

Leviticus 19:18 Does Not Mean “Love Everyone”:

Why I Disagree with Richard E. Friedman

Hector Avalos, Professor of Religious Studies, Iowa State University

The conflicts over immigration and social inequality mean that Leviticus 19:18 is being revived once again as a biblical prooftext.¹ Immigration, when managed poorly, has resulted in some of the worst tragedies in human history, including the Nazi Holocaust.² One of the main defenders for the universalist interpretation of Leviticus 19:18 is Richard E. Friedman, who wrote an article in 2014 in the

¹ See Gregory Lee Cuéllar, *Voices of Marginality: Exile and Return in Second Isaiah 40–55 and the Mexican Immigrant Experience* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2008). More generally, Paul Collier, *Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

² Scholarly literature on the Holocaust is massive, and this is not the place to discuss that tragedy. My own analysis of the religious roots of the Holocaust, including a summary of different views and historiography, is in Hector Avalos, *The Reality of Religious Violence from Biblical to Modern Times* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2019), pp. 312-354.

Biblical Archaeology Review on that passage.³ Friedman is the Ann and Jay Davis Professor of Jewish Studies at the University of Georgia. In the interest of transparency, I will disclose that I often assign his writings to my students in the Bible classes I teach at Iowa State University, and we were both students of Frank Moore Cross (1921-2012).

Leviticus 19:18, with some preceding verses added for context, reads as follows in the Revised Standard Version:⁴

[15] You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the poor or defer to the great, but in righteousness shall you judge your neighbor. [16] You shall not go up and down as a slanderer among your people, and you shall not stand forth against the life of your neighbor: I am the LORD. [17] "You shall not hate your brother in your heart,

³ Friedman, Richard E., "Love Your Neighbor: Only Israelites or Everyone?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 40 (2014): 49-52; Online:<https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-topics/bible-interpretation/love-your-neighbor-only-israelites-or-everyone/>

⁴ Unless noted otherwise, all of our biblical quotations are adapted (diacritics have been removed) from the Revised Standard Version edited by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

**but you shall reason with your neighbor, lest you bear sin
because of him.**

**[18] You shall not take vengeance or bear any grudge against
the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor
as yourself [ואהבת לרעך כמוך]. I am the LORD.**

Interpretations range from those who claim Leviticus 19:18 applies only to fellow Hebrews to those who see it as applying to all human beings. Examples of a broad or universalistic understanding include the self-identified Guatemalan-American scholar, M. Daniel Carroll R., author of *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible* (2008), and Fleur S. Houston, author of *You Shall Love the Stranger as Yourself: The Bible, Refugees, and Asylum* (2015).⁵

⁵ M. Daniel Carroll R., *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008); Fleur S. Houston, *You Shall Love the Stranger as Yourself: The Bible, Refugees, and Asylum* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015). See also Bohdan Hrobon, “Be Useful to Your Neighbor Who Is Like You: Exegesis and Alternative Translation of Lev 19:18B,” *CV* 59 (2017):5-24; Marianne Heinbach-Steins, “‘Die fremden lieben...’ Biblische Impulsen für eine Christliche Migrationenethik,” *BK* 73 (2018): 232-39; Dorothea Erbele-Küster, “Zur Anthropologie der Ethik der (Liebes) Gebote,” in Andreas Wagner and Jürgen van Oorschot (eds.), *Individualität und Selbstreflexion in den Literaturen des Alten Testaments* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen

Jesus, according to many Christian scholars, understood it as a universal commandment (e.g., Matt 22:37-40), but even Christian scholars may disagree.

John P. Meier, the prominent Christian scholar of the historical Jesus, concludes:

There is no good reason to think that, when Jesus cited, Lev.

19.18b, ‘you shall love your neighbor as yourself’, he meant

anything other than what the Hebrew text means by *rēaʿ*,

namely, a fellow Israelite who belongs to the cultic community

Gesellschaft für Theologie 48; Leipzig: EVA, 2017), pp. 341-54, An evangelical Christian perspective is in Henry Ansgar Kelly, “Love of Neighbor as Great Commandment in the Time of Jesus: Grasping at Straws in the Hebrew Scriptures,” *JETS* 60 (2017):265-81. A discussion of why some Dead Sea Scrolls might have intentionally omitted Leviticus 19:18 at a place expected to include it may be found in Kengo Akiyama, “Reproof in CD 9:2-8 and 1QS 5:24-6:1: A Note on a Curious Omission,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 301-06; Carole Fontaine, “Golden Do’s and Don’ts: Leviticus 19:1-17 from a Human-Rights-Based Approach (HRBA),” in Athalya Brenner and Chin Lung Lee (eds.), *Leviticus and Numbers* (Texts@Contexts; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013), pp. 97-118.

that worships Yahweh alone as the one true God (as proclaimed in Deut. 6.4-5).⁶

If Jesus changed any originally more restrictive meaning, then his authority to change the meaning rests on a theological presupposition that he has such authority to reinterpret scripture. If Jesus did change the original meaning of Leviticus 19:18, then Jesus is misusing and de-contextualizing scripture as much or more than any other interpreter. Jesus should not be allowed any special interpretive skills or insights.⁷

A more restrictive understanding includes Joel S. Kaminsky, author of *Yet I Loved Jacob: Reclaiming the Biblical Concept of Election* (2016), who believes Israel's special elected status is justified. James K. Hoffmeier, the author of *The Immigration Crisis: Immigrants, Aliens, and the Bible* (2009) is on the more conservative side of evangelical Christianity.⁸ A technical philological analysis

⁶ John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Volume 4: Law and Love* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 651.

⁷ A discussion of Jesus' portrayal as a paradigmatic exegete of the Hebrew Bible may be found in Hector Avalos, *The Bad Jesus: The Ethics of New Testament Ethics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015), pp. 32-35, 376.

⁸ Joel S. Kaminsky *Yet I Loved Jacob: Reclaiming the Biblical Concept of Election* (Eugene, OR; Wipf and Stock 2016); James K. Hoffmeier, *The*

may be found in Hans-Peter Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten Wie Dich Selbst: Untersuchungen zum altestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstliebe (Lev 19, 18)* (1986).⁹

A more open discussion of the ethics of commentaries on Leviticus is offered by James W. Watts in his recent essay “Drawing Lines: A Suggestion for Addressing the Moral Problem of Reproducing in Commentaries and Bibles” (2019).¹⁰ He grants that some of the teachings of Leviticus are immoral in:

Immigration Crisis: Immigrants, Aliens, and the Bible (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2009).

