

26. ■ Kozlovic, A. K., "Hidden Biblical Characters in Popular Film: A Preliminary Survey of Four Categories of Sacred Subtext," *Counterpoints* (2002) 53–62. [Available at [http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/projects/counterpoints/Proc\\_2002/Pdf/A7.pdf](http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/projects/counterpoints/Proc_2002/Pdf/A7.pdf); accessed March 21, 2014] ■ McBride, J., *Searching for John Ford: A Life* (New York 2003).

Patrick Brereton

## Forehead

In the prophetic literature, the forehead often indicates the stubbornness of the people of Israel. In Isa 48:4 and Ezek 3:7–9 the people are said to have foreheads compared to hard materials that make them unyielding. Jeremiah 3:3 also uses the forehead to indicate the people's stubbornness, but here it appears in connection with a prostitute too obstinate to admit her mistakes.

Ezekiel also uses forehead in a second way; in Ezek 9:4 the people who are to be saved from slaughter are marked on their foreheads. Similar imagery appears in Rev 13:16, where the second beast marks everyone upon their foreheads, and again in Rev 17:5, where the whore of Babylon bears her name upon her forehead.

Genesis 4:15 refers to the "sign" or "mark" of Cain which protects him from those who might kill him. Later interpreters, such as Rashi, maintain that the "sign" appears on Cain's forehead (cf. Ezek 9:4–6; *TJ* on Gen 4:15, which places the sign on Cain's face).

Christopher Clarke

See also → Cain, Mark of; → Head

## Foreigner

- I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
- II. Greco-Roman Antiquity
- III. New Testament
- IV. Judaism
- V. Christianity
- VI. Islam
- VII. Literature
- VIII. Film

### I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

The HB has several different terms for the "foreigner." Coming closest are those deriving from the root *n-k-r* (verb. denom. *nākar* "act/treat as foreign"; cf. Akk. *nakāru* G "to become different/strange/hostile"): *nokri* ("foreign/er," "strange/r")/*nokriyā* ("foreign woman") and *nēkār* (lit. "that which is foreign": "foreign/er," "strange/r")/*ben-nēkār* ("foreigner"). The *zār* ("stranger") and *ʿiššā zārā* ("strange woman"), deriving from the root *zūr* II "to be strange," fall into the same field, whereas the "sojourner" (*gēr*; see Bultmann, Ramírez Kidd), the foreign "nation/s" (*gōy/īm*; sometimes translated "gentiles"), and the prophetic oracles against the

nations are special cases and have to be treated separately. This is also the case for the "strange woman" (*ʿiššāzārā*, *nokriyā*) mentioned in Prov 1–9.

The foreigner normally is a single person staying among the Israelites for a certain time, mostly connected to Israel on economical grounds, and does not enjoy special protections (as, e.g., the sojourner does, cf. Bultmann: 92–102). This is illustrated by the corresponding laws. According to Exod 12:43, no foreigner (*kol-ben-nēkār*) shall eat from the Passover (in cultic matters, the *zār* in priestly and post-priestly law is also unthinkable, see Lev 22; Num 17; etc.). Deuteronomy 14:21 places the foreigner on the "soziale Stufenleiter" ("social step ladder"; Spieckermann: 87):

You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; [but] you may give it to aliens (*gēr*) residing in your towns for them to eat, or you may sell it to a foreigner (*nokri*). For you are a people holy to the Lord your God.

The foreigner is excluded from the holy people of Israel (*ʿam qādōš*, cf. Deut 7:6); he is in no need of special benefits. The same is true for the remission of debts (Deut 15:1–3): The foreigner is clearly separated from the neighbor and the "brother/member of the community" (*ʿāḥ*); he is no *persona misera* (cf. also Gen 17; 31). Therefore, he also can be charged interest on his loan (Deut 23:19–20 [MT 23:20–21]). In this context, the foreigner is not primarily seen as hostile (Spieckermann: 87f.; also cf. Prov *passim*).

The motif as such is hardly found in biblical narrations, with the important exception of Ezra 9–10; Neh 13 (see Pakkala: 212–24; Wright: 212, 242). The intermarriages with foreign women (*nāšim nokriyôt*) are regarded as trespasses against the Lord (cf. Solomon and his women in 1 Kgs 11:1) and have to be dissolved. This obviously corresponds with the late Deuteronomistic prohibition of marriages with the pre-inhabitants of the land leading to serving "other Gods": Deut 7:3–4, cf. 1 Kgs 11:8 (Deut 29; 31). These texts mirror the late postexilic diaspora situation of the Israelites (also cf. Mal 2:10–16). Foreigners are a constant threat for Israel, especially in the 5th to 3rd centuries BCE (Kaiser: 50–52).

The prophetic texts stress the hostile aspect of the foreigner (e.g., Isa 1:7, Hos 7:9; 8:3, 7) and are more or less representative of the ANE (in detail see Zehnder: 48–278; 542–54). The oracles against the nations (as, e.g., Isa 13–23; Jer 46–51 [MT]; Ezek 25–32; Amos 1–2) accordingly predict doom for Israel's enemies. But foreign people and their leaders can also be seen as instruments of God against his own people (see Cyrus in Second Isaiah). Yet eschatologically, the foreigner is seen in different ways (cf. Zehnder: 499–541): Israel will no longer serve strangers or foreigners (Jer 30:8–9). Rather, the foreign people will serve the Lord (and/or the Israelites), bringing their tribute (Isa 49:14–

26; 60 see “Gentiles”); a strong separation from the “unclean” foreigners can be made (Isa 52:1–2). On the other hand, more “inclusive” texts express the hope of the foreigner to be incorporated in the eschatological people of Israel (Isa 14:1; 56:1–8; Ezek 47:23). Along these lines, the texts mentioning an eschatological “pilgrimage of the peoples” to Zion (Mic 4:1–5=Isa 2:2–4; 60; 66:20 etc.) are to be placed, most likely, also 1 Kgs 8:41–43. Historically, in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, the time of these decisions for or against foreign elements and foreigners had to be made (see “Antiochus IV Epiphanes”; Kaiser: 60–62), as reflected in the qumranic and apocalyptic literature on the one hand and in the moderate, Hellenistic influenced literature like Ben Sira on the other.

