

Religious Differences and Intermarriage in Ruth: Lessons for Nigerian Christians

Ikenna L. Umeanolue

Department of Religion and Human Relations
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

This paper studies the book of Ruth in the Bible with special interest in the intermarriage or mixed marriage between Ruth and Boaz. The work considers the positive impact of this marriage for the Judeo-Christian world especially as manifested in the personalities of King David and Jesus Christ who of course came from the lineage of Boaz and Ruth. The menace of discriminations among contemporary Nigerian Christians in choosing marriage partners can be stopped through the proper understanding and internalization of the message of the book of Ruth on marriage. This understanding is necessary for the effective and sincere practising of Christianity in Nigeria bearing in mind that it is the same God that created mankind in his own image. While avoiding discrimination in choosing marriage partners, people should choose those whom they can agree with in religion.

Introduction

Various people in the world practise different types of religion and marriage system. In the contemporary pluralistic society like Nigeria, intermarriage or mixed marriage stands criticized among many Christians. Thus the issue of religious differences has been an obstacle to marriage contracts. Many marriage engagements have been thwarted as a result of religious beliefs. In the biblical book of Ruth, the marriage between Ruth and Boaz is an exceptional case of mixed marriage. Some scholars opine that the book of Ruth was written as a protest against the religion of Israel which forbade mixed marriage especially during the period of Ezra and Nehemiah who tried to make Yahweh a discriminatory God (Hinson, 1992; Campbell, 2003; Fischer, 2007). The idea of Ruth as a polemic against the need to convert has been advanced in a modified form by Amit cited in Smith (2007). She suggests that the references to Ruth as a Moabite evoke an 'implicit polemic' against the Ezra-Nehemiah attitude toward foreign women. Ruth was a Moabitess and was integrated from being a foreigner to a Jew through intermarriage and her character distinguished her. The genealogy as recorded in the book of Ruth shows that Ruth is the great-grand mother of David, Israel's greatest king (Ruth 4:18-22). Henry (1991) commented, "Ruth is hereby brought in among the ancestors of David and Christ, which was the greatest honour. The genealogy is here drawn from Pharez, through Boaz and Obed, to David, and so leads towards the Messiah" (p. 380).

Through the intermarriage between Ruth and Boaz a binding relationship between the Jews and the Moabites has been fostered which climaxed in the birth of Jesus Christ who of course came from the lineage of King David (Umeanolue, 2011). At a time when intermarriage was convenient and most likely common, many deemed it

wrong (e.g. Ezra and Nehemiah). In such a period, according to Laffey (1995), “the book of Ruth would stand as strong testimony that non-Jewish people were not to be condemned out of hand” (p. 553). God’s greatest favour was bestowed upon Israel through a mixed marriage – the very thing that Ezra and Nehemiah frowned upon. Ruth begins with a notice that the events recorded therein took place in the days when the judges were judging (Ruth 1:1) and ends with the notice that Ruth is an ancestor of King David (Ruth 4:17-22). (p. 554).

When famine struck Israel, Naomi and her husband, Elimelech, left Bethlehem (in the tribe of Judah) for the nearby gentile nation, Moab. In Moab, Elimelech died, and the two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, eventually took Moabite wives, Orpah and Ruth. After ten years of marriage, both young men died; Naomi has now lost her entire immediate family. Soon, Naomi hears that the famine has subsided in Israel and she decides to return home. Her devoted daughters-in-law left with her, but Naomi tries to stop them from accompanying her to Israel. Because those women are young, Naomi blessed them with the wish that they return home and find new husbands. The two women insisted on remaining with her, but after Naomi reiterated her appeal, Orpah kissed her and went back. Naomi urged Ruth to return with Orpah but she, in one of the Bible’s most moving passages, refused: ‘Do not urge me to leave you, to turn back and not follow you. For wherever you go, I will go, wherever you lodge, I will lodge, your people shall be my people, your God shall be my God’ (Ruth 1:16). To this Telushkin (1948) says:

In the thousands of years since Ruth spoke these words, no one has better defined the combination of peoplehood and religion that characterizes Judaism: “Your people shall be my people” (“I wish to accept the Jewish nation”), “Your God shall be my God” (“I wish to accept the Jewish religion”). (p. 359).