⁹ Hans-Peter Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten Wie Dich Selbst: Untersuchungen zum altestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstliebe (Lev 19, 18)* (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986). More recently, Christophe Lemardelé, “Another Suggestion Regarding the Hebrew Noun *mērēaʿ*,” *BN NF* 153 (2012): 107-111. For the syntax, see T. Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem in Lev 19:18b,” *JSS* 23 (1978):291-297.

¹⁰ James W. Watts, “Drawing Lines: A Suggestion for Addressing the Moral Problem of Reproducing Immoral Biblical Texts in Commentaries and Bibles,” in Christian A. Ebehart and Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics—Methodology—Themes* (Göttingen; Vandenoek & Ruprecht, 2019), pp. 235-252.

mandating that readers treat some other people in ways now widely regarded as immoral, cruel, inhumane, and exploitive—texts and have historically justified genocide, indiscriminate capital punishment, slavery, and the subjugation of women by men.”¹¹

Watts proposes that we strike-through/delete passages in Leviticus that would be considered immoral today. As such it is similar to my plea to decanonize some immoral passages in the Bible in general.¹²

Despite the enormous number of scholars who argue that Leviticus 19:18 applies to all human beings, I specifically will critique the arguments of Richard E. Friedman. Aside from an attempt to make a case for a universalistic understanding, Friedman identified me as uncritically following Harry M. Orlinsky (1908-1992), the Effie Wise Chair of Bible at the New York School of Hebrew Union College— Jewish Institute of Religion. Orlinsky was a prominent biblical translator who served as editor-in-chief for the New Jewish Publication Society. Friedman refers to the comments in my book, *Fighting Words: The Origins of Religious Violence* (2005), about Orlinsky as follows:

¹¹ Watts, “Drawing Lines,” p. 235.

¹²Hector Avalos, “The Letter Killeth: A Plea for Decanonizing Violent Biblical Texts,” *Journal of Religion, Conflict and Peace* 1 (2007). Online: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=philrs_pubs.

The much respected Bible scholar Harry Orlinsky made the context argument in 1974. Because of his scholarly standing, he was followed by others... Hector Avalos also followed Orlinsky, saying “as Orlinsky has deftly noted ... The “deftly noted” remark has been used (and often quoted) over and over again in connection with the interpretation of this verse. It was not deft at all.¹³

My article here will argue that, despite a pro-immigrant and welcoming appearance, Lev 19:18 actually is part of a colonialist and patriarchal attitude toward foreigners found in Leviticus and in other biblical traditions. Friedman overlooks the exegetical and ethical problems he creates and/or propagates in explaining his disagreement with Orlinsky and with yours truly.

¹³ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 52 quoting Hector Avalos, *Fighting Words: The Origins of Religious Violence* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2005), p. 14. An updated and expanded version of my book is *The Reality of Religious Violence from Biblical to Modern Times* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2019).

Orlinsky discussed Leviticus 19:18 within the context of three ideologies, which I adapt here:¹⁴

A. Nationalism which means that only fellow Hebrews are included.

B. Internationalism, “the concept of world brotherhood and the essential equality of all mankind.”¹⁵

C. Universalism, wherein the author does intend to include all human beings under the directive.

As Orlinsky phrases it:

And so, the God of Israel is at the same time the sole God and Master of the Universe without being the God of any nation but Israel: the *natural* God of biblical Israel is a *universal* God but not an *international* God. With no people other than Israel did God ever enter into a legally binding relationship. To the biblical writers God was never the God of Moab, or of Egypt, or Canaan, or Assyria, or

¹⁴ Harry M. Orlinsky, ‘Nationalism, Universalism, and Internationalism in Ancient Israel’, In Harry Thomas Frank and William L. Reed (eds.), *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert G. May* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1970), pp. 206-236.

¹⁵ Orlinsky, ‘Nationalism,’ p. 210.

**Aram of Ethiopia or Philistia et al. He was the God of Israel
alone...God was national and universal, but not international.¹⁶**

Orlinsky uses mainly these lines of evidence that I adapt here:

- A. YHWH claims Israel as his exclusive nation (e.g., Deut 32:8, Amos 2:1-3; Sirach 17:17);
- B. An exclusive Covenant with Israel (e.g., The Ten Commandments in Exod 20);
- C. The negative views of some foreigners (e.g., Isaiah 56:6-7).

I agree with Orlinsky that Leviticus 19:18 has a highly restricted meaning.

Although Orlinsky may disagree with me, I also hold that Leviticus 19:18 is part of a slave-master society that views both Israelites and foreigners as slaves to God. As Jacob Milgrom remarks in his discussion of the aftermath of the Exodus, “[h]enceforth, the Israelites are slaves of God.”¹⁷

¹⁶ Orlinsky, “Nationalism,” pp. 213-214, 218.

¹⁷ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27, AB 3B* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 2226. For a systematic case against the perpetuation of this slave-master ideology in modern biblical scholarship, see Hector Avalos, *Slavery, Abolitionism and the Ethics of Biblical Scholarship* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011).

Lexicography and Linguistics

Much of the debate about Leviticus 19:18 centers on the meaning of particular words used in Hebrew and Greek. For example, the Hebrew word that is one of the most frequently discussed is *gēr*. Depending on the biblical version or scholar, it has been translated as “sojourner,” “immigrant,” “stranger,” or “resident alien,” among others.¹⁸ There are questions about the historical evolution in the use of these terms, and also in how different literary traditions within the Bible use them.¹⁹ Friedman translates *gēr* as “alien” in his *Commentary on the Torah* (e.g., Lev 25:43, 46), and that will be sufficient for our critique of his view.²⁰ What is

¹⁸ None of these translations of *gēr* or *tôshab*, another related term, may be quite the equivalent of our “undocumented” or “illegal” alien. There were no “documents” that people carried around in ancient Israel describing their citizenship status. A *gēr* may be someone from another tribe, and not just from another nation. All of these linguistic issues complicate any search for what the Bible “really says” about undocumented immigration. See further, Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

¹⁹ Mark A. Awabdy, *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy’s Theological and Social Vision for the Gēr* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

²⁰ Richard E. Friedman, *Commentary on the Torah with a New Translation of the Hebrew Text* (New York, NY: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001), p. 406. Reflections on writing a commentary on Leviticus may be found in Christian

meant by “to love” (אהב) is also irrelevant because Professor Friedman grants that P-sources (cf. Lev. 19:34) presumably also accept many acts (e.g., beating slaves, raping some categories of women, and dispossessing other people) as part of “loving” your neighbor.²¹

Article II of The United Nations’ Convention on The Prevention and Punishment of Genocide (1948) defines its list of punishable acts as follows:

A. Eberhart and Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics — Methodology — Themes* (FRANT 276; Göttingen: Vandehoek & Ruprecht, 2019).