**Bibliography:** ■ Bultmann, C., *Der Fremde im antiken Juda* (FRLANT 153; Göttingen 1992). ■ Kaiser, O., “Von Ortsfremden, Ausländern und Proselyten: Vom Umgang mit den Fremden im Alten Testament,” in id., *Mensch und Geschichte* (BZAW 413; Berlin/New York 2010) 41–62. ■ Lang, B./H. Ringgren, “nkr/nēkār/nokrī,” *ThWAT* 5 (Stuttgart 1986) 454–63; ET: id., “nkr/nēkār/nokrī,” *TDOT* 9 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1998) 423–29. ■ Pakkala, J., *Ezra the Scribe* (BZAW 347; Berlin/New York 2004). ■ Ramírez Kidd, J. E., *Alterity and Identity in Israel* (BZAW 283; Berlin/New York 1999). ■ Snijders, L. A., “zur/zār,” *ThWAT* 2 (Stuttgart 1977) 556–64; ET: id., “zur/zār,” *TDOT* 4 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1981) 52–58. ■ Spieckermann, H., “Die Stimme des Fremden im Alten Testament,” in id., *Gottes Liebe zu Israel* (FAT 2/33; Tübingen 2004) 84–99. ■ Wright, J. L., *Rebuilding Identity* (BZAW 348; Berlin/New York 2005). ■ Zehnder, M., *Umgang mit Fremden in Israel und Assyrien* (BWANT 168; Stuttgart 2005).

Peter Porzig

## II. Greco-Roman Antiquity

As Virgil observed, foreign nations in the Greco-Roman world were characterized by a wide diversity of languages and customs:

The conquered nations walked in a long procession with language as diverse as their clothing and armor. (Virgil, *Aen.* 8.722–23)

The different populations of the Greco-Roman world constructed and experienced their own identities and the identities of “others” in and through literature, oral lore, experience, and material culture. Foreign nations and peoples (common designations: *natio*, *barbarus*, ἔθνος, and βάρβαρος) were most readily identified and labeled by appearance, language, behavior, religion, and ancestral home. Viewed from Greece and Rome, the foreigners par excellence dwelt at the outer extremes of the inhabited world and in the fertile imagination of legend (e.g., Hyperboreans; Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.13; cf. Skinner). Responses to new ideas and customs varied greatly across time and space (e.g., foreign cults in the city of Rome; cf. Orlin). Contact and exchange among differing groups operated on a complex sliding side from rejection to assimilation. Simple rhetorical polarities (e.g., Greeks and barbarians) were

much more complicated in actuality. Rarely, if ever, was cultural interaction unidirectional (Woolf). Both the conqueror and the conquered were, in some sense, transformed. Geographical descriptors (e.g., “Egyptian”) did not have the same meaning across the Mediterranean world. Signal moments – often marked by military conflict or other crisis – created, redefined, and ensconced the barriers of inclusion and exclusion (e.g., the conflict between Greece and Persia in the 5th cent. BCE). These barriers were more porous in some locations. Stereotypes, ethnic shorthand, did inform the marketplace (e.g., purchase of slaves) and the battlefield (e.g., the Egyptianizing of Antony by Octavian). However, the modern pseudo-scientific notion of “race” and its pejorative expression, “racism,” do not find an exact parallel in the Greco-Roman period. Ethnographic descriptions presented a mixed and nuanced presentation of “others” (e.g., the portrayal of Gauls in Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Caesar, and Ammianus Marcellinus). Unmitigated negative portrayal of foreigners was the exception. Geographic placement and climate offered some explanation for human variation (e.g., Hippocrates, *On Airs, Waters, and Places* 12–24). The discovery or invention of a shared ancestry created a (fictive) kinship around a common cultural heritage that obfuscated apparent dissimilarity (e.g., the legend of Perseus).

**Bibliography:** ■ Gruen, E. S. (ed.), *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Los Angeles, Calif. 2011). ■ Gruen, E. S., *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton, N.J. 2011). ■ Hall, E., *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford 1989). ■ Hall, J. M., *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge/New York 2000). ■ Isaac, B., *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, N.J. 2004). ■ McCoskey, D. E., *Race: Antiquity & Its Legacy* (Oxford 2012). ■ Orlin, E. M., *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire* (Oxford 2010). ■ Skinner, J., *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford/New York 2012). ■ Woolf, G., *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge 2000). ■ Woolf, G., *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West* (Chichester 2011).

Trevor W. Thompson

## III. New Testament

The NT uses several words to express the notion of “foreigner” when the closely-related “Gentile” (ἔθνος or ἑθνικός) or “Greek” (Ἕλληνας) would be inappropriate. In Luke 17:18, Jesus refers to a Samaritan as a “foreigner” (ἀλλογενής). Samaritans were not considered by Jews to be Gentiles but were rather regarded as being of mixed race (Josephus, *Ant.* 9.277–91) or “doubtful stock” (*mQid* 4:3). In Acts 7:6, πάροικος (“resident foreigner”) occurs in a citation of Gen 15:13–14: “God spoke in these terms, that his descendants would be resident aliens in a country belonging to others.” As Israel is the subject, “Gentile” would make no sense here. In Acts 17:21, Luke remarks that “all the Athenians

and the foreigners (ξένοι) living [or: visiting] there would spend their time in nothing except telling or hearing something new." Here the stress is not on the ethnic make-up of the group envisaged or its non-Jewish character but its diverse nature: Athens is host to many immigrants and/or visitors, that is, non-citizens. In 1 Cor 14:11, in a discussion of tongues, Paul writes: "If then I do not know the meaning of a sound, I will be a foreigner (βάρβαρος) to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner (βάρβαρος) to me." The point is that people of different languages do not understand one another. "Foreigner" expresses this; "Gentile" would not. The same holds for 1 Cor 14:21, where Paul quotes Isa 28:11–12: "By people of strange tongues and by the lips of foreigners (ἑτέρων) I will speak to this people; yet even then they will not listen to me." In Heb 11:34, the author commends those who put the armies of foreigners (ἄλλοτριών) to flight. It is unclear to what exactly this refers, but it may matter that ἄλλοτριος occurs often in 1 Macc, which features battles won with divine aid (1:38, 44; 2:7; 3:36; 6:13; 15:33).

In all of the foregoing texts, the concept of "foreigner" does not carry theological weight. It is otherwise in Eph 2:19 and 1 Pet 2:11, where πάροικος is used figuratively of Christians. In the first text, Christians are no longer foreigners because they now belong to the household of God. In the latter text, which borrows from Gen 23:4 and Ps 39:13, they remain foreigners because they are not at home in the surrounding society (cf. Heb 11:13).

