Love's Limits: Love of Neighbor in the first three Christian Centuries

Jennifer Knust[*]

Duke University
jennifer.knust@duke.edu

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25784/jeac.v3i0.830

ἰσόψηφα κύφιος ω πίστις ω
Equal in value: Lord 800 Faith 800[†]

Abstract

Among Hellenistic Jews, the saying "love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev 19:18) summarized δικαιοσύνη (justice toward others) as enumerated in Mosaic law. Citations of the passage by Paul and in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew contributed to this wider discussion in the context of debates about the implications of neighbor love for Jesus-following πίστις (faith, loyalty, or trust). Second-century Christians — including Clement of Alexandria, who cited the passage repeatedly — pulled neighbor love into another conversation about the Christian "life in common" (κοινωνία) and in response to the Greek philosophical maxim "friends should possess all things in common." None of these writers, however, explicitly employed the saying to argue that God's love demands equal and compassionate treatment of all persons, ontologically and practically, although their words have been and can be interpreted in this way. Inspired by recent events, this essay employs biblical and historical analysis to resist destructive myths of progress that employ the love commandment as an alibi for disavowed hatred and arrogance.

[*] I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ruben Zimmermann, Raphaela Meyer zu Hörste-Bührer, Janina Alexandra Elisabeth Serfas, and the anonymous reviewers of this essay for their feedback and advice. I would also like to thank Gay Byron, Janet Downie, Bart Ehrman, Michelle Freeman, Mark Goodacre, Joel Marcus, Elizabeth Schrader, Ben Sheppard, Jeffrey Siker, Warren Smith, Nathan Tilley, and all the members of the Christianity in Antiquity group for helping me refine my thinking and my arguments. Thank you also to Joseph Marchal, whose insights are always particularly valuable. I am of course responsible for remaining mistakes and infelicities as well as any neglect of their sound recommendations.

[†] A graffito found in the basement of the agora in Smyrna. ROGER BAGNALL suggests that this graffito may well be Christian and should likely be dated to the late-second to mid-third centuries; see ROGER S. BAGNALL, et al., *Graffiti from the Basilica in the Agora of Smyrna* (New York: New York University Press, 2016), 45–47.

1. Introduction: Love's Limits

As Kengo Akiyama has shown, over the course of the first century CE "love your neighbor as yourself" emerged as "the greatest commandment" in numerous Jewish contexts, including among the followers of Jesus.[1] From then until now, this saying has served as a crux of Jewish and Christian interpretation. Its role in the social, political, and theological movements that claim it, however, has not always been salutary, despite the goodwill it seems to promote. Inspired by recent events, this essay revisits the place of neighborly love in condoning refusals of love. Is it possible to reconfigure neighborly love in such a way that every person is regarded and treated, ontologically as well as practically, as valued, and valuable, without qualification? Perhaps. But, as I argue here, the love command has just as often been used to designate some as more capable of love than others, a discursive move that produces distinction, not solidarity, while disavowing the content of own's disregard.[2] Such an interpretive tendency is already present among the first-century followers of Jesus who, in their writings, employed love of neighbor to portray themselves as superior arbiters of Mosaic law.[3] In the second century, by the time there were "Christians" who claimed or resisted the label, love became a way of specifying the excellence of the Christian "life in common" over and against the failed forms of love associated with named others.[4] It is sometimes claimed that Jesus and the Christians (finally) recognized the truly universal nature of God's love and therefore also the love demanded of God's people toward all.[5] As this survey of the evidence suggests,

[1] KENGO AKIYAMA, *The Love of Neighbour in Ancient Judaism: The Reception of Leviticus 19:18 in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, the Book of Jubilees, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity /Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 105. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

[2] Cf. JANET R. JAKOBSEN and ANN PELLEGRINI, *Love the Sin: Sexual Regulation and the Limits of Religious Tolerance* (New York: New York University Press, 2003).

[3] Akiyama rightly identifies the New Testament writers as "Jewish believers who wrote as Jews" and therefore regards these writings as forms of "Jewish interpretation" (*Love of Neighbor*, 18). Unlike Akiyama, I will not group the writings I discuss here as part of "the New Testament." This term offers a sense of canonical closure that was simply not present in the first Christian centuries and therefore overlooks the fluid and contested character of "sacred scriptures," especially during the period addressed by this essay. See JENNIFER KNUST, "Miscellany Manuscripts and the Christian Canonical Imaginary," in *Ritual Matters: Material Remains and Ancient Religion* (ed. CLAUDIA MOSER and JENNIFER KNUST; Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary 13; ANN ARBOR: University of Michigan Press, 2017), 99–118.