²¹ An unconvincing proposal to translate this verse as ‘You should care for persons in your surroundings the same way as you would like them to take care of you!’ is offered by Bob Becking, “Love Thy Neighbour...” in Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneith (eds.), *‘Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben’ (Gen 18,19): Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie. Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische and Biblische Rechtsgeschichte, 13; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), pp. 182-87 (185). Becking offers no sound linguistic parallels for his speculative reading.

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.²²

²²See The United Nations' Convention on The Prevention and Punishment of Genocide at https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf.

Examples of such acts may be found in Leviticus and other P-sources. One cannot appeal to the antiquity of Hebrew culture to excuse any ethical differences with our modern one unless one is willing to do the same for Canaanite culture.

Source Criticism and the Comparative Argument

Professor Friedman has written extensively on Pentateuchal source criticism (e.g., his *Commentary*) which forms part of the defense of a universalistic understanding of Leviticus 19:18. He argues that:

The first occurrence of the word torah in the Torah is: “There shall be one torah for the citizen and for the alien who resides among you” (Exodus 12:49, from the Levite source P).²³

Friedman, includes Deuteronomistic texts as part of P, the priestly source:

Of the four sources of the Torah or Pentateuch that critical scholars refer to as J, E, P and D,^a three—E, P (the Priestly source) and D (the Deuteronomistic source)—are Levite sources.²⁴

²³ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 50.

²⁴ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 50.

Friedman’s remarks regarding Pentateuchal sources here are not only irrelevant, but these claims can be downright frightening and horrific for many immigrants in search of religious freedom.

Imagine if we were asked or forced to join an entity such as ISIS (aka Islamic State), which aimed at the revival of an Islamic caliphate.²⁵ A main principle of joining would be that “**there shall be one ISIS law for the current citizens and for the alien that resides among you.**”²⁶ Joining would require:

-Surrendering your religion to join Allah’s community. In the case of Leviticus 19:18, this would mean worshipping YHWH exclusively.

-Subjection to the same brutal and inhumane treatment (e.g., stoning, bodily mutilation) imposed on those that violate Allah’s directives and/or worship other gods.

²⁵ A broader history of ISIS is found in Fawaz A. Gerges, *ISIS: A History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, rev. edn, 2017).

²⁶ Hector Avalos, “The Near Eastern and Biblical Roots of Human Trafficking by ISIS,” *Conversations with the Biblical World* 36 (2016): 199-224.

If one looks at how ISIS has treated the Yezidi tradition, one wonders if Professor Friedman is willing to excuse that sort of equality toward Yezidis.²⁷

As it is, one of the Ten Commandments, which Friedman places within the ethical domain of P, says: **"I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. "You shall have no other gods before me"** (Exod 20:2-3). But is it not worshipping other gods that made foreigners so hated in Deuteronomy and Leviticus (e.g., Deut 20:16-18)? How is such permanence as a second-class inhabitant mostly a positive feature for those who do not wish to convert to a new religion? And how does Professor Friedman count that when he says that in **"Levite sources, the command to treat aliens fairly comes up 52 times!"** How does this reflect any equality or "fairness" in the ability to worship another god?²⁸

The Canaanites, who themselves became internal refugees after the Hebrew conquest, were to be slaughtered because they were potential threats to the religion of God's chosen people in Deut. 20:16-18:

²⁷ See Amy L. Beam, *The Last Yezidi Genocide* (City of publication is not provided clearly by publisher: Adinolfi Books, 2019). For a broader treatment of Yezidi history and religion, see Birgül Açıkyıldız, *The Yezidis: The History of a Community, Culture and Religion* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2014).

²⁸ Friedman, "Love Your Neighbor," p. 50.

But as for the towns of these peoples that the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance, you must not let anything that breathes remain alive. You shall annihilate them... that they may not teach you to do all the abhorrent things that they do in the service for their gods, and you thus sin against the LORD your God.²⁹

Where is that in Professor Friedman's count of 52 times that Hebrews are commanded to be "fair" to foreigners?

Ruth is one of the most famous exemplars of a supposedly immigrant-friendly attitude³⁰ Nevertheless, Laura E. Donaldson has pointed out that Ruth was accepted only because she was willing to give up her religion and culture.³¹

²⁹ Friedman (*Commentary*, p. 375) argues for the translation of תועבה (*to'ebah*) in Lev 18:22 and elsewhere as "offensive" rather than with other words such as "abomination."

³⁰ Hoffmeier, *The Immigration Crisis*, pp. 103-107; Carroll, *Christians at the Border*, pp. 74-75.

³¹ See Laura E. Donaldson, "The Sign of Orpah: Reading Ruth through Native Eyes," in Athalya Brenner (ed.), *Ruth and Esther: A Feminist Companion to the Bible*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 130–144.

Even if she willingly gives up her gods, Ruth is an example of how acceptance by the Yahwistic culture demanded her Moabite deculturation.³²

Discounting the Inhumane Treatment of Foreigners

Professor Friedman remarks: **“It is certainly true that there are also some harsh passages toward foreigners in the Bible: Dispossess the Canaanites, destroy Jericho, etc.”**³³ Although Professor Friedman does not emphasize or mention it directly, note that the word “harsh” in the P-sources includes:

- Beating a slave nearly to death in Exod 21:20-21;
- Stoning for violating the Sabbath day in Numbers 15:32-36;
- Raping an unbetrothed woman in Deut 22:28-29;
- Mutilation of Midianites in Numbers 25 (See Numbers 25:8).

Note that the word “dispossess” is used when a modern translator could just as well use words (“covet”) that would contradict the Commandment in Exodus 20:17 to not covet your neighbor’s property (unless you believe God gave it to you). Note that the town of Jericho is what is “destroyed” instead of men, women, and children (Joshua 6:21). Where is that in the count of 52 times that Hebrews are commanded to be “fair” to foreigners?

³² Donaldson, “The Sign of Orpah.”

³³ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 50.

Countertraditions are not Counted Properly

Countertraditions in the Bible are being used to oppose the view that the Bible is ethically flawed.³⁴ Professor Friedman uses this technique, as well. According to Professor Friedman, “**in far more laws and instances, the principle of treatment of aliens is positive.**”³⁵ Friedman’s main examples of positive treatment include these:

“Don’t rape a captured woman in war (Deuteronomy 21:10ff).

Don’t abhor an Edomite (Deuteronomy 23:8).

If you happen upon your enemy’s ox or donkey straying, *bring it back* to him.”³⁶

So, what do you do with Malachi 1:1-5, where the text says that Yahweh hated Esau? What do you do with Deut 22:29, where a male is allowed to rape a female, and then she is commanded to marry her rapist? What do you do with killing animals before you bring them back to anyone (1 Samuel 15:1-3)?

³⁴ See discussion in Ilana Pardes, *Countertraditions in the Bible: A Feminist Approach* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).