**Bibliography:** ■ Elliott, J. H., *A Home for the Homeless* (Eugene, Oreg. 2005). ■ Stählin, G., "ξένος κτλ.," TDNT 5 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1967) 1–36.

Dale C. Allison, Jr.

#### IV. Judaism

■ Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism ■ Rabbinic and Medieval Judaism

##### A. Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism

Hellenistic Jews both in the Diaspora and also within Palestine lived amid foreigners, represented by a broad range of terms. The typical Hebrew terms *ben-(han) nekār* or *nokri*, as well as *zār*, are most variably represented in the LXX as ἄλλογενής (e.g., Isa 56:3, 6; Exod 12:43), ἄλλοτριος (e.g., Deut 15:3; Lev 10:1), and also ξένος (e.g., Ruth 2:10) (Stählin: 8). The Hebrew *gēr* or "resident alien" is generally represented by the LXX πάροικος (e.g., Deut 14:21; Schmidt/Schmidt: 844).

Second Maccabees 4:13's description of Greek attempts to hellenize Jerusalem and the temple conveys a sense of trepidation and even hostility toward foreigners. Subsequent subjugation under Roman rule does not generate any better results. *Psalms of Solomon* 17:28 retaliates with a proclamation that foreigners will essentially be expunged from the land. Similarly, the *War Scroll* describes an

eschatological war after which the rule of the Kitim (*mmšlt ktyym*), commonly understood to represent the Romans, will be no more (1QM I, 1–7). These textual sentiments are rooted in hard evidence. While Josephus describes the exclusion using alternate terminology (e.g., ἀλλόφυλος; J.W. 5.194), the well-known Jerusalem temple inscription itself lists the ἄλλογενής as the one who is prohibited temple court access beyond the balustrade. The purpose for these negative views is summed up by Philo, whose *De vita contemplativa* exemplifies his condemnation of Egyptian animal gods (8) and the extravagant lifestyle of the Greeks (57–64), in favor of the God-abiding and aesthetic ways of the Therapeutae (64–90).

However, other texts demonstrate another view of the foreigner, a view which suggests tempered coexistence and liaison. For example, temple sacrifices could be made by foreigners (Josephus, J.W. 5.17). Many texts also describe conversions of foreigners, such as Achior (Jdt 14:10), Aseneth (*Jos. Asen.* 15), and even Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 9:17). The προσήλυτος (e.g., Deut 26:12, 13) may represent a proselyte to Judaism, or may not, depending on which nuance the term holds within the LXX (Cohen: 121). Despite his above-noted reservations concerning foreigners, Philo himself refers to the acceptance of proselytes (*Spec.* 1.51; 1.308–10).

**Bibliography:** ■ Baumgarten, J. M., "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I," *JJS* 33/1–2 (1982) 215–25. ■ Cohen, S., *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley, Calif. 1999). [Heb.] ■ Schmidt, K. L./M.A. Schmidt, "πάροικος, παροικία, παροικίεω," TDNT 5 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1967) 841–53. ■ Stählin, G., "ξένος κτλ.," TDNT 5 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1967) 1–36.

Carmen Palmer

##### B. Rabbinic and Medieval Judaism

The primary biblical terms used to designate the foreigner, *nokhri*, *nokhriyah*, *zar*, and *zarah*, are part of the rabbinic lexicon as well (with *nokhriyah* being supplanted almost entirely by *nokhrit*; see further on). In the rabbinic period a *nokhri* is a foreigner simply by virtue of not being a Jew. Increasingly the Gentile was coming to be seen in this era as ontologically distinct and therefore inherently "foreign"; the ethnic and national differences were therefore becoming irrelevant to constructing the identity of the "foreigner." An expression of this transformation was the emergence of a formal conversion ceremony allowing members of other ethnic groups to assume (almost) complete Jewish identity. *Nokhri* is also never a collective noun, in contrast to biblical usage. This and the previously mentioned semantic shifts are paralleled by a similar transformation of the meaning of *goi* (see "Gentiles").

A vivid illustration of these parallel developments is the following rabbinic interpretation of the prohibition of selling one's Hebrew maidser-

vant to an *‘am nokhri* (Exod 21:8). The referent of this phrase is clearly either a foreign people or, as Nahum Sarna suggests in his commentary to Exodus, any family clan other than the maidservant’s own kin. However, an anonymous midrashist reads the verse as an admonition against selling the maidservant to a *goi* i.e., a Gentile (*MekhY Nezikin* 3). *‘Am nokhri* is apparently being translated as “any and all members of a foreign people,” i.e., a Gentile – and thus the biblical *nokhri* becomes synonymous here with the rabbinic *goi*.

Deuteronomy 17:15, which prohibits an *ish nokhri*, a foreigner, from serving as Israel’s monarch is similarly reinterpreted. The Mishnah (*mSot* 7:8) relates that Agrippa I, upon reading this verse at a public assembly, saw it as denying legitimacy to his reign as Judea’s monarch and he began to cry. Those assembled reassured Agrippa, declaring, “You are our brother! You are our brother!” As a native of Judea, Agrippa was indisputably a *iudaios* and not a foreigner. Therefore his concern could only have been genealogical; as a descendant of the “half-Jew” Herod the Great his status as a Jew could be seen, and perhaps was seen by some, as questionable. He was reassured by the populace that he was their “brother” i.e., they regarded him as a fellow Jew.

There are a few instances of *nokhri* denoting a stranger. Thus for example, on his deathbed R. Judah the Patriarch instructs that no *nokhri* is to touch his bier but rather only those who served him in his lifetime (*BerR* 96:5). Clearly the contrast here is between confidant and stranger, not Jew and Gentile.

The feminine form *nokhriyah* is used sparingly, serving in one instance as a metaphor depicting the Diaspora as a woman other than one’s mother, in contrast to the land of Israel, one’s motherland (*yKil* 9:3, 32c and parallels; *yMQ* 3.1, 81c). On the other hand verses containing the word *nokhriyah* are parsed in accord with the frequent rabbinic (and biblical) identification of the foreign with the idolatrous. Thus, *erets nokhriyah*, “a foreign land” (Exod 18:3), is “a land of idolatry” (*MekhY Amalek* 1), and the *nokhriyah*, “foreign/forbidden woman” of Prov 23:27 is a metaphoric representation of idolatry’s seductive allure (*BemR* 10.2).

*Nokhrit*, the rabbinical equivalent of the biblical *nokhriyah*, generally denotes a Gentile woman. In the context of levirate law it is used repeatedly in the sense of a non-relative (e.g., *mYev* 3:6).

