

## **Exodus: Oppression and Liberation – the “Paradigm” Book of the Entire Bible**

Since our Bibles begin with the later creation story (→ Genesis 1:1–2:4a), from the Priestly source (“P”, circa 550 BCE), the reader can easily suppose that the Hebrew Bible is centered on God as “creator of the heavens and the earth” (“Apostolic” Creed). However, a reading of the Hebrew Bible makes it clear that the theme of God as creator appears much less – and primarily in the later texts such as → **Second Isaiah** and **Job** – while the liberation of the oppressed, the Exodus theme, proves to be the primary theme. Thus, the “Apostolic” Creed of the Hebrew Bible (Gerhard von Rad 1966) in → **Deuteronomy** 26:5-10 does not refer to the creation; instead, it focuses on the oppression of the Israelites as slaves in Egypt, their liberation by Yahweh and his gift of the fertile promised land.<sup>1</sup>

By considering Exodus as “paradigmatic,” we emphasize that this narration is a model, a pattern and an example in the entire Bible (see the “new Exodus” in → Second Isaiah) and also in human history. It reveals the character of Yahweh as liberator and God’s characteristic way of acting in history for the liberation of the oppressed. It also shows how humans should behave. Nahum Sarna points out how, in addition to the book itself, the paradigm of the Exodus occurs 120 times in the other books of the Hebrew Bible: “God’s role as liberator of the enslaved and his repeated and benevolent provisioning of his people in the wilderness...become the paradigms for Israel’s code of interpersonal relations. That is to say...God’s actions on behalf of Israel must evoke corresponding human concern for the unfortunates of society.”<sup>2</sup>

Thomas Dozeman acknowledges that the book of the Exodus describes “salvation” as a “divine liberation from Egyptian oppression.”<sup>3</sup> Modern history is full of examples in which the Exodus paradigm has inspired other liberation struggles: of black slaves (18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries); the American (1776) and French (1789) Revolutions; for women’s rights (19<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> centuries); of sexual minorities (20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries); the liberation theologies of Latin America, with a focus on the oppression of the poor of the continent (Medellin, 1968 to the present); the struggle of Martin Luther King and the African-Americans in the United States; Nelson Mandela and the struggle against Apartheid in South Africa.<sup>4</sup> The temptation in the use of the Exodus in such political movements is to focus exclusively on the first part (chapters 1–15) and to forget that the book not only speaks of a liberation “from” (the Egyptian oppression) but also of a liberation “for” – the encounter and alliance with God in Sinai, with the revelation of the divine will for the liberated people (Ex. 19–24, 32–34) and the establishment of worship which celebrates God’s character as liberator of the oppressed (Tabernacle and priesthood, Ex. 25–31, 35–40).

The narrative of the liberation from Egypt (Ex. 1–15) comes primarily from the Yahwist history (“J”), traditionally dated in the 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C. (the united monarchy), when David and Solomon created an empire of the twelve tribes. Nonetheless, the consensus of biblical scholars in terms of the dates and the historicity of these events, dominant during almost all of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, has disappeared:

- Some fundamentalist scholars continue maintaining the historicity of Adam, if not with the traditional date of 4004 B.C. then with a minimal adjustment – and affirm the historicity of a universal flood, the patriarchs, an early date for the Exodus (15<sup>th</sup> century B.C.), etc.;
- A minority continue supporting the 20<sup>th</sup> century consensus and consider the stories in Genesis 1–11 to be “pre-history,” but they defend the historicity of the patriarchs, with the Exodus in the 13<sup>th</sup> century B.C.;<sup>5</sup>
- Many scholars now affirm that the authentic history of Israel only began with the monarchy under Saul, David and Solomon (around 1000 B.C.), and they interpret the earlier stories (of the patriarchs, Moses and the judges) as allegories. For David Sperling,<sup>6</sup> for example, the Exodus allegory reflects the historic reality of the liberation of the Canaanite peoples from Egypt – that is, rather than an account of slavery *in* Egypt, it relates to colonies which were *under* the control of Egypt but managed to free themselves.<sup>7</sup>

- The most skeptical biblical scholars even deny the historicity of the monarchy (united and divided) and think that there are historical accounts and reliable data only after the exile, around 550 B.C., the date traditionally indicated by the Priestly source (“P”) of the Pentateuch.<sup>8</sup>

Later the Priestly writers (P) developed another interpretation of God as liberator and revealer. According to them, Moses liberated Israel with the help of his brother Aaron, the priest who, with the power of Yahweh, confronted the Egyptian magicians. With the exception of the story concerning the worship of the golden calf (Ex. 32–34, almost entirely Yahwist), the last part of Exodus details the plan (Ex. 25–31) and the construction (Ex. 35–40) of the portable tabernacle, where the glorious presence of Yahweh, finally, comes to dwell with the people of Israel during their march in the desert (40:34–38). In the tabernacle chapters the detailed correlation between divine mandates (25–31) and human obedience (35–40) is typical of the Priestly source (see Genesis 1, creation, and 17, circumcision).

While the majority of scholars deny the historicity of the exodus, David Pleins even questions the use of this story as a paradigm for the option for the poor in the liberation theologies: “Rarely...does the historical literature make use of the many Hebrew words of ‘poor’ and ‘poverty’ that are common in the rest of the Hebrew Bible....The poor...are not the object of the ethical wrestlings of the historical sections of the Bible. This fact alone is astonishing and ought to at least force us to pause before we all too quickly apply the material, even the book of the Exodus, to modern projects aimed at liberating the poor”.<sup>9</sup> Pleins is correct in that the historical books do not focus on “the poor” as a class, with explicit vocabulary, as is common in the prophets of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, since the former relate the history of *all* the people. Pleins recognizes that the narrative of the people in slavery in Egypt makes evident the strong *oppression* they suffered.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, Pleins concludes that in its final form (the post-exilic Priestly writing) the book of Exodus implies that “God is more specifically on the side of a crushed nation that is seeking, either through priests, kings or tribal leaders, to move out from under the yoke of foreign domination...to pursue the aims of its ruling elite.”<sup>11</sup>

Although the liberation narration is basic (Ex. 1–15, “gospel”), Exodus contains **three legal codes**, all of them important for the study of norms of conduct:

- **The Book of the Covenant** (20:22–23:33; *independent source*); probably the **oldest** legal code in the Bible (1200–800 B.C.);
- **Cultic/ritual** Twelve Commandments (34:14–26), **Yahwist source, “J”**, (NJB 34:10, note). The twelve ritual commandments appear to be older than the Decalogue (“ethical,” Elohist). Of the twelve, three foresee the ritual commandments of the Decalogue: No. 1 against idolatry; No. 4 against images; and No. 7, Sabbath rest.<sup>12</sup>
- The last, **the Decalogue** (20:1–21 // → **Deut.** 5:6–22), from the **Elohist source, “E”**, is the **most famous** legal code in the Bible (in fact, in the whole world); Greek: *deka-logos*, Ten-Words, which by tradition came to be called the Ten Commandments.

The presence of such codes in the Pentateuch shows that, more than an ephemeral revolution, Yahweh’s historical project is of a community liberated and everlastingly free because it is founded on divine justice and is continually revitalized by worship of Yahweh, the liberator God of justice and solidarity (see the Tabernacle<sup>13</sup>). However, reflecting the diversity and the tensions in Israelite society throughout its history, David Pleins points out that “conflict is foundational to the biblical text.”<sup>14</sup> We can never subsume all the texts under a simplistic modern ideology, be it radical, liberal, conservative or reactionary. Obviously the theology of Exodus is quite dialectical, not only in the historical conflict between the oppressors and the oppressed,<sup>15</sup> but also in the 20 texts that speak of the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (*leb*). These texts make two affirmations that appear to be contradictory:

- *God* hardens Pharaoh’s heart: Ex. 4:21 (J); 7:3 (P); 9:12 (P); 10:1 (J), 20 (E), 27 (E); 11:10 (P); 14:4 (J), 8 (J), 17 (E); a total of ten times;
- *Pharaoh* hardens his own heart: 8:15 (J), 32 (J); 9:34 (J); 13:15 (J), (total four times);

- Pharaoh's heart was hardened (with no indication by whom): 7:13-14 (P), 22 (P); 8:19 (P); 9:7 (J), 35 (E) (total six times).

This same dialectic between divine sovereignty and human responsibility ("free will") is evident in many other books. The Bible always makes two apparently contradictory affirmations that leave the subject unresolved (a dialectic without synthesis): Acts 2:37-38; Luke 22:22; Philemon 2:12-13; Ephesians 1:11-12; 4:1; Romans 9:1-29; 9:30-10:21; 11:1-10; 11:11-24; 11:25-32; 11:33-35; John 6:39-40, 44, 54; Acts 27:21-44. Although such a dialectic appears to be somewhat irrational, it is not so in the comprehensive theistic context of the Bible. The Bible begins speaking of an infinite creator God (without limits) and finite human beings (limited). Consequently, we know from the beginning that the finite human beings will never be able to understand an infinite God. (In addition to the dialectic between divine and human will, see the Trinity: one God in three persons.) Outside of the Bible we find the same problem, but without solution, in the history of Western humanist philosophy (determinism – an unresolved problem) and in the Oriental philosophies in the significance of a human being and their actions (see Pantheism: if God is everything and everything is God, how can we distinguish between good and evil and oppose evil?).