[4] On the label "Christian," see MAIA KOTROSITS, *Rethinking Early Christian Identity: Affect, Violence, and Belonging* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015). On the complexity of this label in the Acts of the Apostles in particular, see CHRISTOPHER STROUP, *The Christians Who Became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2020).

[5] See, for example, JOHN J. COLLINS, "The Neighbor and the Alien in Leviticus 19," in *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal: Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan* (ed. T. M. LEMOS et al.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2021), 185–198, 197: "The command to love one's neighbor as oneself is undoubtedly one of the great contribution of the Hebrew Bible to the ethical development of humanity. The application of the neighbor would in time be extended to all people and grounded in the recognition of shared humanity. But the book of Leviticus was not quite there yet. It was primarily concerned with the cohesion and identity of a particular people." The idea that Israel — and, later, "the Jews" — focused love inwardly, exclusively toward one another, while Christians love universally participates in an anti-Jewish stereotype with death-dealing implications as MARTIN LEUTZSCH has shown, "Nächstenliebe als Antisemitismus? Zu einem Problem der christlich-jüdischen Beziehung, " in "*Eine Grenze hast Du gesetzt*"*: Edna Brocke zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. EKKEHARD W. STEGEMANN and KLAUS WENGST; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2003), 77–95.

however, this claim is not only falsifiable; it also participates in the refusal to attend to the valuable lives of target others. The love command was not, and is not now, a reliable prophylactic against hatred, violence, and disregard. Christian love does not necessarily or inevitably pave the way for progress toward compassion, peace, and shared understanding. The saying "love your neighbor as yourself" cannot and will not offer a corrective to evils perpetrated in the name of love so long as those with the wherewithal to act upon their disavowed disregard fail to acknowledge what their love, and the love of their ancestors, has wrought.[6]

2. Prelude: Love's Betrayals

I cannot remember a time when I did not know the saying "love your neighbor as yourself." This must have been one of the first principles my mother ever taught me. I heard it again, year after year, season after season, Sunday after Sunday, in all the churches of my youth.[7] I also always assumed that "love your neighbor as yourself" was the corollary to, and likely the ground of, our equally important national slogan, "All men are created equal."[8] Pledging allegiance to the flag, singing "the church's one foundation," enjoying the spectacle of the July 4 fireworks were of a piece to me, a daughter of America's Christian love. During worship, my family and I confessed that "we have not loved thee with all our heart and soul, with all our mind and strength, and that we have not loved our neighbor as ourselves"[9] resolving to do better and be better next time. We expected our church and our nation to do the same. Occasionally, my mother might even have quoted Martin Luther King, Jr. to emphasize the point: "Love is understanding, creative, redemptive good will toward all men" and, someday, despite all the "deferred dreams and blasted hopes," people "will rise up and come to see that they are made to live together as brothers."[10] In the United States of America, the white Christian status quo (of which my own family is a part) claims that love and equality have always traveled among us, marching hand in hand toward some better version of what we always actually were. As I now understand, this is a mass delusion.[11] In an American context, and in others as well, this slogan has proven to be quite capable of supporting distorted love and serving as a ready excuse for both slow and fast forms of violence.[12]

---

[6] My imagined audience for this essay consists of those who have benefited from such disavowals, including myself.

[7] In the two copies of the *Pilgrim Hymnal* that still sit side by side on a shelf at my parents' house in Maine, all the hymns I know best exhort me to remember that "deeds of love and mercy" bring "the heavenly kingdom," or to "take my hands and let them move at the impulse of thy love," and to be confident that "in Christ there is no East or West, in him no South or North, but one great fellowship of love throughout the whole wide earth" (ERNEST W. SHURTLEFF, "Lead on, O King Eternal," FRANCES R. HAVERGAL, "Take My Life and Let It Be," JOHN OXENHAM, "In Christ There Is No East or West," in *Pilgrim Hymnal* [Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1958], nos. 375, 404, 414).