The semantic range of *zar* in rabbinic writings is quite limited. It almost always denotes someone not of priestly lineage (but not a non-Levite, a usage found in Num 1:51 and 18:4). The plural, *zarim*, is almost entirely absent. A notable exception is the description of the foreign invaders who destroyed Jerusalem as *zarim* in the liturgy for the fast of the Ninth of Av (*yTaan* 2:2 65c). This usage echoes a

number of biblical verses (e.g., Ezek 28:7). Such archaizing is typical of liturgical compositions.

The feminine form *zarah*, on the other hand, appears often, almost exclusively in the phrase *‘avodah zarah*, “strange/foreign worship,” i.e., idolatry. The coining of this term was no doubt inspired by the biblical *esh zarah* “strange fire” (Lev 10:1 and elsewhere) and *qetoret zarah*, “strange incense offering” (Exod 30:9) each of which refers to an unacceptable oblation. It seems likely that *zarah* in this context means both foreign, in that idolatry is – or at least should be – foreign to God-fearing Jews, and, like the non-priestly *zar*, an unwelcome and defiling intruder threatening the integrity and sanctity of God’s land and people.

**Bibliography:** ■ Kahana, M., “The Attitude to Foreigners in the Tannaitic and Amoraic Periods,” *‘Et ha-da’at* 3 (2000) 22–36. [Heb.] ■ Rosen-Zvi, I./A. Ophir, “Goy: Toward A Genealogy,” *Dine Israel* 28 (2011) 69–122. ■ Stern, S., *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings* (AGJU 23; Leiden 1994).  
Eliezer Diamond

## V. Christianity

■ Greek and Latin Patristics ■ Medieval Times and Reformation Era

### A. Greek and Latin Patristics

The English word “foreigner” may refer to a number of Greek terms: ξένος (someone coming from a foreign country), πάροικος (sojourner), or παρεπίδημος (someone living for a while in a site which is not his home). Modern translations often render these terms as “stranger” or “alien.” The concept of “foreigner” is prominent mainly in two contexts: (1) the Christians’ place in the world, alluding especially to Gen 23:4, 1 Pet 2:11, and Heb 11:13 (see also Eph 2:19, “So then you are no longer foreigners and aliens [ξένοι και πάροικοι], but citizens with the saints and members of the household of God [συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων και οἰκεῖται τοῦ θεοῦ].”); and (2) Christian charity regarding foreigners (referring to Matt 25:35, 38, 43–44).

**1. Christians as “Foreigners” in the World.** Christians did not feel at home in the Greco-Roman world. According to the suggestions of some of the Apostolic Fathers they reckoned themselves resident aliens. At the very beginning of his *Similitudes*, Hermas is told that Christians “are living in a foreign country” (*Herm. sim.* 1:1: ἐπι ξένης κατοικεῖτε ὑμεῖς). *Second Clement* 5:1 admonishes the Christians to “turn away from a life as transient residents in this world” (καταλείψαντες τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου). The beginnings of letters often refer to churches “sojourning” in the respective city (παροικοῦσα: thrice in *Mart. Pol.*; cf. also *1 Clem.*; *Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne* in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.1.3), thus indicating a fundamental distance to the Roman state. The notion of ἐκ-κλήσια (see Andresen: 28) alludes to the church “sojourning within the world” (Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 6.59: τῆς παρ-

ἐπιδημοῦσιν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳς). According to Tertullian, the Christian truth “is aware of the fact that she will remain foreign (*peregrinam*) within the world... and will find her home and her place of habitation in heaven” (*Apol.* 1.2). This can also apply to single persons: “Are we not pilgrims in this world?” (Tertullian, *Exh. cast.* 12.1; cf. *id.*, *Cor.* 13.4, referring to Phil 3:20). According to Clement of Alexandria, “he who is elect lives like a foreigner” (*Strom.* 4.165.4: ὁ ἐκλεκτός ὡς ξένος πολιτεύεται, cf. *id.*, *Strom.* 7.77.3, 78.3, referring to Heb 11:13). *Acts of Thomas* 61 quotes Matt 19:27 (“Look, we have left everything and followed you”) and then continues: “we have become gladly and voluntarily foreigners (ξένοι).” The most prominent passage with respect to the Christians as citizens of two “cities” is *Diogn.* 5:4–5:

While they live in both Greek and barbarian cities, as each one’s lot was cast... at the same time they demonstrate the remarkable and admittedly unusual character of their own citizenship. They live in their own countries, but only as non-residents (πατριδας οἰκοῦσιν ἰδίας, ἀλλ’ ὡς πάροικοι); they participate in everything as citizens (ὡς πολῖται), and endure everything as foreigners (ὡς ξένοι). Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is foreign (πάσα πατρις ξένη). (trans. Holmes: 703)

The self-perception of a membership in two citizenships did not cease after the persecutions by the Roman state ended in the 4th century. This is not only true for monasticism whose identity was informed by the concept of ξενιτεία and *peregrinatio* (cf. e.g., *Apophthegmata Patrum* Longinus 1 [PG 65:256C]). The monk is by definition a foreigner and thus devoted to separation from the world (see Fascher: 345–46; Feldmeier: 214). But Augustine also laments that, even after he has left the *regio dissimilitudinis* (*Conf.* 7.10.16) by his conversion, he is “still a pilgrim, far from God” (*Conf.* 10.5.7). In *On the City of God*, he explains that only Cain as a citizen of this earthly world founded a new city, while the “foreigner” (*peregrinus*) Abel was content with his heavenly citizenship (*Civ.* 15.1). The whole church dwells as a foreigner in a still hostile environment (*Civ.* 18.51; cf. *Enchir.* 16.61).

The view of Christians as sojourners in this world was to prevail until early Byzantine times (Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Top.* 2). It is however John Chrysostom who advocates this view most impressively and with biblical foundation: referring to Heb 11:13, he depicts the patriarchs of the OT as foreigners par excellence, since they had not only left their home country but were, speaking with Paul, “dead to the world” (Gal 6:14; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 24.1; trans. NPNF 1.14.473). Chrysostom proceeds with a severe critique of his fellow Christians at Antioch:

But we, both citizens and quite alive, busy ourselves about everything here as citizens. And what righteous people were to the word – “stranger” and “dead” – that we are to the world.