## Outline

### I. Liberation from Egypt

1. Israel in Egypt 1:1-22
  - 1.1 Demographic explosion of the Hebrews in Egypt, 1:1-5
  - 1.2 Oppression and tyranny of the Pharaoh and his captains, 1:6-22
  
2. Moses' birth, youth and mission 2:1-7:6
  - 2.1 Moses' birth and youth, 2:10
  - 2.2 Moses' escape to Midian, 2:11-22
  - 2.3 God hears the groans of Israel, 2:23-25
  - 2.4 The burning bush, 3:1-6 (4b-6, E)
  - 2.5 *Moses' calling, 3:7-12 (E)*
  - 2.6 *Revelation of the Divine name, 3:13-15 (E)*
  - 2.7 Instructions concerning Moses' mission, 3:16-20
  - 2.8 The plundering of Egypt, 3:21-22
  - 2.9 God's signs for Moses, 4:1-9
  - 2.10 Aaron, Moses' interpreter, 4:10-17
  - 2.11 Return to Egypt: departure from Midian, 4:18-23
  - 2.12 Zipporah circumcises Moses' child, 4:24-26
  - 2.13 Meeting with Aaron, 4:27-31
  - 2.14 First interview with Pharaoh, 5:1-5
  - 2.15 Instructions for the taskmasters, 5:6-14
  - 2.16 Complaints of the Israelite officers, 5:15-18
  - 2.17 Complaints of the people, Moses' prayer, 5:19-6:1
  - 2.18 New narrative of Moses' calling, 6:2-13 (P)**
  - 2.19 Genealogy of Moses and Aaron, 6:14-27 (P)**
  - 2.20 Continuation of narrative of Moses' calling, 6:28-7:7
  
3. The ten plagues on Egypt and the Passover 7:8-13:16

Confrontation with Pharaoh: the rod becomes a serpent, 7:8-13

  - 3.1 Water turned into blood, 7:14-24
  - 3.2 Frogs, 7:25-8:15
  - 3.3 Lice, 8:16-19
  - 3.4 Horseflies, 8:20-32
  - 3.5 The death of cattle, 9:1-7
  - 3.6 Ulcers, 9:8-12
  - 3.7 Hail, 9:13-35
  - 3.8 Locusts, 10:1-20
  - 3.9 Darkness, 10:21-29
  - 3.10 Death of the firstborn: warning, 11:1-10 (fulfillment, 12:29-34)

Institution of the Passover (12:1-14, 21-28); the feast of unleavened bread (15-20)
  
4. Departure from Egypt 13:17-15:21
  - 4.1 The departure, 13:17-22
  - 4.2 From Etham (13:20) to the Sea of Reeds (*Yam Suf*), 14:1-4
  - 4.3 The Egyptians pursue Israel, 14:5-14
  - 4.4 Passage through the Sea of Reeds, 14:15-31
  - 4.5 Miriam's song of triumph, 15:1-21

- II. The March Through the Desert** (→ Numbers 1–36; 40 years) 15:22–18:27
1. The bitter waters of Marah, 15:22-27
  2. Quails and manna, 16:1-36
  3. Water springs from the rock, 17:1-7; → Numbers 20:1-13
  4. Battle against Amalek (+ Joshua), 17:8-16
  5. Jethro’s visit to Moses, 18:1-12
  6. Institution of the judges, 18:13-27
- III. Revelation: The Covenant in Sinai** (→ Deuteronomy) 19:1–24:18
1. The Covenant and the Decalogue, 19:1–20:21
    - 1.1 Theophany in Sinai, 19:1-25
    - 1.2 The Ten Commandments, 20:1-21 (→ details below)
  2. The Book of the Covenant, 20:22–23:33 (→ details below)
  3. Ratification of the Covenant, 24:1-18 (= **J**; *only 1-2, 9-11 = E*)
- IV.** (See below.) 25:1–31:18
- V. The Golden Calf: Renewal of the Covenant** (**J**; *only 32:1b-4, 21-24 = E*) 32:1–34:35
1. The golden calf and God’s wrath, 32:1-10
  2. Moses intercedes (32:11-14) and breaks the tablets of the Law (32:15-24)
  3. The Levites: kill 3,000, 32:25-29 (Vulgate: 23,000; → Numbers 25:1-9; 1 Cor. 10:8)
  4. Moses intercedes again, 32:30-35
  5. Order of departure, 33:1-6
  6. The Tabernacle of the congregation (Moses + Joshua), 33:7-11
  7. Moses’ prayer: “Show me your glory”, 33:12-23
  8. New tablets of the Law, God’s appearance (theophany), 34:1-9
  9. Renewal of the Covenant: “The cultic twelve commandments” (Yahwist), 34:10-28
  10. Moses descends from the mount, 34:29-35
- IV. + VI. Intimate Presence: Tabernacle (+ priests) vs. Idolatry (golden calf)**
1. **The Sanctuary plan (25–31) All ‘P’** → **the construction (35–40)**
    - 1.1 The offerings, 25:1-9 → 35:4-9
    - 1.2 The ark, 25:10-22 → 37:1-9
    - 1.3 The table and the bread, 25:23-30 → 37:10-16
    - 1.4 The candlestick, 25:31-39 → 37:17-24
    - 1.5 The sanctuary, 26:1-37 → 36:8-38
    - 1.6 The altar (holocausts), court, oil, 27:1-21 (Lev. 24:1-3) → 38:1-20
    - 1.7 The priestly robes, 28:1-43 → 39:1-31
    - 1.8 The Ordination of Aaron and his sons, 29:1-46 → Lev. 8:1-36
    - 1.9 Altar, incense, tribute, basin, spices, craftsmen, 30:1–31:11 (→ NBJ notes)
    - 1.10 The Sabbath, 31:12-17 (conclusion) → 35:1-3 (introduction)
  2. **Conclusion: Inspection, preparation, presence (glory) of Yahweh** 39:32–40:38

**Exodus 20:1-21 The Decalogue**  
(Greek: *deka-logos*, ten words; “E” source) → Deut. 5:6-22  
(final form, probably post-exilic, circa 500 BC)

**Preface:\***

“I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery.” 20:1-2; → Deut. 5:6

- No. 1** “You shall have no other gods before me.” 20:3; → Deut. 5:7  
‡ (the exclusive worship of one God (monolatry, not monotheism); → 2 Isaiah)
- No. 2** “You shall not make for yourself an idol....” 20:4-6; → Deut. 5:8-10  
(Deut. 4:9-12 interprets: “...You heard the sound of words but saw no form.”)
- No. 3** “You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the Lord your God....” 20:7;  
→ Deut. 5:11 (to avoid the manipulation of God by the abusive use of God’s name)
- No. 4** “Remember the sabbath day, and keep it holy.” 20:8-11; → Deut. 5:12-15  
(Ex. 23:12; 31:12-17; 34:21; 35:1-3; Lev. 19:3; 23:3; Num. 15:32-36)
- No. 5** “Honor your father and your mother....” 20:12; → Deut. 5:16  
(directed toward adult males: take care of the elderly; → 1 Tim. 5:8, 16)
- No. 6** “You shall not murder/kill” 20:13; → Deut. 5:17  
(does not include the death penalty or war, DHHBE note 20:13)
- No. 7** “You shall not commit adultery (*na’ af*.)” 20:14; → Deut. 5:18 (22:22)  
(originally, to steal the sexual property of another male; Lev. 20:10)
- No. 8** “You shall not steal (*ganab*.)” 20:15; → Deut. 5:19 (see Joseph in Gen. 40:15, *ganab*)  
(probably “kidnap, enslave” another person; see Ex. 21:16, *ganab*)
- No. 9** “You shall not bear false witness (*sheqer*) against your neighbor.” 20:16;  
→ Deut. 5:20; Deuteronomy uses *shawe’* (“incorrect”), instead of *sheqer* (“liar”)
- No. 10a** “You shall not covet (*khamad*) your neighbor’s house....” 20:17a; → Deut. 5:21b  
‡ In 5:21b Deut. substitutes *’awah*, desire, for *khamad*; adds “field.”
- No. 10b** “...you shall not covet your neighbor’s wife....” 20:17b; → Deut. 5:21a

\***Preface:** The commandments are directed to the already redeemed male Israelites, as *wise* “words,” as essential standards to maintain the already achieved liberation and to establish a viable community – not as prerequisites for a salvation “by works” (→ Galatians, Romans). The “two tablets” (Ex. 31:18) were two copies of the same covenant and do not reflect any division in the Ten Words.

**The variation in the manner of numbering** the commandments results from the tradition (Catholic and Lutheran) of uniting No. 1 and No. 2 (and separating No. 10a and 10b), while the Jews, the Orthodox and almost all Protestants distinguish between No. 1 and No. 2 and count No. 10a and 10b as one commandment. (Note the order in Ex. 20:17a-b; cf. the different order in → **Deuteronomy** 5:21a-b, a book which dignifies women more.) The Septuagint, sometimes followed in the New Testament, inverts the order of Nos. 7 and 6 (Luke 18:20; Rom. 13:8-10).

“Ethics” and “morals” are elitist Greek philosophical categories and do not appear in the Bible. Thus, the “**Ten Words**” (literally, Ex. 34:28, Deut. 4:13, 10:40), rather than “ethics,” are community norms that reflect **concrete historical contexts**. And between the two versions in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, there are **18 variations** in the Hebrew texts, many of them evident in the translations, above all in the distinct motives for keeping the Sabbath: the creation (Ex. 20:11) and liberation (Deut. 5:15). Nonetheless, we can notice a very significant historical continuum of the norms, even in the New Testament (with the exception of No. 4, “the Sabbath”); → Rom. 13:8-10.

## **Eighteen Differences between the Two Versions of the Ten Commandments:**

### **Exodus 20:1-17**

20:2 Preface equal (=)  
Commandment No. 1 =  
No. 2 + *waw* (and/or/neither), 20:4  
parents, plural *'aboth*, - *waw*  
“even - *waw*”  
No. 3 =  
No. 4 “*zakar*” remember  
  
“*nor your animal*”  
  
“because in six days Yahweh made  
the heavens and the earth, the sea and all  
that is in them, and that he rested on the  
seventh day. Therefore Yahweh blessed  
and consecrated the seventh day”.  
  
No. 5  
  
No. 6 =  
No. 7  
No. 8  
No. 9  
“false” (*shaqer*)  
No. 10  
“Do not covet the *house*... wife/woman.

### **Deuteronomy 5:6-21**

5:6 Preface =  
No. 1 =  
No. 2 - *waw* (and/or) all, 5:8  
parents plural *'aboth*, + *waw*  
“AND-even, ” + *waw*  
No. 3 =  
No. 4 “*shamar*” observe/keep  
+“just as Yahweh your God commanded you”  
+“nor your ox nor your ass,  
*nor any animal of yours*”  
+“that your male slave may rest  
and your female slave, as you do”  
“Remember that you were a slave in Egypt,  
and that Yahweh your God brought you out  
from there with a mighty hand  
and an outstretched arm Therefore Yahweh  
your God commands you to observe  
the Sabbath day.”  
+“just as Yahweh your God commanded you”  
+“and that it may go well with you”  
No. 6 =  
No. 7 + *waw* (“and”) do not...  
No. 8 + *waw* (“and”) do not...  
No. 9 + *waw* (“and”) do not...  
“false” (*shawe* ^)  
No. 10 + *waw* (“and”) do not...  
“Do not covet the *wife/woman*... house.  
and do not *desire* ( ‘ *awah* )...*his land*”

**Summary:** Nos. 1, 3, 6 =  
No. 2 (3 times); No. 4 (5 times); No. 5 (2 times); No. 7 (1 time); No. 8 (1 time); No. 9; (2 times);  
No. 10 (4 times).