The problem with the attitude of Nigerian Christians in the contemporary time towards marriage is that many people claim to be religious even as they discriminate in their choice of marriage partners. Many Nigerian Christians are always blind at understanding the message of the book of Ruth as regards marriage to the extent that within Christianity today denominationalism has become an issue in marriage. Spiritual formation is not the debate. The matter is the church one attends. This ugly trend continues affecting the men and women of marriage age negatively especially the women counterparts, because many of them remain unmarried because they are waiting for marriage partners who are of the same faith, religion and tribe with them, hence the problem of this study.

The task before this paper is to make a study of the book of Ruth with regard to the intermarriage between Ruth and Boaz as recorded in the book of Ruth. The work also aims at investigating the implications of such marriage to the contemporary Nigerian Christians, because as Laffey (1995) says:

At a time when intermarriage was convenient and most likely common, many deemed it wrong (e.g., Ezra and Nehemiah). In such a period the book of Ruth would stand as strong testimony that non-Jewish people were not to be condemned out of hand. After all, a Moabite woman was King David’s great grandmother. (p. 553).

The term marriage has been variously defined by scholars. Nmah (2004) defines marriage as “the state in which men and women can live together in sexual relationship with the approval of their social group. Marriage could be regarded as covenant between

man and woman. It is a divine agreement or sacred bond” (pp. 68-69). Marriage is a sacred bond between a man and a woman because it unites the husband and the wife to become one body and one soul. Chiegboka (2006) states that “marriage is sacred because it is an institution that is both natural to man and divinely established and ordained by God from the very foundation of human race” (p. 10). Thus marriage is a life time union between a man and a woman. In the context of this study, intermarriage or mixed marriage is a marriage between a man and a woman who are from different religions, cultures, denominations, tribes, ethnicities or races.

Marriage in the Old Testament

Marriage has its basis in religion because of its theological background especially in the Old Testament. According to Kaiser (1975), “Marriage was God’s gift to men and woman. Its purpose was to satisfy the social nature of mankind, for Adam found out by experience that he was lonely without human companionship” (p. 181). God agreed with Adam’s estimate, adding ‘It is not good for the man to be alone’ (Genesis 2:18). The relationship that this marriage initiated was regarded in the Old Testament as indissoluble. That is the point of view expressed in Genesis 2:24; Deuteronomy 22:19-29; Jeremiah 3:1, Hosea 3:1-3; and Malachi 2:10-16.

The people of the Old Testament practised different types of marriage including monogamy, polygamy and Levirate marriage. The marriage of Boaz and Ruth resembles that of Levirate marriage. McKenzie (2002) defined levirate marriage as “the law which obliged a brother to marry the widow of his deceased brother if the brother died without male issue” (p. 506). The practice of levirate marriage made possible the perpetuation of a patriarchal line in those families where the husband died before his wife had conceived any offspring (Laffey, 1995). This was a custom prevalent all over the Ancient Near East as also found in the book of Ruth.

Among the ancient Israelites, the only way to continue one’s existence after death was through one’s children. Absence of children, therefore, meant that one would cease to exist in Israel. In order to prevail such a tragedy, the levirate law provided that the deceased man’s brother or closest male relative was to marry the deceased’s widow so that the property or dowry as well as the fertility of the widow would be kept within the same patriarchal line. Such a practice made possible the continuation of the dead man’s name and lineage in Israel as well as the retention of his property within the family. Among the Jews, marriage was however, highly honoured. The Jews saw marriage as holy responsibility. Consequently, they interpreted Genesis 1 and 2 as God’s formal institution of marriage.