³⁵ Friedman, “*Love Your Neighbor*,” p. 50.

³⁶ Friedman, “*Love Your Neighbor*,” pp. 50-51.

And consider Numbers 31:17, which endorses an even more violent form of separating families: **“Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known man by lying with him. But all the young girls who have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.”** Many Christian scholars will protest that this is the “Old Testament” or that it has to do with war, but this practice would be held as immoral today by the United Nations, whether in war or in peace.

Furthermore, Professor Friedman does not seem to count many instances where P-sources endorse some horrific violence towards one’s own biological family members.³⁷ One example based on religion is in Deut. 13:

[6] "If your brother, the son of your mother, or your son, or your daughter, or the wife of your bosom, or your friend who is as your own soul, entices you secretly, saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods,' which neither you nor your fathers have known, [7] some of the gods of the peoples that are round

³⁷ On the relationship of the so-called Deuteronomist source to P, see Eckart Otto, “Priesterschrift und Deuteronomium in Buch Leviticus: Zum Integration des Deuteronomium in den Pentateuch,” in Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 2015), pp. 161-185.

about you, whether near you or far off from you, from the one end of the earth to the other, [8] you shall not yield to him or listen to him, nor shall your eye pity him, nor shall you spare him, nor shall you conceal him; [9] but you shall kill him; your hand shall be first against him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. [10] You shall stone him to death with stones, because he sought to draw you away from the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. [11] And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and never again do any such wickedness as this among you.

This passage shows that not even biologically related individuals should be treated equally, but Professor Friedman's *Commentary* really does not address what "equal treatment" really means.³⁸ How does Professor Friedman count that when he mentions his 52 instances of commanded to be fair to foreigners or fellow Hebrews?

³⁸ Friedman, *Commentary*, pp. 608-609.

The Lack of Historicity is Not an Argument

Elsewhere, I have addressed extensively the idea that lack of historicity exculpates biblical authors for genocidal or murderous mentalities.³⁹ ***It does not.***

Friedman repeats this misguided ethical principle when he remarks:

But the evidence in the ground, discussed and debated many times in BAR's pages, indicates that most of that (the so-called Conquest of the Land never happened.⁴⁰

The fact that ethical principles might have been different two or three thousand years ago means also that Canaanites might be able to claim the same. Indeed, historicity is irrelevant. It is the ethical concept that counts here. Every act of genocide has a preceding intention to commit genocide.

Even if Professor Friedman's claim is true, something similar applies to all those convicted of only one murder in the United States. The problem here is not quantity or historicity, but the ethics of murderous actions and mindset. Our justice system does not condemn people for the positive things they do **"in far more laws and instances."** Our justice system will convict you for just one

³⁹ Hector Avalos, "The New Holocaust Denialists: The Need for a Metacriticism of Biblical Scholarship," *The Bible and Interpretation* (November, 2012). Online: <https://bibleinterp.arizona.edu/articles/ava368013>

⁴⁰ Friedman, "Love Your Neighbor," p. 50.

murder or rape even if you never killed or raped 99% of the people with whom you have interacted.

Geography and Mercantilism Are Not Good Reasons

Professor Friedman offers reasons, such as mercantilism and geographical location for being nice to foreigners:

Why this frequent concern for aliens? We might reasonably guess that it was a matter of geography. Israel lay at the point where Africa, Asia and Europe meet. People of all backgrounds regularly passed through. So we can imagine a nation at that fulcrum of ancient trade routes having a policy of welcome to all those valuable aliens. Still, not all countries that have desired the benefits of trade have emphasized this principle.

Geography and mercantilism may have actually created or exacerbated slavery and other social maladies.⁴¹

⁴¹ A classic statement on the role of capitalism in slavery is found in Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1966). For an overview of Williams's contributions to the study of slavery, see Heather Cateau and Selwyn H.H. Carrington (eds.), *Capitalism and Slavery Fifty Years Later: Eric Eustace Williams—A Reassessment of the Man and his Work* (New

Feelings as an Ethical Criterion

I have no problem with using feelings as part of an ethical evaluation. Empathy may be our single most important ethical feature as human beings despite some formidable philosophical problems.⁴² However, Friedman assumes that his feelings are those of everyone else:

York, NY: Peter Lang, 2000). A more recent contribution to the debate is in Joseph E. Inikori, *Africans and the Industrial Revolution: A Study in International Trade and Economic Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). For the argument that pre-capitalist and capitalist systems co-existed in the American South, see Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene D. Genovese, *Slavery in White and Black: Race and Class in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Philip Gould, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the 18th Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003). A look at both sides of the debate about Williams's thesis, see Walter Minchinton, 'Williams and Drescher: Abolition and Emancipation', *Slavery and Abolition* 4 (1983): 81-105.

⁴² Frans De Waal, *Our Inner Ape: A Leading Primatologist Explains why We are Who We Are* (New York, NY:Riverhead Books, 2005); idem, *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006). On the problems with the use of empathy in our moral systems, see Paul Bloom, *Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2016).

Why should we be good to aliens? Because we know how it feels. We know the alien's soul. So we won't persecute foreigners; we won't abhor them; we won't oppress them; we won't judge them unfairly; we'll treat them the same as we treat ourselves; we'll *love* them.⁴³

So, did feelings and our neuroanatomy change after the Tower of Babel story in Genesis 11:1-9? Is slavery not based on feelings for the suffering of other human beings? Did people suffer less from slavery at that time?

Surrender as a Reason for Forgiveness

Friedman also contends that “The Bible [permits a violent response](#) to those who threaten Israel's existence, but it still forbids a massacre if they surrender.”⁴⁴ Yes, but we can and should ask the same questions about slavery, beating slaves nearly to death, and raping some categories of women. Why is bearing “false witness” against a neighbor more ethically valued than slavery? Furthermore, I don't see that surrender would help the Amalekites in 1 Samuel 15:2-3:

⁴³ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p.50.

⁴⁴ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 51.

[2] Thus says the LORD of hosts, “I will punish what Amalek did to Israel in opposing them on the way, when they came up out of Egypt. [3] Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have; do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.”

Unless they were killed for a sacrifice, were the animals really able to ask for forgiveness?

Speculative Teleology

Professor Friedman presumes that history will evolve as the so-called “Levite” sources describe:

The Biblical authors saw Israel’s destiny as being to bring good to all those foreign nations and peoples—to the earth. It is not a minor point. It appears in God’s first words to Abraham, in God’s first words to Isaac, and in God’s first words to Jacob: Your descendants’ purpose is to be that “all the nations/families of the earth will be blessed through you” (Genesis 12:3; 26:2–4; 28:10–14).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p.51.