Christians find themselves as foreigners and as being tortured for being alien: “For foreigners, whatever they suffer, endure it, as not being in their own country” (*Hom. Heb.* 24.4; trans. NPNF 1.14.474–75). Living in a foreign country here appears as martyrdom, but it also has a missionary impact on pagan society:

If the Christians shine forth even when they are foreigners, how beautiful will they appear when they have reached their home country? (John Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 43.5)

**2. Christian Charity towards Foreigners.** Foreigners were welcome in Christian communities, as Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* 67:6) already pointed out (for the subject of hospitality in ancient Christianity with respect to Matt 25:35, see Puzicha). Though, e.g., *Did.* 11:2 witnesses to uncertainties regarding wandering prophets, hospitality in general ranked among the Christian virtues (cf., e.g., *Apos. Con.* 4.2.1), due to Jesus’ speech about the Last Judgment (Matt 25:31–46) where receiving – or rejecting – foreigners in place of Jesus Christ himself functions as one of the criteria of Christian righteousness (*ibid.*, vv. 35, 38, 43–4). When interpreting John 17:14, Origen parallels the Lord and his followers:

We must welcome the Son of God who became a foreigner and the members of this body who are foreigners in this world. (*Comm. ser. Matt.* 72)

Only a few authors understood this passage as pertaining to all human beings. Such a “universalist” exegesis is found in, e.g., Caesarius of Arles (*Sermo* 29.3–4; 199.3; see Luz: 271–73), while most patristic authors explain the Matthean passage as referring to all Christians, most prominently John Chrysostom who quotes Matt 25:35 nearly forty times (Brändle: 23–25). Taking care of strangers is thus not only a question of organizing charity but also – and primarily – of viewing the foreigner as incorporating Christ: giving the strangers a place to stay (φειδοχία) must be accompanied by giving them love (φιλοξενία; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 33.3). True hospitality is motivated by christological reasons: one should not only erect guest-houses (ξενοδοχεῖα) for pilgrims but also open up one’s private house as a “cell of Christ” (κελλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ; *Hom. Acts* 45.4).

This spiritualized view of the reception of foreigners can be traced back to the apologist Aristides (*Apol.* 15.7) and to Clement of Alexandria according to whom foreigners are not only guests but also friends and, finally, brothers in Christ (*Strom.* 2.41.3–6). Based on Rom 12:2, Clement develops a Christian attitude towards his fellow humans that is characterized as φιλοξενία but also as φιλοστεχνία, φιλανθρωπία and φιλοσοργία. A treatise *On Hospitality* (Περὶ φιλοξενίας) is attributed to Melito of Sardes but unfortunately is lost. The motif of receiving foreigners in place of Christ is however found until the end of late antiquity. Gregory the

Great underlines that Christians should receive “the foreign Christ,” “so that he may not reject you at the Judgment’s Day as foreigners (peregrini) but may receive you in heaven” (*Hom. Ev.* 2.23.2). Gregory admonishes his fellow Christians to be attentive and to urge foreigners to accept hospitality, as the two disciples in Emmaus did (*ibid.*, 2.23.1; cf. Luke 24:13–35). Perhaps the most urgent interpretation of Matt 25:35 is preserved in Papyrus Amherst 1, line 14: “God has commanded to nourish poor and foreign people; be hospitable, so that you may escape the fire of hell!” (quoted in Hiltbrunner/Gorce: 1110) (see also “Chrysostom, John,” and “Charity V. Christianity A. Patristics, Orthodox Churches, and Early Medieval Times”).

**Bibliography:** ■ Andresen, C., *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit* (RM 29/1–2; Stuttgart 1971). ■ Brändle, R., *Matthäus 25,31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. zum 5. Jahrhundert* (BGBE 22; Tübingen 1979). ■ Fascher, E., “Fremder,” RAC 8 (Stuttgart 1972) 306–47. ■ Feldmeier, R., *Die Christen als Fremde: Die Metapher der Fremde in der antiken Welt, im Urchristentum und im 1. Petrusbrief* (WUNT 64; Tübingen 1992). ■ Heen, E. M./P. D. W. Krey (eds.), *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament X, Hebrews* (Downers Grove, Ill. 2005). ■ Hiltbrunner, O./D. Gorce, “Gastfreundschaft,” RAC 8 (Stuttgart 1972) 1061–123. ■ Holmes, M. W./J. B. Lightfoot (eds.), *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2007). ■ Luz, U., *Matthew 21–28* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn. 2005). ■ Puzicha, M., *Christus Peregrinus: Die Fremdenaufnahme (Mt 25,35) als Werk der privaten Wohltätigkeit im Urteil der Alten Kirche* (MBTH 47; Münster 1980). ■ Simonetti, M. (ed.), *Matthew 14–28* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament 2; Downers Grove, Ill. 2002).

Peter Gemeinhardt

## B. Medieval Times and Reformation Era

A number of biblical themes and texts emerged in the discourse around foreigners in the Middle Ages and Reformation. The primary distinction between various nations was commonly thought to consist in “kind, customs, language, and laws” (Regino of Prüm; cf. Bartlett: 197–220), with such differences traced to the division of humanity at the tower of Babel in sources as diverse as theological commentaries and legal charters (Borst; Bartlett: 213). However, the Christian church was acknowledged to have a duty to overcome distinctions through the conversion of all people, as well as to “speak all languages,” due to the authority of such texts as Acts 2, Matt 28:19–20, and Isa 4:1–3 (Wood: 203–5). Differences among Christian peoples were thus minimized in encounters with apparently more foreign nations, as baptism became the primary distinguishing factor (Bartlett: 251–53). Still, such Christian solidarity often fell apart when foreign immigrants were perceived to be absorbing or controlling too many economic or political resources (Archer: 770; Bartlett: 237; Naphy: 121–37). This situation would intensify in the face of Reformation confessionalism, when foreign travelers were scruti-

nized more carefully regarding their stance towards Scripture (Grell 1996: 165; 168; 172–74). Moreover, personal identification as a foreigner and pilgrim took on added significance for Protestant exiles in various countries, as they identified with biblical stories of the wandering patriarchs, the exodus, and the Babylonian exile (Grell 2011: 1–8; 58–60; 127).