**Total** 18 differences: meaning, 8 times; spelling, 1 time; style, + “w/v” = “and” 9 times.

**20:22–23:33 The Book of the Covenant**  
(1200-800 B.C.; *independent* source, Noth, Campbell-Obrien; cp. Eissfeldt, “E”)

*Italics: Justice for the poor and the weak*

20:22-26	Laws concerning the altar (“of earth...in every place,” 20:24); → Deut. 27:5-6 (“of stone”)
21:1-11	<i>Laws concerning slaves</i> ; → Deut. 15:12-18; Lev. 25:35-46; Jer. 34:8-16
21:12-14	Murder; → Lev. 24:17; Num. 35:16-34
21:15, 17	Violence and cursing against parents; → Deut. 27:16; Lev. 20:19
21:16	<i>Kidnapping a person</i> ; → Deut. 24:7
21:18-36	Blows and injuries (abortion); → eye for an eye, Deut. 19:21; Lev. 24:19-20
22:1-3	Theft of animals; → Lev. 19:8
22:5-15	Crimes that should be compensated; → Lev. 5:21-26
22:16-17	Seduction of an <i>unbetrothed</i> virgin; → Deut. 22:28-29 (virgin raped)
22:18-28	Various laws:
18	Sorcery; → Lev. 19:31; Deut. 18:9-12
19	Bestiality; → Lev. 18:23; 20:15-16; Deut. 27:21
20	Sacrifices to other gods; → Deut. 27:1; Num. 25:1-5
21-24	<i>Oppression of the immigrant (//23:9), widow, orphan</i> ; → Deut. 10:18-19; 24:17-22; 27:19; Lev. 19:33-34
25	<i>Loans to the poor</i> ; → Deut. 23:20-21; Lev. 25:35-37
26-27	<i>Cloak of the poor as pawn</i> ; → Deut. 24:10-13, 17
28	Blasphemy against God; → Lev. 24:15-16; or a leader, → Qoh. 10:20; Acts 23:5
22:29-30	The harvest and the firstborn; → Deut. 25:19
22:31	Meat mangled by a beast; → Deut. 14:21; Lev. 11:44; 17:15-16
23:1	<i>False testimony</i> ; → Lev. 5:22; 19:16
23:2-3	<i>Favoritism</i> ; → Deut. 16:18-20
23:4-5	The enemy’s ox; → Deut. 22:1-4; Lev. 19:15; Matthew 5; Luke 6; Romans 12
23:6-8	<i>The rights of the poor ... bribes</i> ; → Deut. 1:17; 16:19; 27:25
23:9	<i>Do not oppress the immigrant</i> ; → 22:21; Deut. 10:18-19; 24:17-22; 27:19; Lev. 19:33-34
23:10-13	<i>Sabbatical year and Sabbath</i> ; → Deut. 24:19; 26:12-13; Lev. 25:2-7
23:14-19a	Israel’s three festivals; → 34:18-25; Deut. 16:1-16; Lev. 23
23:19b	A kid in its mother’s milk; → 34:26; Deut. 34:21
23:20-33	Promises and instructions before entry into Canaan; → Deut. 7:1-26

The Book of the Covenant (20:22–23:33; see 24:3) probably did not belong to any of the classical sources of the Pentateuch (JEDP); it appears to be an independent source with origins between the twelfth and the eighth centuries (after possessing the land but much earlier than Deuteronomy) and added after the Sinai chronicle, since it interrupts this account and reflects a later sedentary lifestyle (simple, not urban). All the laws were developed later in the legal codes of → **Deuteronomy** and → **Leviticus** and almost all have earlier parallels in the Ancient Near East, even before Moses. Although ancient, the obligation to love one’s enemy (23:4-5, return her/his lost ox) anticipates the teaching of Jesus; → **Deut.** 22:1-4; **Lev.** 19:15; **Matthew** 5; **Luke** 6; **Romans** 12.

**34:10-26. Covenant Renewal: “ritualtwelve commandments,” Yahwist (NJB 34:10 note):**  
(\* // Ten Commandments)

1. \*Do not worship any other god, 34:14
2. Do not make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, v. 15
3. Do not take their daughters for your sons, v. 16
4. \*Do not make cast idols, v. 17
5. Keep the festival of unleavened bread (Passover?), v. 18
6. Redeem all the firstborn of your sons, vv. 19-20
7. \*Rest on the seventh day, v. 21
8. Celebrate the festival of weeks ... and the festival of the harvest, v. 22
9. Three times in the year all your males shall appear before the Lord God, vv. 23-24
10. Do not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven, v. 25
11. Take the first fruits of your ground to the house of the Lord your God, v. 26a
12. Do not boil a kid in its mother’s milk, v. 26b

The Cultic 12 Commandments (Yahwist = J) appears to be older than the Decalogue (“ethics”, Elohist). The historical continuity between the Twelve Commandments (J = Yahwist) and the Ten Commandments (Elohist) consists of the repetition (\*) of Nos. 1-2 and 4 of the Decalogue and Nos. 1,4 and 7 of the cultic commands. (Also see the Sabbath and the Sabbatical Year in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 23:10-13; → see Deut. 24:19; 26:12-13; Lev. 25:2-7.)

**Source “E” in Exodus.**<sup>16</sup> The Elohist source appears rather infrequently in Exodus, but some of these texts are important, especially those that include the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20–23):

- 1:15-21 The midwives who feared God
- 3:4b-15 Moses’ calling and the revelation of Yahweh’s name
- 4:17-18, 20b The farewell to Jethro, God’s staff in Moses’ hand
- 13:17-19 Liberation in the Sea of Reeds, Joseph’s bones
- 14:5a, 7, 19a, 25a The king of Egypt pursues the Israelites
- 17:3 Thirst and the people’s complaints
- 18:1-27 Encounter with Jethro, priest of Midian and Moses’ father-in-law
- 19:3a, 13, 16-19 Encounter with God on the mountain
- 20:1-21 The Decalogue (1:17, “E”?, or from an independent source)
- 24:1-2, 9-11 Communion with God on the mountain (10-11: “they saw God”)
- 32:1b-4a...21-24 Negative traditions about Aaron

## 1. The Poor and Oppression

**1.1 Israel oppressed and poor in Egypt, 1:1–6:12.** Exodus 1–6, the classical expression which constitutes the paradigm of this book, makes clear the poverty of the Israelite slaves and the oppression and violence they suffered. When Yahweh is revealed to Moses in the burning bush, the final text combines the Yahwist and Elohist descriptions to emphasize the oppression and poverty of the slaves (Ex. 3:7-8 = J; 9-10 = E):

3:7 “I have observed the *misery* (*‘oni*) of my people who are in Egypt; I have heard their *cry* (*tsa’aq*) on account of their *slavemasters* (*nagash*). Indeed, I know their sufferings (*mak’ob*), 8 and I have come down to deliver them from the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land to a good and broad land, a land flowing with milk and honey... 9 The *cry* (*tsa’aq*) of the Israelites has now come to me; I have also *seen* the oppression (*lachats*, noun) with which the Egyptians oppress (*lachats*, verb) them. 10 So come, I will send you to Pharaoh to bring my people, the Israelites, out of Egypt.”

The text demonstrates how the dimensions of the Israelites’ oppression, violence and poverty bombard all of Yahweh’s senses and motivate Yahweh to begin the historical project of liberation, in fulfillment of the promises in the covenant with the patriarchs (2:23-25; see Gen. 15:13<sup>17</sup>).

The second narrative of Moses’ calling, from the priestly source (P), also abounds in references to oppression and indicates that the historical project of liberation represents the fulfillment of the covenant promises to the patriarchs (Ex. 6:5-7):

5 “I have also heard the groaning of the Israelites whom the Egyptians are holding as slaves (*‘abad*), and I have remembered my covenant. 6 Say therefore to the Israelites, ‘I am the Lord, and I will free you from the *burdens* (*siblot*) of the Egyptians and deliver you from *slavery* to them. I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with *mighty acts of judgment* (*mishpatim*). 7 I will take you as my people, and I will be your God. You shall know that I am the Lord your God, who has freed you from the *burdens* (*siblot*) of the Egyptians.’”

Other references to oppression that occur in Ex. 1–6 include:

slavemasters (*nagash*), 1:11; 5:6, 10, 13-14  
supervisors/inspectors (*shoter*), 5:6, 10, 14-15  
oppress [*‘anah*], 1:11-12;  
ruthless (*perek*), 1:13-14  
cruel slavery, 6:9

Although Exodus 1–6 makes it clear that the primary cause of the Israelite slaves’ poverty is oppression and violence, as with so many tyrants and oppressors, the imperial propaganda proposed a different explanation:

“Loafers, loafers!”, exclaimed Pharaoh. “That is what you are.” (Ex. 5:6-8)

**1.2 Revelation of the divine name, 3:13-15, “E”; 6:2-3, “P”** (DHHBE notes, Ex. 3:13, 14, 15; NJB note, Ex. 3:13. “Yahweh” is an archaic form of the Hebrew verb *hayah*, “to be/to exist/to happen,” and means “I am.” Thus the elaboration in 3:14 (*‘ehyeh ‘asher ‘ehyeh*) means “I am who I am.” However, this divine response to Moses lends itself to many interpretations:<sup>18</sup>

1. It is a philosophical, *ontological* answer: “I am the being, the existing one, the only truly existing one” (LXX: *Ego eimi ho on*; see John 8:24, 28, 58; Rev. 1:4, 8);

2. It is a *causative/factitive* form of the verb “be” (Hebrew: root *hifil*), which means “to make be,” “to bring into existence;” it points toward God as the all-powerful Creator;
3. It is an intentionally *evasive* answer: God does not want to reveal God’s name, since God is always transcendent, infinite, mysterious (Gen. 32:29; Judges 13:18);
4. “I am”: always *present* in solidarity with God’s people to liberate them (see Immanuel; → Isaiah 7:14); “he acts in the history of his people and in human history which he guides toward an end” (NJB note g);
5. The best explanation is not based on Greek philosophy nor on obscure and doubtful etymologies but on clear Hebrew *syntax*. “I AM WHO I AM” is similar to the other expression which reveals divine character. When Moses asked God to “show me your glory” (Ex. 33:18), Yahweh responded:

“I will make all my goodness pass before you, and will proclaim before you the name, ‘The Lord’; and *I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy*” (Ex. 33:19; cp. 34:6-7).