The meaning of marriage and human sexuality is given in the narrative of God’s creation of woman (Genesis 2:4-24). There the Old Testament text pointedly emphasizes the value and worth of man and woman in mutual relationship. As early as Genesis 2:27 man and woman were equally declared to be made in the image of God. The theological perspective of Genesis 2 is that God has created a garden for man’s pleasure, animals to serve him, and women for companionship. Man’s solitude and loneliness were declared to be a condition that was not good’. Man had been made to be a social being. Therefore, God made a ‘helper suited to him’ (Genesis 2: 20). Such a correspondence could not be found in the animals that were named by Adam and were subservient to him.

The prophets made an allegory of marriage. Turning from God to idols, they said, is like the sin of adultery (Jeremiah 3:9; Ezekiel 23:37). With this insight came the divine revelation that God was a husband to faithless Israel (Isaiah 54:5). Despite Israel's sin, God did not reject them but through the prophets (especially Hosea) called them back to renew their intimate marriage relationship with him. This image undermines the grace of God. The sin of rejecting God violates the most intimate of relationships. Yet God continues to love and to forgive.

Intermarriage Marriage in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament, intermarriage or mixed marriage is a serious issue. Mixed marriage was a grave concern to the writers of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. When he arrives in Jerusalem from Persia, he is shocked by the occurrence of mixed marriages among the people of Judah, marriages that are explicitly forbidden by the Torah: Canaanites, Hittites, Ferisites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians and Amorites. Ezra's concern seems to be the prohibition of the nations in Deuteronomy 7:1–7, although he slightly alters the list. Deuteronomy refers to the Hittites, Girgasites, Amorites, Canaanites, Ferisites, Hevites and Jebusites; Ezra omits the Girasites and Hevites but adds the Ammonites, Moabites and Egyptians. Except for the Egyptians, none of these nations existed as a national state in the period of the second temple. Therefore, scholars consider this list as anachronistic, referring to Israel's archetypal enemies and should be interpreted symbolically, that is, anyone who, in the eyes of Ezra, is considered as non-Israelite (Brenner, 2011; Grätz, 2011; Southwood, 2011).

Nehemiah (13:2) alludes to Deuteronomy 23:3. Although this law does not in the first place pertain to mixed marriage, Nehemiah interpreted it as such and furthermore expanded it to all foreigners (Nihan, 2011), with the result that not only 'Moabites and Ammonites' were expelled from the community, but 'all the mixed multitude' were separated. Apparently neither Nehemiah nor Ezra paid heed to those among the nations or the mixed multitude who chose to turn their backs on their people and their gods (Rt 1:16), and eventually sought refuge under the wings of Yahweh, the God of Israel (Rt 2:12). In one way or another, these foreigners became attached to the people of Israel, certainly by marriage or perhaps merely by sheer conviction, and they sincerely wished to be included by the community who called themselves Israel.

In the Book of Ruth, the birth of King David is realised by an intermarriage between Boaz, the Judahite man and Ruth, the Moabite. Also in this regard the Book of Ruth can be read as a protest against Ezra and Nehemiah's campaign against mixed marriages in the Second Temple period. Contamination of the 'holy seed' was one issue; the other was apostasy. Mixing with foreigners, mixed marriages, almost always resulted in apostasy. Frevel and Rausche (2014) indicate three crucial moments in the history where mixed marriages appear as a threat to Israel: Joshua 23:7-12; Judges 3:6; 1 Kings 11:1-8; and Numbers 25. The incident that is recorded in Numbers 25 occurs at the border of the Promised Land. The Israelites pitch camp at Shittim and there Moabite women seduce Israelite men to commit harlotry, share in the sacrificial meals for their gods and eventually to worship these foreign gods. Joshua 23:7–12 forms part of Joshua's farewell address, just before the occupation of the land. In the land there remain several nations, but Joshua warns the children of Israel not to mix with them, because this will

lead to apostasy, turning away from Yahweh, worshipping other gods, and eventually they will lose the land.