The classical traditions regarding monstrous foreigners on the edge of the world also became part of Christian discourse. Monstrous races were depicted as living just outside civilized regions, with Jerusalem as the “navel of the world” (Phillips: 44–49; cf. Ezek 38:12). They also might be depicted in the background of the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, as in the Vézelay tympanum, with the implicit meaning that such races were indeed human and the potential objects of Christian missionary efforts, no matter the degree of their difference (Freedman: 2), which was itself seen as a sign that “God is wondrous in all his works” (Ps 144:13, *Vetus Latina*). The legality of positive social relationships with foreigners could be fraught with difficulty in some periods, as canon lawyers and theologians sought to apply the directives of 1 Cor 10:27 and Titus 1:15 to encounters with foreigners of various religious stripes, with the general conclusion that commerce and commensality were allowed (Freidenreich: 101–9, 197–208).

The ongoing perceived threat of non-Christian foreigners can be seen in the frequent identification of peoples or invaders newly discovered by Europeans with the eschatological Gog and Magog, who were thought at times to be the allies of the Antichrist or potentially the objects of Christian conversion, who could be defeated or “slain” by the preaching of the gospel (Ezek 39:6; Wood: 205). Such legends abounded and shifted through the Middle Ages, with Vikings, Arabs, Turks, and Mongols variously identified as Gog and Magog (Hoppenbrouwers: 207–8). In the Reformation, this fear of a foreign, anti-Christian threat was redeployed against the papacy and Roman Catholicism, especially in the English apocalyptic tradition (Christianson).

**Bibliography:** ■ Archer, I. W., “Responses to Alien Immigrants in London, c. 1400–1650,” in *Le migrazioni in Europa: secc. XIII–XVIII* (ed. S Cavaciocchi; Istituto internazionale di storia economica 25; Florence 1994) 755–74. ■ Bartlett, R., *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950–1350* (Princeton, N.J. 1994). ■ Borst, A., *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1957–63). ■ Christianson, P., *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto, Ont. 1978). ■ Freedman, P., “The Medieval Other: The Middle Ages as Other,” in *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles* (ed. T. Jones/D. Sprunger; StMC 42; Kalamazoo, Mich. 2002) 1–29. ■ Freidenreich, D. M., *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law* (Berkeley, Calif. 2011). ■ Grell, O. P., “Exile and Tolerance,” in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (ed. id./B.

Scribner; Cambridge 1996) 164–81. ■ Grell, O. P., *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge 2011). ■ Hoppenbrouwers, P., “Such Stuff as Peoples are Made on: Ethnogenesis and the Construction of Nationhood in Medieval Europe,” in *JMedHist* 9/2 (2006) 195–242. ■ Naphy, W. G., *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan* (Manchester 1994). ■ Regino of Prüm, “Epistula ad Hathonem arceiscopum missa,” in *Scriptes rerum germanicarum* (ed. F. Kurze; Hanover 1890) xix–xx. ■ Phillips, S., “The Outer World of the European Middle Ages,” in *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters Between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge 1994) 23–63. ■ Wood, I., “‘The Ends of the Earth’: The Bible, Bibles, and the Other in Early Medieval Europe,” in *The Calling of the Nations: Exegesis, Ethnography, and Empire in a Biblical-Historic Present* (ed. M. Vessey et al.; Toronto, Ont. 2011) 200–16.

Zachary Guiliano

## VI. Islam

Classical Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) deals with three categories of foreigner: (1) the *musta'min*, the non-Muslim who enters Islamic territory on the basis of a limited treaty of security (*amān*) with a Muslim (*mu'ammin*), (2) the *mu'āhid* or *mu'āhad* in the sense of *muhādan* or *muwāda'*, the non-Muslim protected by a (paid) peace treaty (*hudna* or *ṣulḥ*) concluded with the Islamic state for a certain time, and (3) the non-Muslim enemy invading from non-Islamic territory, called “from the (house of) war” (*ḥarabī*). In contrast, the *ahl al-dhimma*, members of book-based religions other than Islam, were rightful citizens of the Islamic state with unlimited protection and not so much foreigners as “others”.

By conversion, foreigners could become natives. A comparable example for this importance of religious denomination can be found in talmudic law (Heffening: 121–24, underlining the parallels). In Arabic literature, the notion of the stranger is mainly rendered by the term *gharīb* (e.g., al-İṣfahānī), implying feelings of desolation, humiliation, and loneliness in opposition to familiarity and sociability, but also the idea of a good Muslim, since Islam began as a stranger (see Rosenthal: 62). A survey on the stranger, alien, other, and foreigner in Arabic literature of the Jews, Christians, and other communities or individuals remains to be written.

Islam summons the believers to be friendly to foreigners.

To both parents be good, and to your relatives, the orphans, the destitute, the protected foreigner (*ḡarīb* [cf. Heb. *gēr*]) near to you and the distant one (*al-ḡarīb al-junub*), to those that accompany you, the wayfarer in need (*ibn al-sabīl*), and your slaves. (S 4:36)

The modern Arabic term for foreigner, besides *dakhīl*, the one who enters, and *khārij*, the one who sets out, is mostly *ajnabī*, which is cognate with qur'anic *junub* cited above, and which originally meant all those not belonging to the family. The *ajnabī* of a woman was every man not married to her (or in a family relationship excluding marriage).

In Islamic law of succession, the term denotes those who do not inherit one of the shares prescribed in the Qur'ān, and in contract law a third party not qualified as a witness.

The protection of foreigners (*ijwār* or *ijāra*) is an ancient Semitic legal institution rooted in the temporary hospitality of the Bedouins and bound up with the value of honor. Islamic legal tradition enshrined the institution on the basis of S 9:6 and some relevant traditions of Ḥadīth, and subsumed it under the treaty of security (*'aqd al-amān*). There is a saying ascribed to Muḥammad that those who do not safeguard (*ya'man*) their protégées from misfortune do not really believe (*yu'min*) or, according to a different version, will not enter paradise. Reference to the institution is significant in the “Constitution of Medina,” which already knows of a treaty of security with the Jews (see Lecker: § 28 and 139–47). The least of the Muslims can grant protection that is legally binding on all of them. Conversely, the Muslim in non-Islamic territory needed a license (*idhn*).

The regulations of the treaty of security and its preconditions are sophisticated. The discussions include questions of customs duties, the applicability of the limit-penalties (*ḥudūd*) in cases where foreigners are involved, and their role in procedural law. Later, the Ottoman commercial privileges or capitulations (*imtiyāzāt*) with European powers were developed and dogmatically founded on the treaty of security.