As Paul well understood (→ Rom. 9:15), it is a question of God’s sovereign freedom to do what God wants, which in the Exodus is expressed in the historical project of freeing Israel from slavery so that God’s people can experience and participate in the same freedom which characterizes God. That is, the sacred name refers to Yahweh as the *Liberator* of the Exodus, the event that serves as the paradigm for divine action in all of human history: the historical project of universal liberation, the glorious freedom of God’s daughters and sons, together with all of creation (Rom. 8:21; Gal. 5:1). All the pharaohs (oppressors, dictators and tyrants) of human history cannot defeat the liberating purpose of Yahweh, the liberator of the Exodus. Although a long philosophical and linguistic history has managed to confuse the teaching, the same name of Yahweh (the liberating God of the Exodus) reflects God’s option in favor of the poor, the weak and the oppressed. Many texts of the Hebrew Bible confirm this feeling, including the preface itself to the Decalogue:

“I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery” (Ex. 20:2 // Deut. 5:6; see Ex. 7:5; Lev. 19:10, 36; 22:32-33; 23:43; 25:38; 26:13; 26:44-45; Sal. 103:6-7; Ezekiel, which includes the second exodus: 13:21, 23; 20:5-6, 9, 41-42; 28:24, 26; 34:27, 30; 36:8-12, 22-32, 33-38; 37:6, 9-14, 15-28; 39:25-28).

**1.3 The Book of the Covenant, 1200-800 B.C. (20:22–23:33).** The ritualistic laws (the laws concerning worship, Ex. 20:22-26; the three festivals and the goat, 23:14-19) introduce and conclude the collection of the oldest laws in the Hebrew Bible. The various laws in 22:18-31 also begin and end with ritualistic laws: condemnation of sorcery, bestiality and sacrifices to other gods at the beginning (22:18-20); the prohibition of blasphemy and the laws concerning first fruits and the firstborn at the end (22:28-30). However, although the emphasis on the ritualistic laws is notable (nine in all), the collection includes *twelve* provisions that seek to protect the weak (see, above, the cultic twelve commandments, Ex. 34:14-26):

- 21:1-11 Laws relative to slaves; → Deut. 15:12-18; Lev. 25:35-46; Jer. 35:8-16
- 21:16 Kidnapping of a person for slavery; → Deut. 24:17
- 22:21 Oppression of the immigrant (// 23:9)
- 22:22-24 The widow, the orphan; → Deut. 10:18; 24:17; 27:19; Lev. 19:33-34
- 22:25 Loans to the poor; → Deut. 23:20-21; Lev. 25:35-37
- 22:26-27 Taking the cloak of the poor in pawn; → Deut. 24:10-13, 17
- 23:1 False testimony; → Deut. 16:18-20
- 23:6-8 Justice for the poor...bribes; → 1:17; 16:19; 27:25
- 23:9 Do not oppress the immigrant; → 22:20
- 23:10-11 Sabbatical Year (for the poor and animals); → Deut. 5:12-15
- 23:12 Weekly Sabbath (for animals, slaves, immigrants)

Since the Hebrew Bible places such an emphasis on God's wrath, it is important to note that the principal motive of this just indignation is oppression. God cannot remain indifferent to the mistreatment of the poor and the weak:<sup>19</sup>

22:21 You shall not wrong (*yanah*) or oppress (*lachats*) a resident alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.

22 You shall not abuse (*yanah*) any widow or orphan. 23 If you do abuse (*yanah, two times*) them, when they cry (*tsa'aq, two times*) out to me, I will surely heed their cry; 24 my wrath will burn, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall become widows and your children orphans.

25 If you lend money to my people, to the poor (*'ani*) among you, you shall not deal with them as a creditor; you shall not exact interest from them. 26 If you take your neighbor's cloak in pawn, you shall restore it before the sun goes down; 27 for it may be your neighbor's only clothing to use as cover; in what else shall that person sleep? And if your neighbor cries out to me, I will listen, for I am compassionate.

Reflecting the paradigm of Exodus, such laws do not authenticate the imperial propaganda line that poverty is due to sloth (Pharaoh in Ex. 5:17). They make it clear that the primary cause of poverty is not some vice or sin on the part of the poor (which usually are even more abundant among the elite classes), but the mechanisms of oppression that are common in society.<sup>20</sup>

**1.4 The Poor and the Weak in the Decalogue.** We should probably understand the Ten Commandments in their final form as a later summary of specific laws similar to the Book of the Covenant and not coming from Moses as such. Regardless, such an approach helps us to understand how the Decalogue also attempts to protect the poor and the weak from oppression:

- No. 4, *Sabbath rest*, is not a “ritualistic” commandment, but a guarantee of rest for socially-weak persons (“so that [they] may rest as well as you” [patriarch with property and slaves], Deut. 5:14): slaves, the patriarch's children, the resident aliens and even the animals (Ex. 29:10 // Deut. 5:14, which has its “animal theology” more developed). The Sabbath motive is even stronger in Deuteronomy (the exodus from slavery) than in Exodus (Deut. 5:15; cp. Ex. 20:11, the creation in six days....).
- No. 5, “*Honor your father and your mother*,” endeavored above all to avoid the expulsion from the home of parents of advanced age when they could no longer work or defend themselves (Prov. 19:26; Ex. 21:15, 17; Lev. 20:9; Deut. 27:16; cp. Lev. 19:3; Prov. 1:8; 15:5; → 1 Tim 5:3-16).
- No. 8, “You shall not steal,” prohibits in the first place the practice of kidnapping and enslaving vulnerable Israelites. (Ex. 21:16 and Deut. 24:7 indicate that the prohibition originally referred to the kidnapping of persons and that – as do Nos. 6 and 7 – the penalty is death; Deut. 24:7 explicitly limits this to another Israelite.) Medieval Christian tradition began to interpret commandment 8 in relation to natural law (from Greek philosophy) as a guarantee of any “private property.” However, in the history of Israel, *first*, “property” (land) was divided justly, in an equalitarian sense (→ Num. 26:52-56; 27:1-11; 36:1-13; → Joshua 13-21; Naboth, in 1 Reyes 21); *secondly*, the provision for the Year of Jubilee (→ Leviticus 25) assured that any property that was temporarily lost was returned to the original owner after fifty years; and only *thirdly* did the eighth commandment protect persons from kidnapping and theft (see the prohibitions against moving boundary markers, → Deut. 19:14; 27:17; → Prov. 22:28; 23:10; Hosea 5:10; Job 24:2). Consequently, in the original historical sense, the commandment never served to guarantee the extreme riches of the land owners who left the great majority of a population poor and without land. In fact, such an accumulation of land and other assets constitutes in itself theft in the original context of the eighth commandment.
- No. 9. The poor and weak would be the first target of the “*false witnesses*”, bribed by the rich. If the intention of the Hebrew Scriptures was an “absolute ethic” against all tricks and lies, it would be difficult to explain how other texts present Yahweh as doing the tricking (1 Kings 22:19-23; Psalm 89) and the many texts that describe with apparent approval the tricks of war (the ambush of Joshua 8:1-3) and the tricks

(especially on the part of women) to save lives and kill enemies (the midwives in Exodus 1; Jael in Judges 4:17-24; cp. → Col. 2:9; Ef. 4:25; Titus 1:2). In some conflictive contexts an “elitist ethic” from Greek philosophy which prohibits all tricks and lying can be a luxury of the oppressors.

- No. 6, “*You shall not murder.*” Violence may be expressed in death penalties (→ Naboth, 1 Kings 21).
- No. 10. Since *covetousness* of a neighbor’s possessions is more than mere “desire” and includes planning ways of obtaining that which is coveted, it would be a special temptation for the powerful, who have greater possibilities of obtaining things (bribing false witnesses, changing boundaries, etc.).

**2. Twelve Women (with God as Mother Eagle).** The prominence of twelve women “apostles” of the Exodus parallels Jacob’s twelve sons and Joachim Hahn does not exaggerate when he affirms: “Were it not for the women (Miriam, the midwives, Moses’ mother, Pharaoh’s daughter) the exodus would not have happened.”<sup>21</sup>

**2.1-2 Shiphrah and Puah, Hebrew midwives (Ex. 1:15-21).** The original and paradigmatic revolution of history<sup>22</sup> begins when Shiphrah and Puah decided to disobey the pharaoh’s decree (→ Rom. 13:1-7) and let the Hebrew boys live. Called to the court to explain the failure of the king’s violent plan, the midwives fool Pharaoh about the supposed superior strength of the Israelite women – and God blesses their subversive deception. (The Decalogue and the Bible condemn *false testimony* that *does harm* to one’s neighbor but not all subterfuges and tricks of war; → Joshua.) The importance of Shiphrah and Puah, as initiators of the revolution, is evident because of the fact the text names them but later leaves anonymous the parents and the sister of Moses (2:1-10).

**2.3 Jochebed (“Yahweh is glory”), Moses’ mother (2:1-9; 6:20; Num. 26:59).** In the story itself of Moses’ birth, his parents as well as his sister Miriam are anonymous (see their names in the genealogies in 6:20 and Num. 26:59). The name of Jochebed is the first in the Bible that includes the name of Yahweh, which suggests that Moses learned his faith primarily from her (see the revelation of the name Yahweh, Ex. 3:13-15, above). Jochebed was the daughter of Levi, wife and also aunt of Amram, who was Moses’ father, also a Levite (a relationship condemned in Leviticus 18 and 20 as incestuous!), which underscores the priestly credentials of Moses and Aaron. The second step in the original and paradigmatic revolution of history occurs when Jochebed decides to disobey Pharaoh’s new law to kill all newborn Hebrew boys by throwing them into the river (Ex. 1:22). Jochebed subversively “obeys” the Pharaoh’s mandate, but waits three months and places Moses in a papyrus basket and leaves it near the place on the bank of the river where Pharaoh’s daughter usually went to bathe. When the princess rescues the boy, Jochebed, assisted by Miriam, astutely arranges to get an assured salary by becoming the wet-nurse of her own son (2:1-10).

**2.4 Miriam, Moses’ sister (anonymous in 2:1-12, without mention in 6:20; named and designated a prophetess in Exodus 15; → Numbers 12; 20; 26:59; Deut. 24:9; 1 Chron. 6:3; Micah 6:4).** Many conclude that the song of Miriam, the first prophetess in the Bible (Ex. 15:20-21), represents the original version and that the attribution to Moses (15:1) is later,<sup>23</sup> since the elaborations (15:1-14) usually are subsequent to the shorter versions. Furthermore, even if William Propp were correct to reject the attribution of the original song to Miriam, he recognizes that when the celebrating women went out to greet male victors, as was customary, “there are erotic overtones”<sup>24</sup> – thus, if Moses himself were the “choir director,” he assumed the feminine role and acted as a sexual minority. Miriam apparently was unmarried (see 3 below).