However soon after entering the land, in the Book of Judges, exactly this starts to happen. From Judges 3 the individual judges are introduced because the children of Israel dwelt among the nations, an exchange between taking and giving daughters followed, with the result that the sons and daughters of Israel started to follow other gods. The last instance, 1 Kings 11:1-8 is also referred to by Nehemiah (13:26): King Solomon's love for foreign women. This invokes the anger of Yahweh, and soon after the schism of the monarchy follows. The rest of Israel's history steers towards the downfall first of the Northern Kingdom, then of Judah. Thus, some mixed marriages in the Old Testament resulted in apostasy and trouble.

The Moabites in the Old Testament

The Moabites generally do not get a good report in the Old Testament Bible. The origins of the nation lie in incest: the sexual relationships between Lot and his two daughters in Genesis 19:31-38 (Eskenazi & Frymer-Kensky, 2011). After the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Lot's two daughters are afraid that there will not be any men for them, so they make their father drunk and have sex with him - one daughter the one night, the other daughter the other night. Both daughters become pregnant by their father. The child of the eldest daughter is called Moab. Some scholars are of the opinion that Moab is a word play on *mei-abh* (of a father), in other words, the name of the child indicates its origins (Eskenazi and Frymer-Kensky 2011). The child of the youngest is Ben-Ammi, and his descendants are the Ammonites.

Then there is the incident of Numbers 22-24, the story about Balak, king of Moab, who hires Balaam to curse Israel. This is indeed one of the reasons proposed by Deuteronomy 23:4 why Moabites should be excluded from the community of Yahweh. This episode precedes Numbers 25:1, already referred to above, which specifically names the Moabite women as those who lead the Israelite men into apostasy (Eskenazi & Frymer-Kensky, 2011). Eskenazi and Frymer-Kensky also mention the many wars against the Moabites attested to in Judges 3:12-30, 1 Samuel 14:47, 2 Samuel 8:2, 2 Kings 3 and 13:20.

However, mention must also be made of single instances where Moab is portrayed in a more positive way. In Deuteronomy 2:9 the Lord forbids the children of Israel to consider the Moabites as enemies or wage war against them, and according to Deuteronomy 2:27-29 the Moabites were quite willing to sell water and food to the Israelites - a direct contradiction to Deuteronomy 23:4, and 1 Samuel 22:1-5 tells that David, as he was fleeing from King Saul, requested from the king of Moab to provide shelter to his parents, until the danger passed away (Eskenazi & Frymer-Kensky 2011). However, despite the few positive remarks, the evaluation of the Moabites in the Hebrew Bible is mostly negative. Moabites, and especially Moabite women in the case of Numbers 25 and King Solomon's love for them, indicate trouble.

The Book of Ruth tells about a mixed marriage, but one that does not lead to apostasy, a turn away from Yahweh, but one that leads to a 'turn towards' Yahweh. One of the main characters in the book, is Ruth the Moabitess and foreign woman, who was chosen to play such a key role in the history of Israel - after all, the outcome of this mixed marriage is eventually the birth of King David.

The Intermarriage in the Book of Ruth

The marriage between Ruth and Boaz as recorded in the Old Testament book of Ruth was weaved around the custom of levirate marriage prevalent in ancient Israel. According to Geysler-Fouche and Fourie (2017), “The Book of Ruth is the most common inclusive text and in general claimed in the perspective of inclusivity” (p. 5). Braulik (1999) calls the Ruth narrative a ‘*Gegengeschichte*’ – a counter story to specifically the law in Deuteronomy 23:3-4, the prohibition of Moabites in the community of Yahweh and the reasons why they are forbidden: They did not give Israel bread and water during their journey through the desert, instead, they hired Balaam to curse Israel. The whole narrative of Ruth the Moabite is aimed at correcting this negative image of Moabites during the postexilic period. Moab receives a destitute Judahite family in time of distress by providing them with food and shelter during the famine. However, one might differ here from Braulik: Moab can also be regarded as a negative space, as all the men of this family die in Moab (De Villiers and Le Roux, 2016).