[8] The Declaration of Independence, available online at https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript.

[9] UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, "Prayers of Confession," *Pilgrim Hymnal*, no. 19, p. 505.

[10] MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., "A Christmas Sermon on Peace," in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (ed. JAMES MELVIN WASHINGTON; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 256–57.

[11] JAMES BALDWIN, *The Fire Next Time* (originally published New York: Dial Press, 1963; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 23: "those virtues preached but not practiced by the white world are merely another means of holding Negroes in subjection."

[12] I borrow the term "slow violence" from ROB NIXON, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), 2: Slow violence is "a violence that is dispersed across time and

3. American Progress and the Limits of Law

In 1845, the leading citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio invited two Presbyterian ministers, N. L. Rice and J. Blanchard, to debate the following question: "Is slave-holding in itself sinful, and the relationship between master and slave, a sinful relation?"[13] At stake was the unity of the Presbyterian communion: If slavery is intrinsically sinful, then Christians must adopt an anti-slavery stance and enslaved persons must be swiftly manumitted. If, however, the institution of slavery is not sinful, then slave-holding, "gradualist," and emancipationist Presbyterians could remain in Christian fellowship and the unity of the church preserved.[14] The biblical "law of love" played a starring role in this debate, with Reverend Blanchard insisting that "the spirit of slave-holding is the very opposite of equal love to our neighbor,"[15] and Reverend Rice arguing that good Christians obey the "golden rule" when they purchase slaves. God's law of love, he proclaimed, requires that benevolent, loving masters improve the material conditions of slaves by purchasing them.[16]

This debate illustrates a complexity at the heart of the commandment "love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18) already evident in the ancient literature that preserves it: the commandment does not specify the content of the "love" (אָהַבְתָּ / ἀγαπήσεις) and does not clearly designate who is or is not "your neighbor" (לְרֵעֲךָ / τὸν πλησίον σου).[17] Moreover, as second to the love of God, structures of domination are already logically, if not inevitably, sacralized. God, the sovereign ruler of the universe, demands respect, obedience, and regard in the form of "love." In return, humanity displays love within a divinely designed order of dominion, granting the Almighty the role of final arbiter of all human life.[18] The task of a

space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all." This form of violence is "neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales," resulting in "long dyings" of "staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties."

[13] JONATHAN BLANCHARD and NATHAN LEWIS RICE, *A debate on slavery: held on the first, second, third, and sixth days of October, 1845, upon the question: is slave holding in itself sinful, and the relation between master and slave, a sinful relation?* (Cincinnati, OH: W. H. MOORE, 1846).

[14] LAURA ROMINGER, "The Bible, Commonsense, and Interpretive Context: A Case Study in the Antebellum Debate over Slavery," *Fides et Historia* 38.2 (2006): 35–54. "Gradualists" argued that slavery was an evil that should be abolished gradually, often linking gradual emancipation with a plan to remove the African American population to Liberia; see LUKE E. HARLOW, *Religion, Race, and the Making of Confederate Kentucky, 1830–1880* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014). As Harlow describes, divisions between gradual and immediate emancipationists led to a split among white evangelical abolitionists, forging an uncomfortable alliance between the slave apologists and gradualists.

[15] BLANCHARD AND RICE, *A debate*, 162.

[16] BLANCHARD AND RICE, *A debate*, 196–97.

[17] ODA WISCHMEYER has argued that Leviticus does define the term "neighbor," in this case as Israelite "brothers" and resident foreigners (19:18, 34); see her *Liebe als Agape: Das frühchristliche Konzept und der moderne Diskurs* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 22–25, and ODA WISCHMEYER, "Leviticus 19,18. The Text and Some Stations in the History of its Reception," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 2 (2020): 553–69. Akiyama points out that רעד ("your neighbor") can indicate "a close friend (Job 2:11), a mere acquaintance (Job 20:10; Exod 21:4), an ally (1Sam 30:26), a friend of the king (1Kgs 4:5), a neighbor (Prov 25:17) and so forth" but in every case the term refers "to a fellow Israelite" (*Love of Neighbor*, 40). Scholars generally argue that Leviticus did not intend the "love" to be extended universally, but the extent of inclusion and exclusion is debated.