**2.5 The Daughter of Pharaoh (Ex. 2:5-10).** The princess who, moved with compassion (2:6), challenged her father’s mandate to drown the newborn Hebrew boys in the river, is anonymous. Her participation was nonetheless essential for the salvation of the future liberator. She gave the baby his name, Moses, adopted him and assured him the benefits of a royal education (Acts 7:21-22). Given the firmness of her decision to challenge her father, we can suspect that the hiring of Moses’ mother as his wet-nurse (probably for some three years) was intentional rather than naive.

**2.6-12 Seven single sisters, daughters of the Midianite priest Reuel / Jethro, who gave Zipporah to Moses as his wife (Ex. 2:16-22; 4:20, 24-26; 18:2-6; → Numbers 12).** In appreciation for the solidarity shown by Moses to his seven daughters, in a conflict with some shepherds concerning a well of water, Reuel provided hospitality to Moses and later gave his daughter Zipporah to him as his wife (2:21-22). She and Moses had two sons, Gershom and Eliezer (Ex. 4:20; 18:3-4). After his call to liberate his people (3:1-4:17), Moses bade goodbye to Jethro / Reuel to return to Egypt with Zipporah and their two sons (4:18-23). On the road to Egypt one of the strangest accounts in Scripture occurred, in which Zipporah was the heroine:

4:24 On the way, at a place where they spent the night, the Lord met him and tried [*baqash*] to kill him [Moses]. 25 But Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin, and touched Moses' feet [euphemism for genitals] with it, and said, "Truly you are a bridegroom of blood to me!" 26 So he let him alone. It was then she said, "A bridegroom of blood by circumcision" [see notes in NJB and HCSB].

In its notes the *Sagrada Biblia* (Cantera – Iglesias, BAC) suggests that the primitive narration, probably Midianite, "would have referred to a local bloodthirsty demon" later identified with Yahweh (see Jacob's struggle with an "angel/God" Gen. 32:24-32). In the demythologizing process, Yahweh replaced the demon, and the text was adapted to legitimize the circumcision of boys. If this were the process, the courage, wisdom and power of Zipporah were enormously exaggerated, since when God is at the point of killing Moses, she intervenes, halts the divine action and liberates her husband from death. "It may be conjectured that Moses attracts God's anger for not being circumcised and that Zipporah appeases it by in fact circumcising her son but simulating a circumcision of Moses by touching the latter's genitals...with the child's foreskin" (NBJ note 4:24; see Joshua 5:2-9, also with flint knives).

Furthermore, although later in Leviticus women remain marginalized from worship (precisely for being unclean because of their menstrual *blood*), Zipporah in this account carries out an action (the circumcision) that only men perform in such texts (see Abraham in Gen. 17:23; → Joshua; Paul and Timothy in → Acts 16:1-5). As a priest's daughter, Zipporah apparently knew something about the manipulation of blood to avoid disasters (see the Passover in Exodus 12 with the protective blood on the doorposts of the Hebrew houses). Later, Moses sent Zipporah and their two sons away (18:2; a divorce?), and when they met again (18:6) Moses invited his father-in-law to enter his tent but did not even greet Zipporah. Divorced, separated or a widow, Moses marries again after the Exodus (with a black woman from Cush, → Numbers 12; cf. HCSB note on Numbers 12 that identifies the woman as Zipporah). Thus, as the last of the twelve women who made the liberation of the twelve tribes of Israel possible, Zipporah rescues Moses from death, but her action appears to have distanced her from her husband.

**2.13 God as Mother Eagle (19:1-25), the theophany in Sinai.** Yahweh says to Israel:

You [the Israelites] have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you *on eagles' wings* (*nesharim*) and brought you to myself [to the desert of Mount Sinai] (Ex. 19:4).

In her study of the feminine images of God, Virginia Mollenkott points out that, although the word *eagles*, *nesharim*, is masculine plural in the Hebrew, it is the female of the species which bears the eaglets on its wings to teach it to fly.<sup>25</sup> It is more common in the Bible to present God as masculine with God's daughters (feminine), but in the cases of the images of God as an eagle and as a hen it is the reverse<sup>26</sup> (Ruth 2:12; → Matt. 23:27; Luke 13:34). With God as a hen, the chicks are gathered *under* the wings, but when the texts speak of the eaglets *on* the wings, it is a reference to a mother eagle. A hymn of Metropolitan Community Church expresses this truth (see below). The image is developed even more in → Deuteronomy:

As an eagle stirs up its nest,  
and hovers over its young;  
as it spreads its wings, takes them up,  
and bears them aloft on its pinions,

the Lord alone guided him;  
no foreign god was with him.  
He set him atop the heights of the land.... (Deut. 32:11-13a).

**2.14 The Women in the Decalogue (Exodus 20 // Deuteronomy 5).** Although the verbs in the Hebrew text are in masculine singular, they could include women; but that the Ten Commandments are directed primarily toward free men is evident in the tenth, which prohibits coveting “your neighbor’s wife.” However,

- The fifth commandment (Ex. 20:12 // Deut. 5:16) explicitly includes the mother: “Honor your father and mother....”, and in Lev. 19:3 “mother” appears first.
- The fourth commandment (Ex. 20:10 // Deut. 5:14) commands rest for daughters and female slaves, but not explicitly for the wife/mother, who might be included as being responsible for permitting the daughters and female slaves to rest<sup>27</sup> (→ Prov. 31:10-31).

**2.15 Seduction of an unbetrothed virgin (Ex. 22:16-17); → Deut. 22:28-29**  
(see 3. Sexual Minorities, below).

**2.16 Sorceress (22:18); → Deut. 18:9-12; Lev. 20:27.**

“You shall not permit a female *sorcerer (mekashepah)* to live.”

The Leviticus Holiness Code prohibits two specific practices and it includes men:

“A man or a woman who is a medium (*’ewob*) or a wizard (*vid’oni*) shall be put to death; they shall be stoned to death, their blood is upon them” (Lev. 20:27).

Witchcraft is one of the eight or nine practices of magic/divination condemned in Deut. 18:

9 When you come into the land that the Lord your God is giving you, you must not learn to imitate the abhorrent practices of those nations. 10 No one shall be found among you who makes a son or daughter pass through fire, or who practices divination, or is a soothsayer, or an augur (*mekashep*), or a sorcerer, 11 or one who casts spells, or who consults ghosts or spirits, or who seeks oracles from the dead.... 14 Although these nations... do give heed to soothsayers and diviners, as for you, the Lord your God does not permit you to do so. 15 The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet.”

In the case of witchcraft, the text refers only and explicitly to women, although they also participated in other practices (see the appearance of Samuel’s ghost achieved by the medium of Endor, 1 Sam. 28:3, 7-25; see also Ex. 7:11; Dan. 2:1-3; 2 Kings 9:22; 2 Kings 21:6; 2 Chron. 33:6; Is. 8:19-20; Jer. 27:9). In addition to the association with pagan idolatry, perhaps Isaiah explains best the motive of such condemnations.<sup>28</sup>

19 Now if people say to you, “Consult the ghosts and the familiar spirits that chirp and mutter; should not a people consult their gods, the dead on behalf of the living, 20 for teaching and for instruction?” Surely, those who speak like this will have no dawn! (Is. 8:19-20).

Although modern, educated people reject superstitions that are still very popular (see the gay and lesbian magazines which frequently offer astrological material as a religion that substitutes Christianity), it is important to remember the tragic history of the persecution of women, especially lesbians, accused of witchcraft, spiritualism, etc. (see HCSB note on 8:19-20).<sup>29</sup>

**2.17 The Tabernacle (Ex. 25:1–31:18 + 35:1–40:34).** The essence of being masculine is to go to war, and the Song of Moses/Miriam assures us that “The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name” (Ex. 15:3).<sup>30</sup> Meanwhile, the Israelites could remain calm and passive, like a housewife awaiting the return of her triumphant husband: “The Lord will fight for you, and you have only to keep still” (14:14). Consequently, it is surprising to read in the 12 chapters undedicated to the plan and construction of the tabernacle of “another Yahweh” – one more interested in aesthetics, art and the architectural details, furniture and drapes of God’s dwelling place – like a queen who gives unending instructions to the decorator (Moses) of her luxurious apartment.<sup>31</sup> (The fierce ironic humor may upset traditionally pious people, but it is difficult to negate the validity of the observation.) Without irony, Dorah Setel points out that the chapters concerning the tabernacle offer the only example in the Bible of feminine participation in official worship (Ex. 35:22, 25-26, 29) and include explicitly “Israelite... women” (35:29).<sup>32</sup> The details of the sanctuary and its furniture appear to be related to the worship of earlier female deities (→ Acts 7:44, 50; John 1:14; Heb. 8:1-6; 9:1-14; Rev. 13:6; 15:5; 21:3).

In addition to the dialectic tension between the warrior Yahweh of Ex. 15:3 and the effeminate divinity who is concerned with the aesthetics of God’s dwelling place in the tabernacle, a dialectic also exists between the preoccupation for cultic details (Exodus 25–31, 35–40; → Leviticus 1–10) and the zeal for community justice in the commandments of Exodus 20–23. Facing so many reactionary ecclesiastical institutions, modern interpretation opts for prophetic criticism of worship (→ Amos 4:4-5; Hosea 6:6; Micah 6:6-8; Is. 1:11-15; Jer. 7:4, 8-11) and looks down on the concern for worship in the priestly writings of the Hebrew Bible. However, as Walter Brueggemann insists: “It is evident in the contemporary world, as in the ancient world, that *a regularized stylized practice of symbolization is indispensable for the sustenance of intentional ethical practice*....Moreover, the cult [worship] is a place in which Israel may indeed be in the presence of the Holy One.”<sup>33</sup> Like many, Brueggemann concludes that the purpose of the prophetic criticism of worship was the rejection of common abuses, not authentic ritual worship directed toward the liberating God of the Exodus (→ John 4:21-24).

### 3. Sexual Sins and Sexual Minorities.

**3.1 Two midwives, subversive and single (1:15-20), eventually married (1:21).**

**3.2 Miriam (2:1-10); in Ex. 15, single; → Numbers 12.**

**3.3 Seven single daughters of the Midianite priest (2:16-22).** Drawing water from a well is the work of single daughters. Reuel gives Zipporah to Moses as his wife, 2:21-22 (see above).