According to Smith (2007), the book of Ruth is characterized by the bonds involved in terms of covenantal language. One theme that permeates the story is that of fidelity (*hesed*), loyalty born of covenant bonding. Attentive to the use of *hesed* in Ruth 1:8-9, 2:20 and 3:30, Campbell (2003) comments: “The striking thing about the theology of the Ruth Book, however, is that it brings the lofty concept of covenant into vital contact with day-to-day life...” (p. 80). Laffey (1995) characterizes Ruth’s words in 1:16-17 as an example of covenant fidelity. Lacocque (2004) has also drawn attention to the use of *hesed* in 2:20 in his characterization of Ruth’s change of status in 1:16-17 as one of voluntary displacement. Naomi thinks of Ruth’s future and arranges things so that Boaz will marry Ruth eventually. Naomi sets matters moving and had to explain to Ruth what she must do to show Boaz that she was interested in marrying him.

In Ruth 2:11, when Boaz recounts what Ruth has done, he acknowledges “All that you have done for your mother-in-law after the death of your husband has been fully reported to me, and how you left your father and your mother and the land of your birth, and came to a people that you did not previously know.” McKenzie (2002) defines Boaz as, “Kinsman of Naomi, a wealthy landowner of Bethlehem, who married Ruth (Ruth 2:1ff); an ancestor of David” (p. 100). It was Naomi’s initiative that Ruth gets married to Boaz and Naomi tells Ruth that night, Boaz will be winnowing barely at the threshing floor. Naomi instructs Ruth to wash and anoint herself. Having prepared herself in this way, Ruth is to go down to the threshing floor, but not to make herself known to Boaz until he finished eating his food (Ruth 3:1-5). These instructions given to Ruth by Naomi now come to the climax.

Boaz lies down to go to sleep; Ruth is instructed to make the place where he lies. She is to come and uncover his legs and lie down there. The point of this perhaps was to awake the man at his feet, because of cold. The position taken by Ruth also represented her as a petitioner. That represented the completion of Ruth’s task as the role she must play to show that she is interested in the marriage. The above makes it clear that this describes a way whereby Ruth signified to Boaz her desire to marry him. Ruth carried out the plan and how Boaz received her overtures is a thing that is commendable. Ruth is not left long in doubt; Boaz’s response is to pour down a blessing upon her (Ruth

2: 4, 12). He thinks that Ruth has shown more kindness at the beginning may be that which Ruth showed to Naomi. Boaz made plain what was to be the order of things.

First, he told Ruth to stay where she is; there is no point for her to go elsewhere. In the morning, Boaz promised action. There is a closer kinsman who has the right to marry Ruth if he chooses to exercise the right. Boaz took up Ruth's case, and called the other man who had the right to redeem, the one who was nearer than himself. He wanted to show that this man was not able to redeem Ruth. Boaz had a deep and abiding love and interest in Ruth and Naomi. The other man did not. The other man had not bothered himself about them at all and still did not care until Boaz challenged him and confronted him with the matter.

The other redeemer now confessed publicly that he was unable to redeem. Boaz bought and inherited what belonged to Elimelech, Malon and Chilion. He inherited Ruth as well. And he did not inherit her that she might be his slave; she was to be his wife. He was no longer the poor Moabite widow or even a humble gleaner in his field. Her place was to be at his side, in his home and in his heart. The entire harvest was hers. And more than that she now possessed not only the inheritance of Elimelech, Mahlon and Chilion but also all the wealth of Boaz. This mighty man of wealth was now at her disposal.