[18] My thinking here is informed by political philosopher GIORGIO AGAMBEN'S discussion of sovereignty and the "state of exception" and ACHILLE MBEMBE'S description of the "necropolitics." See GIORGIO AGAMBEN, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998)

subject of this God is therefore to love the sovereign first and the proximate other second, within a system that has already subjected both the lover and the neighbor within a prior relationship of domination and threat as well as (possible) care.

A tension between love as a form of domination and love as a call to equal personhood is played out in both ancient and modern interpretations of the saying, with "love" martialed not only to demand compassion in the face of divine impartiality but also hierarchy, hate, and even genocide. From the anti-Semitic declaration that "loving the Jew" requires that he be killed,[19] to the white supremacist re-signification of racialized hate as national "love,"[20] to Rice's suggestion that love requires free Christian white men to purchase (and therefore "rescue") Black persons, "love your neighbor as yourself" has clearly been as capable of denying full personhood to any number of target others as it has been at supporting the egalitarian ideal Blanchard and other abolitionists defended. Indeed, as J. Albert Harrill has shown, the love patriarchalism of the slave apologists easily fit within the biblical hermeneutics of "plain sense" presupposed by most North American Protestants at the time, forcing abolitionists to reconsider Calvinist approaches to Scripture in ways that continue to reverberate in American culture to this day.[21] And, while a few early Christians do seem to have interpreted "love your neighbor" to mean "enslavement is wrong" and/or "women and men are of equal dignity," most early Christian literature re-iterated rather than challenged a domestic and political status quo that defended the natural and divinely sanctioned superiority of free men.[22]

---

and GIORGIO AGAMBEN, *State of Exception* (trans. Kevin Attell; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005) and also ACHILLE MBEMBE, "Necropolitics," trans. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15.1 (2003): 11–40.

[19] As German Christian theologian Siegfried Leffler put it in 1939, "Even if I know 'thou shalt not kill' is a commandment of God or 'thou shalt love the Jew' because he too is a child of the eternal Father, I am able to know as well that I have to kill him, I have to shoot him, and can only do that if I am permitted to say: Christ"; translated and discussed by SUSANNAH HESCHEL, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 10. "Love your neighbor as yourself" also played an important anti-Semitic role; see LEUTZSCH, "Nächstenliebe als Antisemitismus. "

[20] SARA AHMED, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New York and London: Routledge, 2015), 121–22.

[21] J. ALBERT HARRILL, "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slave Controversy: A Case History in the Hermeneutical Tension between Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate," *Religion and American Culture* 10.2 (2000): 149–86. In North America, theological heirs to the pro-slavery arguments of ministers like Rice continue to apply hierarchical definitions of love to any number of targets, be they gay Christians exhorted to "pray the gay away," women encouraged to obey their husbands in the name of "biblical womanhood," or immigrant children imprisoned within Christian holding camps along the Mexican border.

[22] See JENNIFER A. GLANCY, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); J. ALBERT HARRILL, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 32; Tübingen: Mohr, 1995); J. ALBERT HARRILL, *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005); KYLE HARPER, *Slavery in the Late Roman world, AD 275–425* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011; but see JENNIFER A. GLANCY, "The Sexual Use of Slaves: A Response to Kyle Harper on Jewish and Christian Porneia," *JBL* 134.1 [2015]: 215–29). For the late ancient situation see, most recently, the essays collected by KATE COOPER and JAMIE WOOD in *Social Control in Late Antiquity: the Violence of Small Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020). On the complexity of the participation of enslaved persons in early Christian assemblies, see KATHERINE SHANER, *Enslaved Leadership in Early Christianity* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018). I do not dispute the fact that ancient and modern forms of slavery were divergent. My focus, rather, is on the rhetorical implications of various re-uses of Leviticus 19:18, especially as this verse was employed to defend hierarchical forms of human difference. For a helpful overview of various approaches to ancient slavery among European and North American scholars, see JULIA S. NIKOLAUS, "The Study of Slavery: Past Issues and Present Approaches," *JRS* 26 (2013): 651–62.