**3.4 Adultery, Commandment No. 7: “You shall not commit adultery (*na’ af*)”, 20:14 // Deut 5:18** (22:22); originally, to rob the sexual property of another male, Lev. 20:10; → NT – Rom. 13:8-10 (harm to a neighbor). The prohibition against bestiality is repeated in three legal codes in the Hebrew Bible, from the first until the latest, but never in the New Testament (see below). The prohibition against anal sex between males (without a condom) occurs only in the latest legal code (→ Lev. 18:21 and 20:13) and probably (with obscure terminology and meaning) once in Paul (→ 1 Cor. 6:9-10) and again in a Pauline pastoral letter by a disciple of Paul (→ 1 Tim. 1:10), but never in the Gospels or other parts of the New Testament. Adultery, however, is marked as sin from the narrations of Genesis (12; 20; 26; 39), in the seventh of the Ten Commandments (Ex. 20:14 and Deut. 5:18), in all of the legal codes of the Pentateuch, repeatedly in the prophets and wisdom literature, in the teachings of Jesus and Paul and in other parts of the New Testament including Revelation. Obviously, in terms of repetition, emphasis and continuity, no biblical commandment in the sexual area is comparable to the prohibition of adultery. As Paul points out, adultery is not compatible with love of neighbor, since (except in very rare circumstances) it harms the neighbor (Rom. 13:8-10).

However, in spite of the impressive *continuity* in the Bible concerning this subject, we should also note the *radical transformation* in the concept today. In modern society we take for granted the equality of women and men, and marriage is conceived as a pact (mutual vows) between the couple. In contrast, the great majority of biblical texts reflect patriarchal society in the way they perceive adultery as a theft of sexual property (a woman) from another male. Furthermore, married Israelite men, like those of other cultures, could have sexual relations with their

slaves, concubines, prostitutes, widows or divorcees, since they were not the sexual property of another male (→ Abraham and Hagar, Genesis 16; 21; Philemon; 1 Cor. 5-7).<sup>34</sup> Although today such sexual relations would be classified as adultery, a sin against the wife (only) which violates the marriage vows, it was not so in Israel, where polygamy, concubines and slavery were accepted and taken for granted. Certain later biblical texts, especially in the New Testament, anticipate a modern non-patriarchal perspective (→ 1 Cor. 6:12-20; 7:1-7; Mark 10:1-12; Matthew 19:3-9; Luke 16:18; see Gen. 1:27 y 2:24).<sup>35</sup>

### 3.5 Seduction of a Virgin, 22:16-17/MT15-16; → Deut. 22:22/28-29 (“premarital sex?”).

**Ex. 22:16** When a man seduces a virgin who is not betrothed to be married, and lies with her, he shall give the bride-price for her and make her his wife. **17** But if her father refuses to give her to him, he shall pay an amount equal to the bride-price for virgins.

The patriarchal perspective is evident: the woman is treated as (damaged) property which passes from the father to the seducer/husband. Marriage is not a pact between the husband and wife (hence we speak of “betrothal”, not “engagement”),<sup>36</sup> since the father is the one who decides if he wants to give his damaged sexual property to the seducer/violator. The text does not answer modern questions about “premarital sex”, since:

- this applies only in the case of a virgin, sexual property of her father, not to other women (orphans) and those with sexual experience (widows, raped young women, prostitutes), and much less to single men (who had access to concubines, slaves and prostitutes);
- the seducer had to pay a dowry (the price established for virgins);
- the father decided if he wanted to give his damaged sexual property in exchange for the dowry, or accept the dowry but still maintain his damaged sexual property;
- it reflects a patriarchal society in which sex existed to procreate legitimate heirs of the ancestral property and where recourse to contraceptive methods was unthinkable.<sup>37</sup>

To cite this text as an “ethical absolute” to answer a modern question about “premarital sex” is to ignore the specificity of the treated case in an ancient agricultural society and the distinctive characteristics of our modern context, primarily urban, where:

- the woman is not the sexual property of anybody but is equal to men (the father or the “seducer”), makes her own decisions, makes marriage vows, etc.;
- the man commonly is not a “seducer/rapist” (of a passive woman) but a friend or fiancé who proposes a consensual sexual relationship, or even where the woman takes the initiative;
- the sexual relationship is for mutual love and pleasure, almost never to procreate heirs for an ancestral property;
- contraceptive methods avoid the procreation of undesired children and the responsibility of raising them.

Exodus 22:16-17 is an example of a “casuistic” law (ex.: “If a man... *then*”), which are different than “apodictic” laws: “You shall not murder,” for which there is not an explicit punishment.<sup>38</sup> → **Deut. 22:22-29** does not repeat the case of Ex. 22:16-17, but it presents four other *cases* (two deal with *rape*, *’anah*):

- *If* a man is caught lying with a *married* woman, both *shall die*....;
- *if* in a *city* a man lies with a virgin engaged to be married...*both shall be stoned* to death... (since she didn’t cry for help)....;
- *if* in *open country* a man *rapes* an engaged virgin, only the man who raped the young woman shall die (since no one would have heard her cry for help)....;
- *if* a man *rapes* a virgin who is *not engaged to be married*, the man shall pay (the father) fifty shekels of silver and she *shall become his wife*.... He shall not be permitted to divorce her as long as he lives

**3.6 Bestiality: “Zoophilia” or idolatry? Ex. 22:19/18MT (*kol*, all = males; death penalty); // → Lev. 18:23a, masc.; 23b, fem.; death in 20:15, masc., 20:16, fem.; Deut. 27:21, masc.**

18 You shall not permit a female sorcerer to live. → Lev. 6:27; Deut. 18:9-12.

19 Whoever lies with an *animal* shall be put to death. 20 Whoever sacrifices to *any god*, other than the Lord alone, shall be devoted to destruction (Ex. 22:18-20; → Gen. 2:18-20).

In the “Book of the Covenant” (20:22–23:33), Israel’s oldest legal code, the only sexual *prohibition* (“apodictic” law) is against sex with animals (see the prohibition of adultery in the Decalogue and the case law [casuistic law] of a seduced virgin in 22:16-17). To correctly interpret this prohibition, we must note that it occurs in two other prohibitions of idolatrous pagan practices and had a magical background in both Ugarit and Babylonia. Hittite law only prohibited the practice with certain animals (→ Genesis 19; Ezekiel 16).<sup>39</sup> The prohibition (apodictic law) of bestiality is repeated in Deut. 27:21 (8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century B.C.) and amplified in → **Leviticus** 18:23 and 20:15-16 (exilic texts that extend the prohibition to women). In Leviticus the prohibition continues to be linked with pagan idolatrous worship practices:

21 You shall not give any of your offspring to sacrifice them to Molech, and so profane the name of your God: I am Yahweh.

22 You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination.

23 You shall not have sexual relations with any animal and defile yourself with it, nor shall any woman give herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it: it is perversion Lev. 18:21-23).

In Lev. 20:15-16 the cases (casuistic laws) of bestiality occur between two laws against incestuous relations (20:14-17) and are separated by the prohibition of anal sex between males (18:22; 20:13), but they repeat the inclusion of a woman and add the punishment of the death penalty (also for the animal!):

15 If a male has sexual relations with an animal, he shall be put to death; and you shall kill the animal.

16 If a woman approaches any animal and has sexual relations with it, you shall kill the woman and the animal; they shall be put to death, their blood is upon them (Lev. 20:15-16).

The context of the reference to bestiality in → Deuteronomy (27:21, alluding only to males) are three prohibitions against incestuous acts (27:20, 22-23) in a list of 12 curses (27:15 is against idolatry, the others insist on social justice).

Although zoophilia today lacks importance in itself, it always serves as a basis to question the interpretation and use of the Bible in relation to modern sexual questions. That is, it has a “*heuristic*” value, since it forces us to question and helps us understand. For example, for fundamentalists who attempt to make us “return to the Bible” with regard to sexual practice questions, it is extremely disconcerting that the New Testament does not provide a single prohibition against sexual relations with animals. On the other hand, no one wants the laws from the Hebrew Bible such as the levirate or the ordeal for a woman suspected of adultery (→ **Numbers** 5) to be imposed on contemporary communities. Consequently, the fact that the prohibitions of zoophilia are repeated in the three principal codes of the Hebrew Bible (from the oldest to the most recent) but absent from the New Testament requires us to rethink our methodology in using the Bible as a source for norms today. Those who would limit themselves to the New Testament are embarrassed by the absence of such prohibitions there; but those who would accept the entire Hebrew Bible as normative reject many elements unacceptable today.

In debates concerning homoerotic relationships it is common to affirm that Jesus said nothing against them. But those who condemn such relationships reply that neither did Jesus say anything explicit against sexual relations with animals. They point out that countless important questions exist about which Jesus said nothing, in part because, like a good Jew, no one in his culture raised questions about such activities (homoerotic relationships,

bestiality, etc.).<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, in Jesus' teaching and praxis we can point out dimensions that challenge the homophobic prejudices of his compatriots: Jesus' most intimate relationship was with his beloved disciple, not with his beloved little dog (→ **John**); Jesus healed the centurion's "beloved slave," not his horse (→ **Matthew Luke**). Likewise, Paul enjoyed his most intimate relationship with Timothy, not with a talking mule (Balaam, → **Numbers 22:28**), and greeted disciples in Rome who lived with friends of the same sex, not with animals (→ **Romans 16**).

Another common incoherent argument that manipulates the bestiality prohibition is that the acceptance of consensual loving relationships between persons of the same sex would imply that we must also approve sexual relations with animals; or that if we accept marriage between two gay or lesbian persons we would also have to approve the blessing of matrimony between a man and his dog. With such "logic," we conclude that any minor adjustment in sexual norms will take us to the acceptance of any sexual activity, in addition to other scorned acts:

- Does the acceptance of masturbation in private obligate us to accept it in public?
- Does the acceptance of the bikini oblige us to accept total public nudity?
- Does the acceptance of marriage require us to approve polygamy?
- Does the allowing priests to marry imply approval of their adultery?
- Does the acceptance of divorced pastors imply the acceptance of abortion?
- Does the approval of eating hamburgers obligate us to accept cannibalism?