But it does not matter what literary tradition you might be following (e.g., P or J),
The result would be the same. You must surrender your religion to be part of us.

Friedman suggests, as have many other biblical scholars, that loving one's neighbor was behind the trajectory toward human freedom: **“A remarkable proposition coming out of ancient Judah, which was embedded in the Near Eastern world of wars, slavery, class and ethnic divisions and discriminations of all kinds.”**⁴⁶ As previously mentioned, I have devoted an entire book for the opposite view: *As biblical and Christian culture spread, so did slavery. It was extricating our social systems from biblical precepts that helped to overcome that inhumane system.*⁴⁷

Sequence of Narrative as a Defense

This segment of Friedman's argument requires some subtle exegetical parsing. Here, Friedman argues against Milgrom, who has a more restrictive understanding (only fellow Israelites):

⁴⁶ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 49.

⁴⁷ Avalos, *Slavery, Abolitionism and the Ethics of Biblical Scholarship* (2015). A view contrary to mine may be found in Shimon Bakon, “Why Did the Torah Allow Servitude?” *JBQ* 42 (2014): 89-94.

I see his [Milgrom's] point, but his position would have been more likely if the verse about love of aliens had come first in the text and the love of neighbor had come later. But the instruction to love aliens comes after we've already had the instruction to love your neighbor as oneself.

That is, if you tell people first to love their aliens and then give a second instruction to love their neighbors, that second instruction really does sound like an addition because the first group, aliens, obviously doesn't include the second group, neighbors.

But if you tell people first to love their neighbors, then a second instruction to love aliens a few verses later can make sense as a specification for anyone who would have thought that love of neighbor didn't include loving others as well.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Friedman, "Love Your Neighbor," p. 51. For a discussion of the Hebrew word (*rēā* רֵעַ) for neighbor, see also Mathys, *Liebe Deinen Nächsten*, pp. 31-32.

Yet, Professor Friedman describes this verse as “[c]apable of a thousand interpretations and raising 10,000 questions.”⁴⁹ **But if the meaning were so clear, could the issue not have been settled by simply reading the passage once?**

Friedman’s Fifty-Two Times

As mentioned, Professor Friedman observed: “**In these “Levite sources, the command to treat aliens fairly comes up 52 times! (How many times does this come up in the non-Levite source, J? Answer: None.)**.”⁵⁰ He seems to be alluding to the times where the P sources “give this reason... *‘because you were aliens in the land of Egypt’* (Exod 22:20).”⁵¹

I cannot properly evaluate this overall statistical statement without further definition of what Friedman means by “**treat aliens fairly**” or by a “**positive**” **treatment**. Friedman provides no precise comparative quantitative analysis for this sweeping statement. This is why such sweeping quantifications are always a bad argument. If killing and torturing aliens is allowable even once, then any positive treatment is irrelevant in a law code that presents itself as a model for humanity. There is no need at all for any mistreatment of aliens. We certainly do not need to enslave them. It also may be factually incorrect or ethically perplexing

⁴⁹Friedman, “Love your Neighbor,” p. 49.

⁵⁰ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 50.

⁵¹ Friedman, “Love Your Neighbor,” p. 50. Friedman’s italics.

if his claim is that particular Hebrew words (וְאֵהָבֶת לְרֵעֵךְ כַּמֹּד) must be present to be counted as part of his 52 examples.

Friedman also seems unaware that he undermines his own claim in his *Commentary* where he distinguishes numericity from the theological and ethical conceptions of the biblical monotheistic god. In his discussion of Deut. 6:4 (“Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD”), he remarks:

YHWH is one. In comparing Israel’s monotheism to pagan religion, we must appreciate that the difference between one and many is not the same as sort of thing as the difference between two and three or between six and twenty.

It is not numerical. It is a different concept of what a god is. A God who is outside of nature, known through his acts in history, a creator, unseeable, without a mate, who makes legal covenants with humans, who is one, is a revolution in religious conception.⁵²

If we parse his claim further, we can summarize seven features that Friedman identifies as making the Hebrew god so ethically revolutionary:

⁵² Friedman, *Commentary*, p. 586.

1. **A God who is outside of nature**
2. **Known through his acts in history**
3. **A creator**
4. **Unseeable**
5. **Without a mate**
6. **Makes legal covenant with humans**
7. **Who is one.**

Except perhaps for Feature 4 (See Deut 4:12: “you heard the sound of words, but saw no form”), these are all also shared by the god described in J. Each one of these seven features (e.g., YHWH as creator) could be counted in all instances listed. Some Pentateuchal traditions also did not have a problem with seeing God (Exod 24:10, 33:20-21). J depicts YHWH as being outside of nature when he acts through history to create our worlds (Features 1-3). He has no mate but is a monotheistic or monolatrous god who makes covenants with human beings (e.g., with Abram in Genesis 15:18).

Appendix I contains 53 examples (52 + 1 beyond what Professor Friedman claims for the P-sources) of places where the victims or recipients of any violence might see those actions as unfair or unacceptable if one uses the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Appendix II to this article lists instances where J may be expressing the obligation to be fair and kind to foreigners. I only need one counterexample from J because Professor Friedman told us that there were “**none**” in J. I also don’t need to find precise terms

[ואהבת לרעך כמוך] from P-sources because Professor Friedman has told us that expressing a “**principle**” is sufficient to judge a source’s ethics.

God Does Not Follow His Own Moral Directives

According to Exod 23:7, which Professor Friedman places within the Elohist tradition (i.e., the source that uses Elohim for the divine name) in his corpus of Pentateuchal sources:⁵³

Keep far from a false charge, and do not slay the innocent and righteous, for I will not acquit the wicked.

Is this the same god who killed a child because of the father’s sin, even though children are not to be punished for the sins of the father (Deut. 24:16)? After David committed adultery with Bathsheba in 2 Samuel 11, he should have been executed according to Leviticus 20:10 (“**If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death**”). David had placed Uriah the Hittite at the front lines to ensure his death and conceal his adultery. God himself denounced David as the killer (2 Samuel 12:9: “**You have smitten Uriah the Hittite with the sword**”). David performed the ritual of penance and forgiveness (2 Samuel 12:1-24, and especially v. 22). God forgave David but allowed his child to die for something the child did not do.

⁵³ Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, p, 251.

Note that Professor Friedman's *Commentary* is completely silent about the enormous ethical implications of Exodus 23:7.⁵⁴ So, how would that remark from God be counted in the 52 instances of P-sources being fair that Professor Friedman mentions? If this does not describe a god destitute of ethical sense, then what does?