Moreover, when free men — citizens of the United States of America or free early Christian writers, for example — employ love to legislate about various others, target others rarely benefit concretely or directly from this "good work." Instead, they are asked to wait patiently within circumstances of subjection while the parameters of both love and law are determined.[23] Of course, subordinate others do not necessarily accept the validity of such an arrangement, then or now.[24] Many ancient enslaved persons, women, and other Others possessed a firm sense of their own dignity and self-worth.[25] In ancient literary sources, however, the "love of neighbor" saying was more often used to uphold, not undercut, hierarchical interpretations of the human. Initially employed to situate Jesus-followers within a broader Jewish conversation about the eternal value and validity of Mosaic law, "love your neighbor as yourself" soon became a dividing line upon which intra-Jewish and then intra-Christian difference was negotiated. When, in the late second century, Clement of Alexandria ascribed a commitment to love, commonality, and equality to the "Carpocratian heretics," he did so not to celebrate universal love but to condemn equality as a perversion of Christ's true message. Equality (ἰσότης), like love, was a topic to be debated, not enacted. [26] Neither the intra-Jewish, Jesus-following writings represented by the letters of Paul and the Gospels of Mark and Matthew nor the explicitly Christian interpretations articulated by Clement and his rival "Carpocratians" extended love to all persons in equal measure.[27]

---

[23] Their voices are therefore overlooked, ignored, and silenced; see RONALD CHARLES, *The Silencing of Slaves in Early Jewish and Christian Texts* (London: Routledge, 2019). Of course, this does not mean that contemporary scholars need to acquiesce to these silencings, as Charles shows. Also see ANTOINETTE CLARK WIRE, *The Corinthian Women Prophets* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); MITZI J. SMITH, *Womanist Sass and Talk Back: Social (In)Justice, Intersectionality, and Biblical Interpretation* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018); and the recent collection of essays in JOSEPH A. MARCHAL, ed., *After the Corinthian Women Prophets* (Semeia Studies 97; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021). On the illegitimacy of asking targets of discrimination, murder, and abuse to wait see, most famously, MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., "The Letter from the Birmingham Jail" in Washington, ed. *A Testament of Hope*, 313–30 and, MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 64–84.

[24] Black abolitionists like Frederick Douglass and Mary Ann Shadd Carry, for example, had no problem applying the "law of love" to their own situation. On Douglass, see HARRILL, "Use of the New Testament," 161. MARY ANN SHADD CARRY'S sermon on the double-love of God and neighbor (April 6, 1858) is found in *Canada, 1830–1865*, vol. II of *The Black Abolitionist Papers*, ed. C. PETER RIPLEY et al. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), Document 72, 388–89. On Shadd Cary, see JANE RHODES, *Mary Ann Shadd Cary: The Black Press and Protest in the Nineteenth Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998). Also see CHRISTINA SHARPE, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (DURHAM, NC: Duke University Press, 2016) and CHRISTINA SHARPE, "And to Survive," *Small Axe* 22.3 (No. 57; November 2018): 171–80.

[25] I take this as a given.

[26] Justice entails "commonality with equality" (κοινωνίαν τινὰ εἶναι μετ᾽ἰσότητος) Epiphanes, son of Carpocrates allegedly argued, a form of the widely discussed philosophical commonplace, "friends hold all things in common" (κοινὰ τὰ φίλων; *Strom.* 3.2.6. Greek text edited by OTTO STÄHLIN and LUDWIG FRÜCHTEL, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. 2, *Stromata Buch I-IV*; GCS 52 (15) [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960], 197–98) Compare Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica* 30.167: "Accordingly, the origin of justice is commonality and equity (τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἴσον) and for all to have the same experience, very nearly sharing one body and one soul (ἑνὸς σώματος καὶ μιᾶς ψυχῆς), and for all to proclaim 'mine' and 'the other's' about the same thing, just as Plato testified, having learned from the Pythagoreans." For discussion, see PETER GARNSEY, "Pythagoras, Plato and communality: a note," *Hermathanea* 179 (2005): 77–87 and KATHY EDEN, *Friends Hold All Things in Common* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 78–108.