Obviously people who use such arguments have not developed coherent criteria for reflection. Their fears cause them to swallow any "argument" that appeals to their fears and prejudices and props up their rigid ideology (commonly defended with biblical quotes arbitrarily chosen and cited without understanding). Thus, the heuristic challenge that zoophilia raises for us obligates us to develop a more coherent approach to sexual questions that utilizes science, reason and the Scriptures. Recognition of the diversity of biblical teaching in the sexual sphere, evident in the treatment of eunuchs (→ **Deuteronomy 23:1, Isaiah 56, Matthew 19, Acts 8**) and divorce (→ **Deuteronomy, Ezra-Nehemiah, Mark**), is an important step in this task.

At present zoophilia (sexual relations with animals, or literally "sexual love for animals") is rare: one percent of the population according to Kinsey. However, as magical practice and an idolatrous fertility rite it was in vogue in the ancient East. Comparatively, while 33-40 percent of the masculine population (in the United States at least) have had homosexual experience, male anal sexual relations is prohibited only in two verses in the latest biblical legal code (the "Holiness Code," Leviticus 17-26).

The understanding of sexual questions in ancient Israel was pre-scientific, but its priests had surpassed pagan idolatry in one aspect: if procreation was the purpose, sexual relations with sacred cows or dogs are not appropriate means. Many centuries later, when the "Holiness Code" of Leviticus 17-26 was written (about 550 BC), scientific understanding had progressed considerably. To experiment the blessing of maximum fertility and growth of a population decimated in the exile, the Israelite priests prohibited sexual relations with a woman who is menstruating, the sacrifice of children to Molech, anal sexual relations between males and sexual relations with animals (18:19, 21-22; 20:13, 15-16, 18). As Carol Meyers points out, such prohibitions represent the negative expression of the positive mandate to bear fruit and multiply which God gave to the first human beings in the creation (Gen. 1:28; see also the repetition of this mandate after the flood, Gen. 9:7). Another factor could be the priestly concern of avoiding the *mixture* of things that should remain separated and pure:<sup>41</sup>

You shall not let your animals breed with a different kind;  
you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed;  
nor shall you put on a garment made of two different materials (Lev. 19:19).

That is, human beings should respect the boundaries that God established and not have sexual relations with animals, nor with angels (→ **Genesis 6:1-4; 19; Jude 7**).

Pagan priests promoted sexual relations with animals and anal sexual relations between males as part of the “fertility cults.” The Israelite priests did not believe this was a very smart idea and prohibited both practices:

You shall not give any of your offspring to sacrifice them to Molech, and so profane the name of your God:  
I am Yahweh.

You shall not lie with a male as with a woman [anal penetration]; it is an abomination.

You shall not have sexual relations with any animal and defile yourself with it, nor shall any woman give herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it: it is perversion. (Lev. 18:21-23).

In Israel’s oldest code similar concerns arise that conclude with a prohibition, *You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk* (Ex. 23:19). This Israelite obsession intrigued commentators for centuries. Those who followed Calvin sought to link each law with the Ten Commandments: they asked if the concern was to honor the parents or to be benevolent toward animals. Finally, a Ugaritic text clarified that the prohibition is directed against a Canaanite ceremony of pagan fertility worship.<sup>42</sup> The use of those texts as biblical absolutes to determine the recipes of sauces today ignores the original context and purpose.

Sexologists affirm that sexual relations with animals occur because of isolation and the lack of sexual contacts by male heterosexuals. As a matter of fact, in the Middle Ages, when celibate clerics strove to purge the world of sexual pleasure, the frustrated monastic monks ended up having sexual relations with their donkeys.<sup>43</sup> In 1622, in the English colony of Plymouth in what is now the United States, where the church and society were only Christian, someone named Thomas Ganger was condemned to burn at the stake after having confessed to practicing “sodomy” with a mare, a cow, two female goats, five sheep, two female calves and a hen turkey.<sup>44</sup> We learned in grade school that the pilgrim fathers of Massachusetts liked tom turkeys, but they did not tell us they were *in love* with them! Even the sexologist Vern Bullough was surprised about the tom turkey. Although he is not often surprised, he admitted that he was when informed during a conference in Los Angeles about a man jailed for having raped a chicken (after a fight with his girlfriend, since the chicken was hers).

If God’s wise love is applicable even to the sparrows, undoubtedly the chicken’s fate should concern us, in addition to that of the jailed chicken violator. But is a law imposing corporal punishment on someone who has sexual relations with chickens coherent in a country where Colonel Sanders, with his enormous chain of fried chicken restaurants, walked unpunished? Does this situation call out for another fundamentalist like Anita Bryant to *save our chickens*?

### **3.7 The Golden Calf, Ex. 32–34; → King Jeroboam, 1 Kings 12:25-33, esp. 28-30.**

“And the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up *to revel (tsakhaq)*” (32:6b).

The verb *tsakhaq* can have a non-sexual meaning (“to joke,” Gen. 19:14) or sexual (“fondling,” Gen. 26:8; 39:14).<sup>45</sup> The Septuagint maintains the non-sexual meaning, but modern translations usually opt for the sexual meaning (see 32:6 note in HCSB).

When Moses saw that the people were running wild (for Aaron had let them run wild, to the derision of their enemies)....” (32:25).

Following the division of the kingdom, Jeroboam I (931-910 BC), the first king of the Northern Kingdom, wanted to subvert the loyalty of the people to Solomon’s Temple in Jerusalem. Consequently (1 Kings 12):

28 So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. He said to the people, “You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.” 29 He set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. (See 1 Kings 12:25-33, esp. 28-30, a text related closely to Ex. 32:4; HCSB note, 32:4.)

Saint Paul cites the Exodus text in his exhortation to the Corinthians:

Do not become idolaters as some of them did; as it is written, “The people sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up *to play* (1 Cor. 10:7; see Acts 7:38-41).

The book of Numbers narrates a similar idolatry episode:

While Israel was staying at Shittim, the people began to have sexual relations with the women of Moab. These invited the people to the sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate and bowed down to their gods.... Nevertheless those that died by the plague were twenty-four thousand (Num. 25:1-2, 9).

According to Num. 31:15-16, Balaam was the one guilty of making the Israelites betray Yahweh at Baal of Peor. Paul referred to the idolatry with the golden calf (Exodus 32) in 1 Cor. 10:7, and in the following verse (10:8) to sin with the Moabite women (Num. 25:1-2):

We must not indulge in sexual immorality as some of them did, and twenty-three thousand fell in a single day. (1 Cor. 10:8; cp. twenty-four thousand in Num. 25:9.)

The calf, or bull, was the symbol par excellence of strength, vitality and masculine fertility. These texts link sexual immorality with idolatry. The sexual activities are described as a form of diversion/play, not of procreation (→ **Song of Songs**; cp. Gen. 1:28, Leviticus 18 and 20). The sin, then, did not consist of enjoying the sexual activity as diversion or play, but in linking it with the worship of other gods (idolatry). The texts do not give us other wise norms to guide us in sexual activity.

**Our God is Like an Eagle** Laurence G. Bernier, 1974 (music: Webb, “Stand up, Stand up for Jesus”)

When Israel camped at Sinai, then Moses heard from God.  
This message tell the people, and give them this my word:  
From Egypt I was with you and carried on my wing,  
The whole of your great nation from slav'ry I did bring.

Just as a mother eagle who helps her young to fly,  
I am a mother to you; your needs I will supply.  
And you are as my children, my own who hear my voice.  
I am a mother to you, the people of my choice.

If God is like an eagle who helps her young [*be free*]  
And God is also father, then what of you and [*me*]?  
We have no fear of labels; we have no fear of roles.  
If God's own being blends them, we seek the selfsame goal.

Our God is not a woman, our God is not a man.  
Our God is both and neither; our God is I who am.  
From all the roles that bind us, our God has set us free.  
What freedom does God give us? The freedom just to be.

## Bibliographies

### Abortion (\* = self-identified as “pro-life”)

- \*Davidson, Richard M. (2007). *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, 486-500 Peabody: Hendrickson.
- \* Fowler, Paul B. (1987). *Abortion: Toward an Evangelical Consensus*. Portland, OR: Multnomah.
- Henry, Carl F. H. (1984). *The Christian Mindset in a Secular Society: Promoting Evangelical Renewal and National Righteousness*, 102-103. Portland, OR: Multnomah.
- \* House, Wayne (1978). “Miscarriage or Premature Birth: Additional Thoughts on Exodus 21:22-25.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 41:105-123.
- Jones, D. Gareth (1984). *Brave New People*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity. Later withdrawn from publication by InterVarsity and published by Eerdmans (Grand Rapids).
- \* Kline, Meredith (1977). “Les Taliones and the Human Fetus,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 20:193-201.
- Ricks, Stephen D. (1992). “Abortion in Antiquity.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, I:31-35. New York: Doubleday.
- \* Schaeffer, Francis A. y C. Everett Koop (1979). *Whatever Happened to the Human Race*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell.
- \* Schaeffer, Franky (1985). “Sincere People: How Evangelical Leaders Have Capitulated to the Abortion Industry.” *The Christian Activist* (Winter), 1.
- Smedes, Lewis B. (1983). *Mere Morality*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- \* Wallis, Jim. *Sojourners* (November 1980), editorial, p. 3.
- \* Waltke, Bruce K. (1976). “Reflections from the Old Testament on Abortion,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 19:3-13.

### Exodus and History

- Dever, William G. (2001). *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? What Archaeology Can Tell Us about the Reality of Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Finkelstein, Israel and Neil Silverman (2001). *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*. London/New York: The Free Press.
- Frerichs, Ernest and Leonard Lesko, eds. (1997). *Exodus: The Egyptian Evidence*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Kitchen, K. A. (2003). *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, 241-312. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Propp, William H. C. (2006). *Exodus 19-40*. AB, 735-56. New York: Doubleday.
- Sperling, David (1998), *The Original Torah: The Political Intent of the Bible's Writers*. New York: New York University.

### Magic/Witchcraft

- Aune, David (1986). “Magic, Magician”. ISBE III, 213-219. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Kuemmerlin-McLean, Joanne (1992). “Magic (OT)”. ABD IV, 468-471. New York: Doubleday.
- Mott, Luis (1999). *Homossexualis da Bahia: Dicionario Biográfico (Séculos xvi-xix)*. Salvador, Bahia (Brasil): Grupo Gay da Bahia.
- Schlager, Bernard (2000). “Inquisition”. In *Reader's Guide to Lesbian and Gay Studies*, ed. Timothy F. Murphy, 304-305. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Johansson, Warren (1990). “Witchcraft”. In *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes, 2:1395-98. New York: Garland.