The marriage between Ruth and Boaz is a classical integration of two religions. Ruth was a Gentile and stranger to the Jewish religion. She was eventually related to Boaz by marriage. Thus intermarriage between Ruth and Boaz has fostered a binding relationship between the Jews and the Moabites, which climaxed in the birth of Jesus Christ, the saviour of the whole world who of course came from the lineage of David.

Christians' Attitude towards Intermarriages in the Contemporary Nigeria

In the contemporary time, the issue of mixed marriage or intermarriage has become an issue of strong debate among Nigerian Christians. Generally, Christians' attitude towards intermarriage is not encouraging. Some Christians forbid intermarriage drawing from 2 Corinthians 6:14 which says: "Do not be mismatched with unbelievers. For what partnership have righteousness and iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness?" Some other Christians believe that anyone has the freedom to choose his or her partner for life, and that love has no boundaries. This attitude is found most often among those Christians who may be

identified as progressive or liberal Christians. This is supported by 1 Corinthians 7:12-14 with the central sentence: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through her believing husband". Often times, these biblical passages are interpreted without their contextual meanings by some Christians for selfish interests.

Some Christian denominations do not allow their members to marry from other denominations. In other words, within Christianity in Nigeria, Christians discriminate among themselves in choosing marriage partners. Some churches do not allow their members to marry people from other churches in order to protect the faith and doctrines of their respective churches. According to Okeke cited in Chiegboka (2012), "in Nigeria, mixed marriages create situations of real tensions and conflicts. The problem is more pronounced on the part of women..." (p. 29). The issue of intermarriage affects mainly the Christian ladies many of whom remain unmarried only because they are waiting for marriage partners who are of the same faith or church with them. This discrimination

goes contrary to the marriage between Ruth and Boaz which has become a source of blessing to the whole world.

Apart from marital discrimination on the basis of faith, in the contemporary Igbo society of Nigeria which is dominated by Christians, one thing that is really counting casualties is the issue of intermarriages between the *Osu* and the freeborn. An *Osu* is someone sacrificed or dedicated to a deity as personal property of the deity whom he must serve all his life, taking care of his welfare from the proceeds of sacrifices to the deity and donations to the chief priest and custodian of the shrine. According to traditional belief in Igbo land, any man who marries an *Osu* becomes one, and his offsprings inherit this dehumanizing segregation. In some cases, many Igbo ladies and men of marriage age had their dreams to marry their choices of partners crashed on account of this segregatory system.

Efforts are being made to abolish this inhuman practice of caste system. The churches are the front liners. They try their best to let followers know that to tag another human being created by God sub-human is an abomination before God and a sin. However, as much as the churches canvass for the end of this system, their parishioners speak from both sides of their lips, for while they condemn this caste system in the day time, they hide to discriminate against the people at night. How then could this system be abolished when there are lots of hypocrisy and betrayal on the matter from some people who call themselves Christians?

Interestingly enough, some true Christians, who are both young men and women, who really believe that all human beings are created equal before God have married each other, sometimes against the wishes of their parents just to please God. But the fact remains that these bold and courageous young people are grossly in the minority, as majority of the freeborn lack the confidence to begin the dismantling of this discriminatory practice through intermarriages.

Therefore, discrimination in choosing marriage partners among Christians in the modern time cannot be denied. In other words, the issue of mixed marriage is still a problem among our Christians, no matter how some people try to play it down. Any system which could derail the plan of two lovers to marry themselves, on account of religious belief or social stratification is definitely anti-human, and therefore should be eradicated without further delay.