[27] I resist interpretations that celebrate the uniquely loving and universal stances of Paul and the Gospel writers. For an alternative point of view, see, for example, WISCHMEYER, "Leviticus 19,18," 561; ODA WISCHMEYER, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der paulinischen Aussagen über die Liebe (ἀγάπη)," *Zeitschrift für die*

4. The Ten Words and the Two

Among the Greek-speaking followers of Jesus, the saying "love your neighbor as yourself" (ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν) summed up a much broader first-century Jewish conversation about the content and meaning of the "ten words" (the decalogue).[28] The first commandment, described in the Gospel of Mark as loving God with heart, soul, mind, and strength (Mark 12:30; cf. Deuteronomy 6:5), compressed the first five commandments of Moses into one saying under the rubric εὐσέβεια, piety toward God. The second commandment, "love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18) encapsulated the next five laws (no murder, adultery, theft, lying, or coveting) within the category δικαιοσύνη, justice toward others. The summarizing function of the second saying is made explicit in Paul's letter to the Romans:

> You shall not commit adultery, you shall not murder, you shall not steal, you shall not covet and any other commandment is summed up in this word (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοὐτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται), "Love your neighbor as yourself." Love does not do wrong to a neighbor; love is therefore a fulfillment of the law (13:9–10; cf. Galatians 5:14).

Summarizing the "ten words" in a similar way, the writer of Matthew cited the verse on three separate occasions, first in the context of the Sermon on the Mount (5:43), next in a conversation between Jesus and a rich young man (19:19),[29] and a third time in a debate between Jesus and the Pharisees (22:39). In the first context, Jesus intensifies the commandment, exhorting his hearers to "love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" (5:44). In the second, Jesus lists commandments that should be kept, including prohibitions against murder, adultery, theft, false witness, as well as the requirements to honor to parents and love one's neighbor (19:19–22). In the third citation, Jesus declares that the "whole law and the prophets are suspended" upon the love of God and love of neighbor (22:34–40). Adopting a similar point of view in his allegorical discussions of the decalogue, Philo of Alexandria states

---

Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche 74.3 (1983): 222–36 and VICTOR PAUL FURNISH, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972). On the ethical problems inherent in the Christian theological claim of uniqueness see, for example, BURTON MACK, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988) and the roundtable discussion of Mack's work twenty-five years later, DAVID A. SÁNCHEZ, ed., "Burton Mack and the Loss of Our Innocence," *JAAR* 83.3 (2015): 826–57, featuring essays by David A. Sánchez, Davina C. Lopez and Todd Penner, William Arnal, Maia Kotrosits, Eric C. Stewart, and Hal Taussig.

[28] ODA WISCHMEYER, "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe bei Paulus. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, " in ODA WISCHMEYER, *Von Ben Sira zu Paulus: Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Texten, Theologie und Hermeneutik des Frühjudentums und des Neuen Testaments* (ed. EVE-MARIE BECKER; WUNT 173; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 137–61; PAULA FREDRIKSEN, "Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, and Pagan 'Justification by Faith,'" *JBL* 133.4 (2014): 801–8 and PAULA FREDRIKSEN, *Paul, the Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 182. Fredriksen's discussion was provoked by E. P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). Also see: DAVID FLUSSER, "The Ten Commandments and the New Testament," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition* (ed. BEN-ZION SEGAL; Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990), 219–46, as cited by Fredriksen. Also see the many parallels among Hellenistic Jewish and Christian texts collected by KLAUS BERGER, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu; ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament.* Teil I: *Markus und Parallelen* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 40; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972).

[29] Matthew adapted this story from Mark, adding the explicit citation of "love your neighbor as yourself." See Mark 10:17–31.

that the "two principal headings" (δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια) under which the many great words (λόγοι) and teachings (δογμάτα) can be summarized are piety (εὐσέβεια) and holiness (ὁσιότη) toward God and kindness (φιλανθρωπία) and justice (δικαιοσύνη) toward people (*Spec. leg.* 2.15§63).[30] For these first-century, Greek-speaking, Jewish-identifying writers, the duo love of God and love of neighbor illustrated the general excellence of divine law as promulgated by Moses.