## Yahweh, divine name

McLaughlin, John L. (2000). "Yahweh". EDB, 1402.

van der Toorn, Karel (1995). "YHWH". In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (DDD), ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking and Pieter W. van der Horst, 910-19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

## Zoophilia

Davidson, Richard M. (2007). *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, 172-74. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Bagemihl, Bruce (1999). *Biological Exuberance: Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity*. New York: St. Martin's.

Brown, Peter (1988/90). *El Cuerpo y la Sociedad: los cristianos y la renuncia sexual*. Barcelona: Muchnik.

Dailey, Dennis M., ed. (1988). *The Sexually Unusual: Guide to Understanding and Helping*, 21-22. New York: Harrington Park.

Ferguson, L. N. (1985). "Zoophilia". In *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology*, ed. David G. Benner, 1222-23. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Gagnon, Robert A. J. (2001). *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Linzey, Andrew (1994/96). *Animal Theology*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois.

——— (1998). *Animal Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Meyers, Carol (2001). "Lev. 18:22, 23; 20:16". In *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers, 208-209. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Van der Geest, Hans (1990). *Verschwiegene und abgelehnte Formen der Sexualität*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

## Exodus

Alpert, Rebecca (2006). "Exodus". In *The Queer Bible Commentary*, ed. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, Thomas Bohache, 61-76. London: SCM.

Andiñach, Pablo R. (2006). *El Libro del Éxodo*. Salamanca: Sígueme.

Ashby, G. W. (1998). *Go Out and Meet God: A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. ITC.

Auzou, Georges (1969). *De la servidumbre al servicio: Estudio del libro del Éxodo*. Madrid: Fax.

Boer, Roland (2001). "Yahweh as Top: a Lost Targum". In *Queer Commentary on the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Ken Stone, 75-105 (on the Tabernacle). Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Boli-Bennett, John (1980). "The Absolute Dialectics of Jacques Ellul". In *Research in Philosophy & Technology*, Vol 3, 171-201.

Brueggemann, Walter (1994). "The Book of Exodus". *New Interpreter's Bible*, 1:675-982. Nashville: Abingdon.

Burns, Rita (1987). *Has the Lord Indeed Spoken Only Through Moses? A Study of the Biblical Portrait of Miriam*. Atlanta: Scholars.

Childs, Brevard S. (1974). *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Countryman, L. William (1988/2007). *Dirt, Greed and Sex*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Craghan, John F. (1999). "Éxodo". In *Comentario Bíblico Internacional*, 364-409; see 371-375 on the theme of the Exodus in the whole Bible. Estella: Verbo Divino.

Croatto, J. Severino. (1994). "Éxodo 1-15: Algunas claves literarias y teológicas para entender el Pentateuco". *Estudios Bíblicos* 52, 167-194.

——— (1980/81). *Liberación y libertad: Pautas hermenéuticas*. Lima: CEP/Orbis.

Davidson, Richard M. (2007). *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

- Dozeman, Thomas B. (1996). *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition*. New York.
- (2000). “Exodus, Book of.” In *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, 443-444. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Durham, John I (1987). *Exodus*. Word Bible Commentary, 3. Waco: Word.
- Fretheim, T. E. (1991). *Exodus*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox.
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva (2000/01). “Virgen”. In *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers, 195-196. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Gowan, D. D. (1994). *Theology in Exodus: Biblical Theology in the Form of a Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Hahn, Joachim (1999). “Exodus, Book of.” In *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, 364-372. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Harrelson, Walter (1980/97). *The Ten Commandments and Human Rights*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hugenberger, Gordon P. *Marriage as a Covenant: Biblical Law and Ethics as Developed from Malachi*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994 / Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Janzen, J. G. (1997). *Exodus*. WBC. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. (1992). “Exodus, The.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, II, 700-708. New York: Doubleday.
- Larsson, Goran, tr.. (1999). *Bound for Freedom: The Book of Exodus in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Loewenstamm, S. E. ([1965]1992). *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*. Jerusalem: Magnus.
- Mollenkott, Virginia R. (1988). *The Divine Feminine: The Biblical Imagery of God as Female*. New York: Crossroad.
- Paul, Shalom M. (1970). *Studies in the Book of the Covenant in Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law*. VTSup 18. Leiden: Brill.
- Pixley, George V. (1987). *On Exodus: a liberation perspective*. Maryknoll: Orbis
- Pixley, Jorge V. (1983). *Éxodo: una lectura evangélica y popular*. México: Casa Unida.
- Propp, William H. C. (1999). *Exodus 1-18*. AB. New York: Doubleday.
- (2006). *Exodus 19-40*. AB. New York: Doubleday.
- Sarna, Nahum M. (1991). *Exodus*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- (1992). “Exodus, Book of”. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, II, 689-700. New York: Doubleday.
- Setel, Dorah O’Donnel (1992/98), “Exodus”. WBC, 30-39. Waco, TX: Word.
- Scholz, Susanne (1999). “Exodus: Was Befreiung aus “seiner” Sighet bedeutet...”. *Kompendium Feministische Bibelauslegung*, 26-39. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser.
- Spinaficio, A. (1995). *El Libro del Éxodo*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Trible, Phyllis J. (2000/01). “Miriam 1.” In *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1989). “Bringing Miriam Out of the Shadows,” *Biblical Review*, 5/1 (Feb.), 14-25.
- van der Toorn, Karel (1995). “YAHWEH”. In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Revised Edition ed. Karel van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. W. Van der Horst, 910-19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Van Seters, J. (1994). *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Walzer, Michael (1985). *Exodus and Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wiéner, Cl. (1998). *El Libro del Éxodo*. Estella: Verbo Divino.
- (1986). *El Libro del Éxodo*. Cuadernos Bíblicos 54, Estella: Verbo Divino.
- Zvi Brettler, Marc (2000/01). “Women in the Decalogue”. In *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers, 191-92. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- <sup>1</sup> Thomas Hanks, *Opresión, Pobreza y Liberación: Reflexiones bíblicas* (San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Caribe, 1982), 38-39; *God So Loved the Third World: The Biblical Vocabulary of Oppression* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983), 17; cf. the texts, few and later, of the New Testament which speak of Jesus' birth, when the fundamental emphasis is on his death and resurrection.
- <sup>2</sup> Nahum Sarna, 1992:698-99; Ex. 11:20; 23:9; Lev. 19:33-34; Deut. 5:13-15; 10:17-19; 15:12-15; 23:8; 24:20-22; see John Craghan 1999:371-75.
- <sup>3</sup> Thomas Dozeman, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000:443.
- <sup>4</sup> See Michael Walzer, 1985; Severino Croatto, 1980/81, 1994.
- <sup>5</sup> William Albright; John Bright; see Israel now, in Finkelstein and Neil Silverman 2001.
- <sup>6</sup> David Sperling, 1998.
- <sup>7</sup> See also the negation of the historicity of the Exodus by Ernest Frerichs and Leonard Lesko, eds., 1997.
- <sup>8</sup> William Dever, 2001.
- <sup>9</sup> David Pleins, 2001:95-96; → Genesis.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid., 158; see below.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., 174; see 1. The Poor, below.
- <sup>12</sup> See Xabier Pikaza 2007: "Dodecálogo", *Diccionario de la Biblia*, Verbo Divino, 287-88.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., 162.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., 28.
- <sup>15</sup> John Boli.Bennett, 1980.
- <sup>16</sup> Campbell, Antony F. and O'Brien, Mark A. *Sources of the Pentateuch*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993:183-190.
- <sup>17</sup> Pleins, op.cit., 158.
- <sup>18</sup> Karen van der Toorn, "YAHWEH", in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, revised edition, edited by Karel van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. W. Van der Horst.(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 910-19. Cp. Propp (2006:757-94).
- <sup>19</sup> Thomas D. Hanks 1983:115-117
- <sup>20</sup> Hanks 1983, 33-39.
- <sup>21</sup> Joachim Hahn, "Exodus, Book of," *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*., Nashville: Abingdon, 1999, 371. Richard M. Davidson has an outstanding treatment of the seven women and recent feminist interpretation (2007), *Flame of Yahweh*, 235-42
- <sup>22</sup> Michael Walzer, *Exodus and Revolution* (New York: Basic Books, 1985).
- <sup>23</sup> Dorah O'Donnell Setel, "Exodus" (WBC, 1992/98), 30-39; Phyllis J. Trible, "Miriam 1" in *Women in Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000/01, and citing Trible, "Bringing Miriam Out of the Shadows," *Biblical Review*, 5/1 (Feb. 1989), 14-25.
- <sup>24</sup> William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 547.
- <sup>25</sup> Virginia Mollenkott, 1988:83-91
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., 92-96.
- <sup>27</sup> Marc Zvi Brettler, "Women in the Decalogue" *Women in Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000:191-92.
- <sup>28</sup> David Aune 1986:ISBE III, 213-219; Joanne Kuemmerlin-McLean 1992:ABD IV, 468-471
- <sup>29</sup> Warren Johansson, "Witchcraft," *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland, 1990), 2:1395-98; Bernard Schlager, "Inquisition," *Reader's Guide to Lesbian and Gay Studies*, ed. Timothy F. Murphy (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000), 304-305; Luis Mott, *Homossexualis da Bahia: Diccionario Biográfico (Séculos xvi-xix)*, (Salvador, Bahia (Brasil): Grupo Gay da Bahia, 1999.
- <sup>30</sup> Stephen Moore 2001:173-199.
- <sup>31</sup> Roland Boer 2001:75-78.
- <sup>32</sup> Dorah Setel (1998:32.
- <sup>33</sup> Walter Brueggemann, (1997). *Theology of the Old Testament*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 678; italics his)
- <sup>34</sup> William Countryman 1988:149, 157 - 159; 2007:29-33, 147-52, 265-69
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., 175-178.
- <sup>36</sup> pace Gordon Hugenberger 1994/98
- <sup>37</sup> Tikva Frymer-Kensky, "Virgen," in *Women in Scripture*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001:195-196; cf Richard Davidson 2007:202,359-61, 405-06, 519.
- <sup>38</sup> From Albrecht Alt, 1934.
- <sup>39</sup> Brevard Childs 1974:478, who—mistakenly—refers to "bestiality" as "sodomy," 463.
- <sup>40</sup> Robert Gagnon 2001:185-228.
- <sup>41</sup> Carol Meyers 2001:208-209
- <sup>42</sup> Childs 1974:486
- <sup>43</sup> Brown 1988/90:230/315.
- <sup>44</sup> Bullough in Daily 1988:22.
- <sup>45</sup> Schökel 636.