The Post-Scripturalist Position

The post-scripturalist position affirms that sacred scriptures are not useful nor morally authoritative in solving any social problems today, including immigration. Any document that at any time endorses violence because someone is of a different religion or ethnicity invalidates any moral authority in that document. That is also why pointing to countertraditions (e.g., where ambiguous words such as "justice" are used) is irrelevant. ***One should not have any instances of permitting rape or genocide in a text designated as some moral paradigm.***

Aside from objections to the use of theology in any area of biblical studies, the main post-scripturalist objections to a position such as that of Professor Friedman are as follows:

⁵⁴ There is no comment on this verse in Friedman, *Commentary*, p. 248.

- 1) **The Bible offers both pro-immigrant and anti-immigrant sentiments, and so it is arbitrary to choose one or the other as representative of the Bible’s “core” or “essential” message.**

- 2) **The texts chosen to represent each stance usually overlook other problems or are permeated by a bibliolatrous perspective, which deems the Bible as offering a superior set of ethics when compared to non-biblical cultures.**

- 3) **Advocates of both sides often omit or do not fully address texts that are not consistent with their respective positions.**

Indeed, there never was a single interpretation of Leviticus 19:18 in Jewish or Christian exegesis as far as I know. That fact alone should be sufficient to reject Leviticus as any divine moral authority. More dramatically, Jesus actually asks followers to hate their family in Luke 14:26: **“If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.”**⁵⁵

Even if post-scripturalists hold that the Bible may not be useful in setting social policy on immigration, they would not deny that it does have some

⁵⁵ I devote an entire chapter (“The Hateful Jesus” on pages 50-89) of my book, *The Bad Jesus*, to flawed pro-love defenses (including the ubiquitous “love more” reading) of Luke 14:26.

historically important lessons. Perhaps the most important lesson is that biblical texts show how there have been three recurrent methods to deal with unwanted populations from ancient to modern times: **1) genocide; 2) enslavement; 3) exile** (see also Collier). These are all illustrated in Exodus 1-12, when the Egyptian Pharaoh views the multiplication of the Hebrews as a problem.

At any one time today, governments are still using one or more of these policies to deal with unwanted populations. Nazi Germany, of course, is infamous for using genocide against Jews and other unwanted populations. In Syria, genocide and exile are being used by the Bashar Hafez al-Assad regime against those who oppose him. In the United States, mass deportation is openly advocated by some politicians, mainly for Latinx immigrants. Virtual enslavement exists for many immigrants who work as domestic housekeepers, sex workers, or in the agricultural sector in many western countries.⁵⁶

For the post-scripturalists, a biblical view on immigration is irrelevant because it is immoral to use a sacred text to authorize any moral behavior or social policy. Furthermore, post-scripturalists affirm that we should love our neighbors not because a text or deity tells us to do so, but because we empathize with other human beings. Simple as that.

⁵⁶ See further Collier, *Exodus*.

Conclusions

The Bible is too morally contradictory to be a friend to immigrants. In some places, Leviticus is a morally convoluted guide. For every immigrant-friendly proof-text, someone else can find one that says the opposite. That is why commentaries that do not address the ethical issues of specific passages should be jettisoned from our academic field.

As a scholar devoted to rigorous philological work as a starting point, I prefer Orlinsky's position. I see nationalism as the best of the positions he outlines for understanding Leviticus 19:18. However, Orlinsky's last sentence of his essay is: "And if anyone wishes to designate biblical Israel a Founding Member of the League of Nations or of the United Nations that is all right with at least one author."⁵⁷ Here, I do disagree with Orlinsky because Leviticus violates so many of the basic humanitarian concepts of the United Nations.

As a post-scripturalist scholar who believes all God-talk is self-referential, I am still distressed by the passive acceptance and/or lack of moral outrage at the treatment of children and immigrants endorsed by some biblical authors and biblical scholars. If one insists that Leviticus 19:18 commands love for everyone. Then one will have to accept beatings, rape, and slavery as part of what the author means by "love your neighbor." One will have to accept the same ethical rationales from Canaanites.

⁵⁷ Orlinsky, "Nationalism," p. 236.

As a Mexican immigrant and human being who has experienced the pain of forced family separations, I certainly empathize with the well-intentioned biblical scholars who are distressed with destructive family separation policies at the border and elsewhere.⁵⁸ As a human being, I certainly do not wish to surrender my freedom of belief or subject myself to someone else's religious directives, especially when they can lead to my death.

The result of these religionist approaches in so-called "critical" biblical scholarship is the perpetuation of a textual imperialism and complicity that retains the ethical authority of the Bible. We may have even more writings by scholars such as James W. Watts, who challenges some of the immoral behavior endorsed in Leviticus.⁵⁹ We probably will have more books such as that by Charles Hedrick, *Unmasking Biblical Faiths: The Marginal Relevance of the Bible for*

⁵⁸ A discussion of how scholars from underrepresented minorities approach biblical scholarship may be found in Hector Avalos, "Minoritized Biblical Scholarship as Christian Missiology and Imperialism." Online: <https://bibleinterp.arizona.edu/sites/bibleinterp.arizona.edu/files/docs/AvalosMissiology.pdf>.

⁵⁹ Watts, "Drawing Lines."

Contemporary Religious Faith (2019).⁶⁰ More importantly, the denunciation of “bad” or “illegitimate” interpretations of the Bible, when based on theological rationales, continues *an orthodox-heterodox model* of biblical interpretation that has caused so much conflict and violence throughout history.

⁶⁰ Charles Hedrick, *Unmasking Biblical Faiths: The Marginal Relevance of the Bible for Contemporary Religious Faith* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019)
Eberhart and Heike (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus*.

APPENDIX I

Appendix I contains 53 examples (52 + 1 beyond what Professor Freedman claims for P-sources) of places where the victims or recipients of any violence might see those actions as unfair or unacceptable if one uses the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some passages (e.g., Gen 20:7) with the announcement of imminent punishment have been retained because that also might cause distress. See: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>:

- In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:**
- (a) Killing members of the group;**
 - (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;**
 - (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;**
 - (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;**
 - (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.**

Letters in lower case after Bible verse indicate one of the five features of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights genocide definition.