Lessons of Boaz's marriage with Ruth for Contemporary Nigerian Christians

The marriage between Ruth and Boaz presents a lesson before contemporary Nigerian Christian that we should be against discriminations in choosing marriage partners. Christians should encourage mixed marriages once the man and woman marrying themselves agree to dwell together under one religion or faith. Ruth left her people, her nation and her god Chemosh to cling and follow her mother-in-law and eventually to marry Boaz. To this, Henry (1991) comments, "In the conversion of Ruth the Moabitess, and the bringing of her into the pedigree of the Messiah, we have a type of calling of the Gentiles in due time into the fellowship of Christ Jesus our Lord" (p. 372). Imagine a Moabitess getting married to someone of the Jewish race who sees themselves as the only people of God. Jews have always believed that God is peculiar to them and it is not in their character to marry a non-Jew. They discriminate against other nations, race etc. But, Boaz loved and married Ruth, a

Moabites.

Boaz's marriage with Ruth points to the contemporary Nigerian Christians that God is always willing to accept any stranger or foreigner who accepts to be part of his covenant relationship. Jews often despised the Moabites, but Ruth was loved for her faithfulness. Her modesty and virtue won the admiration of Boaz who eventually indicated interest in marrying her. Hence, Christian women especially the young ones who are seeking for marriage partners should emulate Ruth's faithfulness, modesty and virtue.

The success of the marriage between Boaz and Ruth implies that God is a universal God. Religious sentiments and tribal discrimination are not supposed to count in marriage. Once there is love and understanding between the intending couple, their marriage should be encouraged. God as the creator of the universe is the God of all people there in. According to

Menezes (2003):

The author of the Book of Ruth along with the author of the Book of Jonah and the Second Isaiah are outstanding examples of prophetic personages who criticized the narrow-minded, nationalistic and racist types of theology as represented in the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah, who tried to make of Yahweh national God, not to say a partisan god, who considered non-Jews as 'pagans', destined for Yahweh's wrath and rejection. (p. 115).

Ezra and Nehemiah go so far as to annul marriages of Jews with non-Jews and consider such marriages as treachery to their God (cf. Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 10).

Boaz's marriage with Ruth, a foreigner was a source of satisfaction to God. Their marriage was blessed with a son, Obed who became the grand father of King David and an ancestor of Jesus Christ. So, the issue of intermarriage is not thing of tribal sentiment, it is a thing of religious formation of the individuals coming into marriages. Boaz's marriage with Ruth points to the Jews and Christians that God is willing to accept any foreigner who accepts to be part of his covenant relationship he has with them. The author of the book of Ruth advocates universalism. He anticipates Paul of Tarsus who asks his opponent: "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is he not the God of the Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one!" (Rom 3: 29-30). Religious sentiments and tribal discrimination are not supposed to count in marriage. God is the God of all flesh and he does not discriminate between individuals, peoples and nations. He is a universal God, not a God to Jews alone but a God to all who profess faith in him.

Conclusion

Religion influences marriage. It influenced Ruth's marriage to Boaz because Ruth came under the wings of the God of Israel to take refuge. Ruth being a foreigner and Moabite had to nationalize as a Jew. The marriage between Ruth and Boaz helped to foster a binding relationship between the Jews and the Moabites. Of course, God can use other people and nations to work out his divine purpose and plan. Ruth the Moabite became part of the lineage that had Abraham and produced figures to reckon with particularly David and Jesus

Christ. God is a universal God and does not discriminate. Thus if Nigerian Christians can be faithful to God and to their fellow human beings knowing that God is one and created all mankind, marriage in our time can also be blessed irrespective of religion, tribe, colour and social status. The book of Ruth presents a lesson before us that we should

stand up against discriminations in choosing marriage partners. Mixed marriage should be encouraged once the man and woman marrying themselves agree to dwell together under the same religion. For a smooth intermarriage, there should be religious acceptance and cultural adaptation. Ruth accepted the Jewish religion and adapted to the culture of the Jewish people. While avoiding discrimination in choosing marriage partners, people should choose those whom they can agree with in religion. Ruth agreed with Boaz's religion.