**Bibliography. Primary:** ■ Abu l-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā: Al-Maqāla al-tāsi'a* (Cairo 1918). [Esp. 13.321–87, 14.1–109] ■ Abū l-Faraj al-İṣfahānī, *Adab al-ghurabā'* (ed. Ṣ. al-Dīn al-Munajjid; Beirut 1972). ■ Al-Majlis al-a'lā li-l-shu'un al-islāmiyya, “Ajnabī,” in *Mawsū'at al-fiqh al-islāmī*, vol. 3 (Cairo 1968) 121–58. ■ Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Sarakhsī, *Sharḥ kitāb al-siyar al-kabīr li-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī* (ed. Ṣ. al-Dīn al-Munajjid; Cairo 1957–58). [Esp. 1.283–370, 2.409–586]

**Secondary:** ■ Heffening, W., *Das islamische Fremdenrecht bis zu den islamisch-fränkischen Staatsverträgen* (Hannover 1925). ■ Khadduri, M., *The Islamic Law of Nations: Shaybānī's Siyar* (Baltimore, Md. 1966). ■ Lecker, M., *The “Constitution of Medina”: Muḥammad's First Legal Document* (Princeton, N.J. 2004). ■ Rosenthal, F., “The Stranger in Medieval Islam,” *Arabica* 44 (1997) 35–75.

Andreas Neumann

## VII. Literature

The othering of “the foreigner” as part of the creation of self-identity is a common theme in the Bible, with a range of perspectives recorded.

These sorts of perspectives are unsurprisingly present throughout the history of literature, whether directly referencing the Bible or not, and used to deal with the constructed foreigner and the foreign at any given period, as has been shown, for instance in the history of fear and dominance of the Other in American literature, film, and culture (see e.g., Franklin), or Western control of “the Orient”

and “Oriental” (see e.g., Said). Indeed, these are the sorts of questions that run throughout European modernist literature as it grappled with rapidly developing issues of nationalism and nation, and conversely those deemed outside, and those moving between.

In “The Lake Isle of Innisfree” (1888), W. B. Yeats would understand his urban London exile and yearning for the peace of the rural Irish homeland with an allusion to the parable of the prodigal son and the sinful excursion in foreign land (“I will arise and go now”; cf. Luke 15:18). Yeats would most famously play with and invert biblical imagery as a great beast which in fact marks the second coming and emerges from “somewhere in sands of the desert” (“The Second Coming” [1919]). T. S. Eliot would also use the biblical language of idolatry and desolation to make a comment on modernity, most famously in “The Waste Land” (1922). And of course it was understandings and constructions of “the Jew” in relation to the nation state that would provide the darkest moments. Even incidental comments betray wider cultural assumptions. As Eliot notoriously put it in “Gerontion” (1920), “My house is a decayed house, And the Jew squats on the window sill” (Eliot: 21).

The binary of foreigner/non-foreigner, and the blurring and/or critiquing of the boundaries, would, of course, continue beyond modernity with new Others. In the Cold War, for instance, the tension between East and West is played out in the tense spy games of Karla and Smiley in the *Karla Trilogy* by John le Carré (1974–79) as each takes on perceived strengths and weaknesses of either side, with little in the way of moral victories made. More recently, older orientalist themes have re-emerged in light of the “war on terror” (e.g., “the Muslim” or “the Arab” as the arch-foreigner), as have ways of understanding the Bible in relation to this version of foreigner/non-foreigner (see e.g., Crossley), whether as representative of democracy and freedom in contrast to the perceived barbarism of “fundamentalism” (e.g., Tony Blair’s autobiography), or the structurally similar idea but with the Bible and religion as part of “fundamentalism” and alien to western liberal democracy (e.g., Martin Amis, Christopher Hitchens).

**Bibliography. Primary:** ■ Eliot, T. S., *Complete Poems and Plays: 1909–1950* (London 1950). ■ Le Carré, J., *Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy* (London 1974). ■ Le Carré, J., *The Honourable Schoolboy* (London 1977). ■ Le Carré, J., *Smiley’s People* (London 1979).

**Secondary:** ■ Barclay, J. M. G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* (Berkeley, Calif. 1996). ■ Crossley, J. G., *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century* (London 2008). ■ Franklin, H. B., *War Stars: The Superweapon and the American Imagination* (Amherst, Mass. 2008). ■ Harvey, D., *The New Imperialism* (Oxford 2003). ■ Hayes, C. E., *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities* (Oxford 2002). ■ Kelley, S., *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship* (London/New York 2002). ■ Said, E. W.,

*Culture and Imperialism* (London 1993). ■ Vander Stichele, C./H. Pyper (eds.), *In the Picture: Otherness in Children’s Bibles* (Atlanta, Ga. 2011).

James Crossley

## VIII. Film

Biblical films may highlight what is suspect and dangerous about individuals presented as “foreign” to their audiences, or, alternatively, emphasize links of shared identity that transcend any difference. For Hollywood productions, malevolent foreignness is usually opposed to the default identity of Northern European or Anglo-American ethnicity. Thus, in *The Ten Commandments* (dir. Cecil B. DeMille, 1956), the only Egyptian with a noticeably non-American accent is the cruel Rameses (Yul Brynner), archrival to the Hebrew Moses (Charlton Heston). Similarly, in *King of Kings* (dir. Nicholas Ray, 1961), the odious Herod the Great (Grégoire Aslan) and Herod Antipas (Frank Thring) are positioned as decidedly Middle Eastern (despite Thring being Australian). In a nod to American popular allegiances in the struggles of post-war Middle East, however, the Herods are identified not as Jews (the film’s “us” portrayed mostly by American actors) but rather as the “them” of Arabs. By contrast, when Moses flees Egypt in *The Ten Commandments*, he is sheltered by Jethro of Midian (Eduard Franz), who, in an adaptation of biblical references, is offered obliquely as Muslim. Instead of being descendants of Abraham and Keturah (Gen 25:1–2), the bedouin Midianites are “the children of Ishmael, [Abraham’s] first born,” who are called “the obedient of God,” Jethro explains. Shared worship of “He Who Has No Name” serves to bridge any distance between Hebrew and Muslim, but so does a shared enemy: the Amalekites, an elaboration on the generic “shepherds” who prevent Jethro’s daughters from watering their flocks (Exod 2:16–21). Doubled in their threatening difference by the goats (as opposed to the daughters’ sheep) they herd in the film, DeMille’s intruders borrow the Amalekites’ treacherous identity as designated enemy of the Israelites (Exod 17:8–16), making them an even more appropriate foil for Moses’ heroic rescue of the women. By calling himself a “stranger in a strange land” and promising to “dwell” in Jethro’s land (Exod 2:22, 18:3), furthermore, Moses introduces a more positive understanding of foreigner as “sojourner” with a biblically mandated right to protection (Exod 22:21, Lev 19:33–34).