1. Gen 3:15 (physical & mental harm to Adam & Eve, b)
2. Gen 3:16 (physical pain to women, b)
3. Gen 3:17 (mental & physical harm to Adam, b)
4. Gen 4:11 (mental & physical harm to Cain, b)
5. Gen 4:12 (mental & physical harm to Cain, b)
6. Gen 4:13 (mental & physical harm to Cain, b)
7. Gen 4:14 (mental & physical harm to Cain, b)
8. Gen 6:3 (humans limited life span, c)
9. Gen 7:22 (destruction of humanity and “biosphere”, a)
10. Gen 7:23 (destruction of humanity, a)
11. Gen 11:7 (mental harm to humanity, b)
12. Gen 11:9 (mental harm to humanity, b)
13. Gen 12:17 (Pharoah’s plagues, b)
14. Gen 15:13 (slavery & oppression, c)
15. Gen 16:2 (Sarai & no children, d)
16. Gen 16:4 (Abram’s rape of Hagar, b)
17. Gen 16:5 (Sarai’s blame on Hagar, b)
18. Gen 16:6 (Hagar dealt harshly, b)
19. Gen 16:12 (Curse on Ishmael, b)
20. Gen 17:11 (physical harm with circumcision, b)
21. Gen 17:14 (mental harm for those without circumcision, b)
22. Gen 17:23 (forced circumcision upon slaves, b)
23. Gen 16:9 (Hagar’s submission, b)
24. Gen 19:5 (homosexual rape, b)
25. Gen 19:25 (destruction of Sodom, a)
26. Gen 19:25 (destruction of cities on the plain, a)
27. Gen 19:38 (incestuous sexual assault, b)
28. Gen 20:7 (mental and physical harm to Abimelech, b)
29. Gen 20:18 (no future offspring for Abimelech, d)
30. Gen 21:12 (mental and physical harm to Hagar, b)

31. Ex 7:18 (First plague, Nile made undrinkable, b)
32. Ex 7:19 (First plague, Nile made undrinkable c)
33. Ex 7:24 (First plague, Nile made undrinkable c)
34. Ex 8:3 (Second plague, frogs to disrupt households, c)
35. Ex 8:17 (Third plague, stinging gnats on humans and animals, c)
36. Ex 8:21 (Fourth plague, flies to disrupt households, c)
37. Ex 8:24 (Fourth plague, flies to disrupt households, c)
38. Ex 9:4 (Fifth plague, skin disease to livestock/animals, c)
39. Ex 9:6 (Fifth plague, skin disease to livestock/animals, c)
40. Ex 9:9 (Sixth plague, skin disease on humans, c)
41. Ex 9:10 (Sixth plague, skin disease on humans, c)
42. Ex 9:11 (Sixth plague, skin disease on humans, c)
43. Ex 10:4 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
44. Ex 10:5 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)

45. Ex 10:6 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
46. Ex 10:12 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
47. Ex 10:13 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
48. Ex 10:14 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
49. Ex 10:15 (Eighth plague, locusts to destroy plant life, c)
50. Ex 10:21 (Ninth plague, darkness over the land, c)
51. Ex 10:23 (Ninth plague, darkness over the land, b)
52. Ex 11:5 (Tenth plague, death of firstborn, a)
53. Ex 11:6 (Tenth plague, death of firstborn, b)

APPENDIX II

Appendix II is intended to show that how you count makes a difference in the results. This Appendix contains instances where J may be expressing the seven characteristics of the Hebrew god that lead to the obligation to be fair and kind to foreigners. I only need one counterexample from J because Professor Friedman told us that there were “none” in J. I also don’t need to find precise terms from P-sources because Professor Friedman has told us that expressing a “principle” is sufficient to judge a source’s ethics. In my count, I have at least 60 examples, wherein all of Professor Friedman’s seven features recur and so could be regarded as part of any count that retains the feature.

Features of God in J

- 1) A God who is outside of nature
- 2) Known through his acts in history
- 3) A Creator
- 4) Unseeable
- 5) Without a mate
- 6) Makes a legal covenant with humans
- 7) Who is one

In no specific order; numbers after Bible verse indicate one of the seven features of Friedman’s Biblical God: ⁶¹

1. Gen 2:4b
2. Gen 2:5
3. Gen 2:6
4. Gen 2:7
5. Gen 2:8
6. Gen 2:9
7. Gen 2:18

⁶¹ Adapted from Friedman, *Commentary*, p. 586.

8. Gen 2:19
9. Gen 2:21
10. Gen 2:22
11. Gen 3:1
12. Gen 3:2
13. Gen 6:6
14. Gen 6:7
15. Gen 7:4
16. Gen 7:22
17. Gen 8:21
18. Gen 8:22
19. Gen 18:21
20. Gen 12:7
21. Gen 13:10
22. Gen 14:19
23. Gen 14:22
24. Gen 15:1
25. Gen 15:7
26. Gen 15:8
27. Gen 15:9
28. Gen 15:10
29. Gen 15:11
30. Gen 15:12
31. Gen 15:13
32. Gen 15:14
33. Gen 15:15
34. Gen 15:16
35. Gen 15:17
36. Gen 15:18
37. Gen 15:19
38. Gen 15:20
39. Gen 15:21
40. Gen 18:20
41. Gen 19:24
42. Gen 18:14
44. Gen 3:14
45. Gen 12:17
46. Gen 16:13
47. Gen 18:19
48. Gen 18:26
49. Gen 18:28
50. Gen 18:29
51. Gen 18:30
52. Gen 18:31
53. Gen 18:32
54. Gen 24:1

55. Ex 2:23

56. Ex 5:3

57. Num 12:6

58. Num 12:13

59. Num 12:14

60. Num 12:15

NOTES TO READERS

-My thanks to Adam J. Meseke for his assistance with this article.

-Unless noted otherwise, all quotations of the Bible are from the Revised Standard Version.

-Some URL links may need to be cut and pasted in their entirety to access the contents.

-**One may also consult my** chapter on “Immigrants ‘R’ US: Attitudes Toward Immigrants in the Bible,” in Frances Flannery and Rod Werling, eds., *The Bible in Political Debate: What Does it Really Say?* (London: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 33-46. See <https://www.amazon.com/Bible-Political-Debate-What-Really-ebook/dp/B01J3E37G2>

WORKS CITED

Açıkyıldız, Birgül, *The Yezidis: The History of a Community, Culture and Religion* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2014).

Akiyama, Kengo, “Reproof in CD 9:2-8 and 1QS 5:24-6:1: A Note on a Curious Omission,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 301-06.

Avalos, Hector, *The Bad Jesus: The Ethics of New Testament Ethics* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015).

— *The Reality of Religious Violence from Biblical to Modern Times* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2019), pp. 312-354.

— “Immigrants ‘R’ US: Attitudes Toward Immigrants in the Bible,” in Frances Flannery and Rod Werling (eds.), *The Bible in Political Debate: What Does it Really Say?* (London: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 33-46.

—“The Near Eastern and Biblical Roots of Human Trafficking by ISIS, ” *Conversations with the Biblical World* 36 (2016): 199-224.

—“The New Holocaust Denialists: The Need for a Metacriticism of Biblical Scholarship,” *The Bible and Interpretation* (November, 2012). Online: <https://bibleinterp.arizona.edu/articles/ava368013>.

—*Slavery, Abolitionism and the Ethics of Biblical Scholarship* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011).

