussed in Chapter 2.1.1.1.2.1, between those born of Israelite lineage, and thus entitled to a land inheritance, and those outside. Hospitality balances power because it offers to the one in need access to resources necessary for prosperity. Eternal access and acceptance has been granted by Christ. Once we become His we become stewards of all that is His. By means of hospitality, we invite others into that same access and acceptance, to both belong to Christ and to participate in His redemptive work in the world. We can offer help from a distance and simply give in the direction of another, but this is not hospitality. Hospitality offers life, and so it must involve the sharing of life. Therefore, whether we are the ethnic native or foreigner, we are the spiritual sojourner with God, knowing that He is our gracious host and that our temporal setting is to be tended in such a way that the holiness of the God who compels our movement and has secured our relationship with

Him is reflected in our lives.³⁶ As a result, we offer hospitality in every realm of life, be it for physical, emotional, intellectual, or political needs, with the aim of drawing those yet far off into the same covenant relationship in which we flourish.

Our reflection of God's holy character confirms our identity as ones who recognize human dignity and thereby reflect the love of God to the nations, which is a catalyst for their submission to His rule in their lives. This is concretely demonstrated in acknowledging the potentially vulnerable position of those who are not native-born, even more emphatically for the greater purpose of bringing all into covenant relationship with God because we who were ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι have been brought near by the blood of Christ. While the distinctions are no longer simply between the native-born and foreigner, they do not exclude ethnic distinctions. The help given to any who are strangers among a community of God's people or to a community estranged from God is mutual, because it is help for those in need and growth in godliness for those who offer help. As Jonathan Magonet asserts, speaking specifically of the Old Testament context, that "the גֵר...gives something to us,...opens up our own latent generosity,...broadens our sense of humanity, [and] challenges our insularity and selfishness."³⁷ This can be said for any ξένος in our midst or to whom we take the gospel, and the goal has been enlarged, as such individuals are invited not only to join in covenant privileges and responsibilities, but also to partake in an eternal inheritance through faith in the death and resurrection of Christ for the atonement of their sins.

³⁶ Recall the summary of exegetical findings recorded in chapter 2.1.2.3, namely that the act of sojourning recorded in the Old Testament was consistently initiated by a source outside the sojourner rather than the sojourner himself. Further, the exegetical details pointed to the conclusion, recorded in chapter 2.3, that "the dwelling and movement of one who is sojourning is externally compelled, relying on the stability of relationships which will sustain the sojourner rather than stability of circumstances or one's own volition, and these factors distinguish it from other field-related terms," 34.

³⁷ Jonathan Magonet, "Guests and Hosts," *Heythrop Journal* 36 (1995): 420.

In addition to this expansion of inheritance, there is a shift from the Old Covenant to the New in the direction of the growth of God's people. The foreign-born in the ancient Near East could come into covenant relationship with the God of Israel by submitting to the covenant rite of circumcision included in the Mosaic law. As mentioned previously, the Council in Jerusalem confirmed that with the salvation secured by Christ and offered to the nations, one born outside the covenant need not convert to Judaism to be included. Further, the focus is no longer on outsiders seeking to convert and join the covenant community but rather members of the covenant community going to the nations and extending the call to those who have not necessarily sought membership.

What a deepening of gratitude when we understand more about the place of the sojourner in ancient Israel, and then see how much more has the one farther outside than the proselyte, which is us who were far off, been brought near to God by the blood of Christ. This understanding that deepens our gratitude generates an awe which fuels the desire to participate in the call of Jesus who has all authority to command us to "go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that [he has] commanded [us]," remembering that he is with us always, "to the end of the age."³⁸ Let us, therefore, remember our deliverance and live with such gratitude that we honor our Lord by reflecting His holiness in extending hospitality to all yet to be redeemed.

³⁸ Matt 28:18-20 (ESV).

Bibliography

- Archer, Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1994.
- Arsen, Bernhard A. "From Acceptance to Inclusion: The Stranger in Old Testament Tradition." In *Christianity and the Stranger*, ed. Francis W. Nichols, 16-35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Balz Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- _____. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Bauer, Walter., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Block, Daniel. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Bratcher, Robert G., and W.D. Rayburn. *A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Psalms*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1991.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Regency Reference Library, 1986.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Carr, William W. "Charity Under the Covenant as a Reminder of Redemption." *Concordia Journal* 24 (1998): 357-370.
- Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 6a. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001.

- Cole, H.R. "The Sabbath and the Alien." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38 (2000): 223-229.
- Cotterell, Peter, and Max Turner. *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989.
- De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Its Institutions*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1961.
- Douglas, Mary. "Justice as the Cornerstone: An Interpretation of Leviticus 18-20." *Interpretation* 53 (1999): 341-350.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham, ed. *A New Concordance of the Old Testament Using the Hebrew and Aramaic Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker and Ridgefield, 1984.
- Gibson, Arthur. *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis*. New York: Sheffield Press, 2001.
- Gottwald, Norman. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897/1906.
- Heim, Knut. "Coreferentiality, Structure, and Context in Proverbs 10:1-5." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 6:3 (1993): 183-209.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2000.
- Kittel, Gerhard. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. Translated under M.E.J Richardson, ed. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Kruse, Colin. *The Letters of John*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

- Lee, J.A.L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Longman, Tremper III. *Literary Interpretations to Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1987.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Lyons, J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Magonet, Jonathan. "Guests and Hosts." *Heythrop Journal* 36 (1995): 409-421.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Acts*. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
- McKnight, Scot. *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Meek, Theophile James. "The Translation of GER in the Hextateuch and Its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49:2 (1930): 172-180.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Alien in Your Midst," *Bible Review* 11 (December, 1995): 18-48.
- Moucarry, Georges C. Translated by Joye Smith. "The Alien According to the Torah," *Themelios* 14 (October-November 1988): 17-20.
- Nida, Eugene. *Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Ollenburger, Ben C. "Jubilee: The Land is Mine; You Are Aliens and Tenants With Me." In *Reclaiming the Old Testament: Essays in Honour of Waldemar Janzen*, ed. Gordon Zerbe, 208-234. Winnipeg: CMBC Publications, 2001.
- Pilch, John J. "Citizen." *Bible Today* 39 (2001): 43-47.
- Quitslund, Sonya A. "The Alien Among You." *Bible Today* 26 (1988): 80-86.

- Rendtorff, Rolf. "The Gēr in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch." In *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett, 77-89. Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1983.
- Sklar, Jay. *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- Spina, Frank Anthony. "Israelites as Gērîm, 'Sojourners,' in Social and Historical Context." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Carol Meyers and M. O'Connor, 321-333. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Ullman, Stephen. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
- VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997.
- Van Houten, Christiana. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Waltke, Bruce, and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*. Edited by D.W. Gooding. London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Wiseman, Donald J. *1 and 2 Kings: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Wigram, George V. *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Wright, Christopher J. *An Eye for an Eye: The Place of Old Testament Ethics Today*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983.