If certain accents, like Brynner’s, sound dangerously non-American, the Scottish lilt in the accent of Mary, mother of Jesus (Siobhan McKenna) in *King of Kings*, suits the audience’s predisposed affinity for her. The assumption that Britishness is the “right” sort of foreignness gets tapped as well in *The Last Temptation of Christ* (dir. Martin Scorsese, 1988) when Satan, harshly voiced by Leo Marks, hides his identity behind the English accent of a sweet girl

angel (Juliette Caton). When a British accent is associated with a film's villains, as with the Romans in *Ben Hur* (dir. William Wyler, 1959), it connotes at least sophisticated cosmopolitanism.

*King of Kings* suggests that perceived foreignness may, in fact, signal unrecognized virtue when Pontius Pilate (Hurd Hatfield) explains his antipathy to Jesus (Jeffrey Hunter): "He is different, and refuses to behave like the others." Given Hunter's blue-eyed Americanness, the statement reveals Pilate as the one who is not of the right sort. Similarly, Amalekites again figure in the *Netflix* series *Orange Is the New Black* (creator Jenji Kohan, 2013). Bible-crazed and grammatically-challenged crystal meth addict Tiffany "Pennsatucky" Doggett demonstrates her skewed perspective in a threatening note to protagonist Piper Chapman: "Your gonna die Amalekite" ("Can't Fix Crazy" episode). Church-savvy Black Cindy (Adrienne C. Moore) explains the reference, which viewers recognize as hardly fitting Chapman: "Oh, they real baddies in the Bible ... In Samuel, God told Saul to kill them all ... Even the babies. Even the cows. They so bad their cows had to die" (1 Sam 15:3).

Given strong association of the biblical term "foreigner" with "stranger" or "alien," especially in connection with Christian claims to be alien to an unrestored earth in the manner of Christ and the patriarchs (Heb 11:9, 13–14; Matt 25:35; 1 Pet 2:11), it is not surprising that some of the most overt links between foreigners and Christ-figures have been in science fiction films. Governmental persecution of extraordinary strangers from other planets is a central theme in such films as *E.T.: The Extraterrestrial* (dir. Steven Spielberg, 1982) and *Starman* (dir. John Carpenter, 1984). Although not persecuted, K-PAX in *K-PAX* (dir. Iain Softley, 2001) is committed to a mental institution for claiming (possibly correctly) that he is an alien. The choice of Starman (Jeff Bridges) to appear as the husband of Karen Allen (Jenny Haden), the earth woman who helps him, is a reminder that the foreign may be recognizably familiar to those with eyes to see. Despite E.T.'s alien appearance, his gentle nature is likewise obvious to children such as Elliot and Gerrie. As with biblical admonitions to deal kindly with temporary sojourners, resolution in all three films focuses on returning the aliens safely to their homes.

**Bibliography:** ■ Martin, J./C. E. Ostwalt, Jr. (eds.), *Screening the Sacred: Religion, Myth, and Ideology in Popular American Film* (Boulder, Colo. 1995). ■ Michalek, L., "The Arab in American Cinema: A Century of Otherness," *Cineaste* 17/1 (1989) 3–9. ■ Plate, S. Brent/D. Jasper (eds.), *Imag(in)ing Otherness: Filmmic Visions of Living Together* (Atlanta, Ga. 1999).

James H. Thrall

See also → Barbarian; → Gentiles; → Nations;  
→ Pagan, Paganism; → People, Peoples;  
→ Sojourner; → Stranger

## Forerunner

**1. Classical Greek Literature.** Προδρομος ("fore-runner") occurs as both noun and adjective with the basic sense of "running before." In nonbiblical Greek literature, προδρομος was used literally for heralds or messengers announcing the approach of a party (Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.203; 9.14), military scouts preceding the main army (Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.60; 4.121–22; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 80; Arrian, *Anab.* 1.12; Polybius, *Hist.* 12.20.7; Sophocles, *Ant.* 108), light ships sailing ahead of a fleet (Alciphron, *Letters* 1.14.1), or an athlete who breaks away from others to win a race (Pollux, *Onomasticon* 3.30.148). Metaphorically, προδρομος could refer to winds (Aristotle,  *Mete.* 2.5.2; Aristotle, *Probl.* 26.12.1; Theophrastus, *De ventis* 2.11) or fruit (Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* 5.1.5).

**2. Jewish Literature.** The LXX employs προδρομος only metaphorically: after Moses tells Joshua and Caleb to bring some fruit from Canaan, the narrator mentions that it was the season of the first grapes (lit. "the forerunners of grapes"; Num 13:20); the Solomonic sage refers to wasps or hornets as forerunners of God's avenging army to destroy the Canaanites (Wis 12:8; cf. Exod 23:28); Isaiah likens the fate of Ephraim with the quick "consumption" (i.e., destruction) of an early fig (lit. "a forerunner of a fig"; Isa 28:4). In nonbiblical Jewish literature, προδρομος is used mainly in a literal, military sense – an advance company of soldiers (Josephus, *Ant.* 7.345; 12.314, 372; *Jos. Asen.* 24.14; 26.5); it occurs metaphorically only once (an honored "precursor") in a doxology concluding the narration of Solomon's idolatrous downfall (*T. Sol.* [rec. A] 26:10).

**3. New Testament.** The concept of "forerunner" is most often used to refer to the figure of John the Baptist. Against the background of Isa 40:3 and Mal 3:1, the Synoptics depict John as the precursor of Jesus, God's messianic agent of Israel's eschatological restoration (cf. Acts 13:25). In the Gospel of John, Jesus and the Spirit-Paraclete are presented in tandem. In view of his imminent departure, Jesus promises his disciples "another advocate" (Gk. ἄλλος παράκλητος), i.e., one of the same kind, implying that Jesus was the first "advocate" – a forerunner (John 14:16). In neither case is there any explicit mention of "forerunner." In fact, the literal term προδρομος ("forerunner") is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, occurring only in Heb 6:20, where it functions as a figurative extension of the meaning "to run ahead" to depict Jesus as a forerunner on behalf of his people.

**4. Jesus as Forerunner (Heb 6:20).** Most scholars agree that Heb 6:19–20, which closes the parenthetical admonition in 5:11–6:20, alludes to Lev 16:2, 12, 15, speaking of the high priest's entrance into the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Hebrews 6:20 presents two ideas. First, Jesus has en-