—*Fighting Words: The Origins of Religious Violence* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2005).

—“Minoritized Biblical Scholarship as Christian Missiology and Imperialism.” (August, 2017):

Online:<https://bibleinterp.arizona.edu/sites/bibleinterp.arizona.edu/files/docs/AvalosMissiology.pdf>.

Awabdy, Mark A., *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy’s Theological and Social Vision for the Gēr* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

Beam, Amy L., *The Last Yezidi Genocide* (City of publication not identified clearly by publisher: Adinolfi Books, 2019).

Becking, Bob, “‘Love Thy Neighbour...’” ‘*Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben*’ (*Gen 18,19*): *Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie. Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag*, In Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneth (eds.) (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische and Biblische Rechtsgeschichte, 13; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), pp. 182-87.

Bloom, Paul, *Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2016).

Carroll, M. Daniel R., *Christians at the Border: Immigration, the Church, and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008).

Cateau, Heather and Selwyn H. H. Carrington (eds.), *Capitalism and Slavery Fifty Years Later: Eric Eustace Williams—A Reassessment of the Man and his Work* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2000).

Clark, Elizabeth A., “Antifamilial Tendencies in Ancient Christianity,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5 (1995), pp. 356-80.

Collier, Paul, *Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Cuellar, Gregory Lee, *Voices of Marginality: Exile and Return in Second Isaiah 40–55 and the Mexican Immigrant Experience* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008).

De Waal, Frans, *Our Inner Ape: A Leading Primatologist Explains Why We are Who We Are* (New York, NY: Riverhead Books, 2005).

—*Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

Donaldson, Laura E., “The Sign of Orpah: Reading Ruth through Native Eyes,” in Athalya Brenner (ed.), *Ruth and Esther: A Feminist Companion to the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). pp., 130–144.

Eberhardt, Christiana A. and Thomas Heike (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics — Methodology — Themes* (FRANT 276; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019).

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, “Zur Anthropologie der Ethik der (Liebes) Gebote,” in Andreas Wagner and Jürgen van Oorschot (eds.), *Individualität und Selbstreflexion in den Literaturen des Alten Testaments* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 48; Leipzig: EVA, 2017), pp. 341-54.

Elizondo, Virgilio, *Galilean Journey: The Mexican American Promise* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983).

Fontaine, Carole, “Golden Do’s and Don’ts: Leviticus 19:1-17 from a Human-Rights-Based Approach (HRBA),” in Athalya Brenner and Chin Lung Lee (eds.), *Leviticus and Numbers* (TextsC@Contexts; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013), pp. 97-118.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Eugene D. Genovese, *Slavery in White and Black: Race and Class in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Friedman, Richard E., "Love Your Neighbor: Only Israelites or Everyone?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 40 (2014):49-52.

Online:<https://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-topics/bible-interpretation/love-your-neighbor-only-israelites-or-everyone/>

—*The Bible with Sources Revealed: A New View into the Five Books of Moses* (New York, NY: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003).

— *Commentary on the Torah with a New Translation of the Hebrew Text* (New York, NY: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001).

—*Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York, NY: Summit, 1987).

Gerges, Fawaz A., *ISIS: A History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, rev. edn, 2017).

Gould, Philip, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the 18th Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Heinbach-Steins, Marianne, "‘Die fremden lieben...’ Biblische Impulsen für eine Christliche Migrationenethik," *BK* 73 (2018): 232-39.

Hedrick, Charles, *Unmasking Biblical Faiths: The Marginal Relevance of the Bible for Contemporary Religious Faith* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019).

Hoffmeier, James K., *The Immigration Crisis: Immigrants, Aliens, and the Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2009).

Houston, Fleur S., *You Shall Love the Stranger as Yourself: The Bible, Refugees, and Asylum* (New York: Routledge, 2015).

Hrobon, Bohdan, “Be Useful to Your Neighbor Who Is Like You: Exegesis and Alternative Translation of Lev 19:18B,” *CV* 59 (2017): 5-24.

Inikori, Joseph A., *Africans and the Industrial Revolution: A Study in International Trade and Economic Development* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Kaminsky, Joel S., *Yet I Loved Jacob: Reclaiming the Biblical Concept of Election* (Eugene, OR; Wipf and Stock 2016).

Kelly, Henry Ansgar, “Love of Neighbor as Great Commandment in the Time of Jesus: Grasping at Straws in the Hebrew Scriptures,” *JETS* 60 (2017): 265-81.

Lemardelé, Christophe, “Another Suggestion Regarding the Hebrew Noun *mērēaʿ*,” *BN NF* 153 (2012): 107-111.

Mathys, Hans-Peter, *Liebe deinen Nächsten Wie Dich Selbst: Untersuchungen zum alttestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstliebe (Lev 19, 18)* (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986).

May, Herbert G. and Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1977).

Meier, John P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Volume 4: Law and Love* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 23–27, AB 3B* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

Myers, Ched and Matthew Colwell, *Our God Is Undocumented: Biblical Faith and Immigrant Justice* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2012).

Muraoka, T., “A Syntactic Problem in Lev 19:18b,” *JSS* 23 (1978): 291-297.

Orlinsky, Harry M., ‘Nationalism, Universalism, and Internationalism in Ancient Israel’, In Harry Thomas Frank and William L. Reed (eds.), *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert G. May* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1970), pp. 206-236.

Reimann, Mathias and Reinhard Zimmerman, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Otto, Eckart, “Priesterschrift und Deuteronomium in Buch Leviticus: Zum Integration des Deuteronomium in den Pentateuch,” in Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 2015), pp. 161-185.

Pardes, Ilana, *Countertraditions in the Bible: A Feminist Approach* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).

Ruiz, Jean-Pierre, *Readings from the Edges: The Bible and People on the Move* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011).

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L., “Between Ezra and Nehemiah: Exclusion, Transformation, and Inclusion of the Foreigner in Post-Exilic Biblical Theology,” in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, edited by Mark G. Brett (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 117-142.

— *Jonah, Jesus, and Other Good Coyotes: Speaking Peace to Power in the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007).

Terrio, Susan J., *Whose Child Am I? Unaccompanied, Undocumented Children in U.S. Immigration Custody* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015).

UNHCR, “‘Refugee’ or ‘Migrant’—Which Is Right?” August 27, 2015. Online: <http://www.unhcr.org/55df0e556.html>

Van Houten, Christiana, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

Watts, James W. “Drawing Lines: A Suggestion for Addressing the Moral Problem of Reproducing Immoral Biblical Texts in Commentaries and Bibles,” in Christian A. Eberhart and Thomas Hieke (eds.), *Writing a Commentary on Leviticus: Hermeneutics—Methodology—Themes* (Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), pp. 235-252.

Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1966).