References

- Anderson, G. W. (1966). *The history and religion of Israel*. London: Oxford University.
- Anderson, G. W. (1978). *The living world of the Old Testament* (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- Brenner, A. (2011). Ruth: The art of memorizing territory and religion. In D.J.A. Clines and E. Van Wolde (Eds.). *A critical engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in honour of J. Cheryl Exum* (pp. 82–89). Sheffield: Academic Press.
- Braulik, G. (1999). The book of Ruth as intra-biblical critique on the Deuteronomic Law. *Acta Theologica* 1. 1-20.
- Campbell, E.F. (2003). *Ruth*. Yale. Yale University.
- Chiegboka, A.B.C. (2006). *What God Has Joined Together: The marriage Bond in Canonical Doctrine and Jurisprudenc*. Nimo: Rex Charles & Patrick.
- Chiegboka, A.B.C. (2012). *The Catholic Church and marriage bond*. Awka: Fab Anieh.
- De Villiers, G. and le Roux, J. (2016). The book of Ruth in the time of the Judges and Ruth, the Moabitess. *Berbum et Ecclesia*. 37. 1. 1-6. Retrieved May 12, 2020 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1587>.
- Eskenazi, T. and Frymer-Kensky, T. (2011). *Ruth*. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Fischer, I. (2007). The book of Ruth as exegetical literature. *European Judaism: A Journal for the New Europe*. 40. 2. 140-149.
- Frevel, C. and Rausche, B. (2014). Mixed marriages as a challenge to identity in Second Temple Judaism. Retrieved May 12, 2020 from <http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/fre318503.shtml>
- Geyser-Fouche, A. and Fourie, C. (2017). Inclusivity in the Old Testament. *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies*. 73. 4. 1-9. Retrieved June 1, 2020 from <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i4.4761>.

- Grätz, S., (2011). The Question of “mixed marriages” (intermarriage): The extra-biblical evidence. In C. Frevel (Ed.). *Mixed marriages, intermarriage and group identity in the Second Temple period* (pp. 192–204). London: T & T Clark.
- Henry, M. (1991). The Book of Ruth. In *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible* (pp. 372-380). New York: Hendrickson.
- Hinson, D. F. (1992). *The books of the Old Testament: Old Testament introduction 2*. London: SPCK.
- Kaiser, W. C. (1983). *Toward Old Testament Ethics*. Michigan: Grand Rapids.
- Kizhakkeyil, S. (2009). *The Pentateuch: An Exegetical Commentary*. Bandra: St Pauls.
- Laffey, A. L. (1995), Ruth. In R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Murphy. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (pp. 553-557). London: Burns and Oates.
- Lacocque, A. (1990). The feminine unconditional: Four subversive figures in Israel's tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- McKenzie, J. L. (Ed.) (2002). *Dictionary of the Bible*. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation.
- Nihan, C. (2011). Ethnicity and identity in Isaiah 56–66. In O. Lipschits, G.N. Knoppers and M. Oeming (Eds.). *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid period. Negotiating identity in an international context*, pp. 67–104, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake.
- Nmah, P. E. (2004). *Basic & Applied Christian Ethics: An African Perspective*. Onitsha: Gucks Systems Int'l.
- Menezes, R. (2003). *The Old Testament for Our Times*. Bandra: St. Pauls.
- Smith, M.S. (2007). “Your people shall be my people”: Family and covenant in Ruth 1:16-17. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 69.2. 242-258. Retrieved May 12, 2020 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43725964>.
- Southwood, K.E. (2011a). An ethnic affair? Ezra's intermarriage crisis against a context of “self Ascription” and “Ascription of Others”. In C. Frevel (Ed.). *Mixed marriages, intermarriage and group identity in the Second Temple period* (pp. 46–59). London: T&T Clark.
- Telushkin, J. (1948). *Biblical Criticism*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Umeanolue, I.L. (2011). Religion and marriage in the book of Ruth: Implications for contemporary Nigerian Christians. *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*. 12. 2. 152-167.