Still, the words were variously applied, including by the followers of Jesus. Paul cited "love your neighbor" twice, in both cases under the rubric "the desires of the flesh": "Do not bring a desire of flesh to completion," he declared in Galatians (5:16) and "Do not plan ahead for the sake of desires of the flesh," he warned in Romans (13:14). In Galatians, Paul advised his Gentile audience to "become enslaved to one another through love" (5:13) while avoiding the "slavery" of circumcision. "For the whole law is satisfied by one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (5:14). Gentile Christ-followers are brought into the law by Christ, transformed by spirit (πνεύμα), and obligated to take on the constraints of the "one word": "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor a foreskin strengthens anything but faith is efficacious through love" (5:6).[31] In Romans, Paul also linked love to subjugation. "Let every person (ψυχή) be subject to ruling authorities," he asserted, since authority is determined by God (13:1). Resistance therefore brings judgement, evil-doing provokes wrath, tributes and taxes should be paid, and both fear and honor should be given (13:2–7). Paul then applied these principles to property arrangements: "Owe nothing to anyone except love to one another, for love of the other satisfies the law" as is shown by "love your neighbor as yourself" (13:8–9).[32] These instructions are highly complex and have been interpreted in multiple ways.[33] Nevertheless, Paul's definition of love is predicated upon the rule of a sovereign God

[30] Also see "Concerning the Decalogue," where Philo explains that the first set of the written words begins with the necessity of honoring God and ends with parents (since parents imitate God when begetting particular persons) while the second set specifies prohibitions (*Decal.* 12§51; LCL 302:33). Philo, FREDDY LEDEGANG argues, is here moving quite far away from earlier settings of the Sinai covenant when he claims that the "ten words" is an "absolute, ideal, ethical standard, which applies to the whole creation and to which all special laws can be reduced" ("The Interpretation of the Decalogue by Philo, Clement of Alexandria and Origen," in *Origeniana nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of His Time* [ed. G. HEIDL and R. SOMOS in collaboration with C. NÉMETH; Leuven: Peeters, 2009], 245–254, 246). As resonances between Philo's writings, Paul, the Synoptic Gospels, and later Jewish literature suggest, such summarizing was a common rhetorical strategy among Greek-speaking Jews, even as the significance of the summary varied.

[31] The question of whether and how Paul sought to associate Gentile Jesus-followers with Jewish law is a matter of vigorous debate. I do not seek to contribute to that debate. Instead, I am merely observing that Paul sought to articulate a position whereby Gentiles could worship of the God of Israel and did so, in part, by defining their relationship to the Mosaic covenant. For the view that Paul sought to avoid separate the Christ-followers from the material observance of this law, see, for example, DANIEL BOYARIN, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994) and PHILIP ESLER, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003). Alternatively, see JOHN G. GAGER, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); CAROLINE JOHNSON HODGE, *If Sons, then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); and PAUL FREDRIKSEN, *The Pagans' Apostle*.

[32] Cf. ROBERT JEWETT, *Romans: A Commentary* [ed. ELDON JAY EPP, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 805: "The expression employs a conventional expression for monetary or social indebtedness" and appears in contracts and inscriptions as well as in literary contexts.

[33] I am assuming the Romans 13:1–7 is not an interpolation; for discussion see JEWETT, *Romans*, 782–84. Jewett's remarks regarding the history of interpretation of this passage are also helpful: "The endless stream of studies [of

who organizes the cosmos hierarchically in ways that ought not be openly challenged.[34] Knowledge of the ten words and the two placed Jesus followers, Jewish or Gentile, firmly within the category "children of Abraham," obligating them to obey εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη as revealed to Moses, but it offered few challenges to the quotidian social arrangements familiar to Paul's imagined audience. Instead, love was linked to subjection, even metaphoric slavery, and δικαιοσύνη was flattened into warnings about the desires of the flesh.

The writers of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew also assumed the eternal validity of the ten words and the two, which they applied to intra-Jewish legal debates between Jesus and various Jewish interlocutors. In Mark, love of neighbor is cited by Jesus in response to a question from a scribe. What is the first commandment, the scribe wants to know. Jesus responds by naming the two words and then the scribe takes the teaching one step further. Loving God and neighbor, he asserts, "exceeds all the burnt-offerings and sacrifices" (12:33). Jesus approves, stating, "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (12:34).[35] Such an interpretation, particularly when read within a larger Markan narrative context, elevates adherence to the two words over participation in the work of the Jerusalem Temple. Set after the Temple incident, framed by Jesus's cursing of the fig tree and the parable of the vineyard, and third in a string of legal debates, Jesus's summary of the ten words and the two silences rival legal experts: "After that no one dared to ask him any question" (12:4).[36] From this perspective, Jesus's superior understanding of Mosaic law supersedes earlier interpretations, overturns the necessity of the Temple, and forces other Jewish men to retreat, even while Jesus welcomes this scribe, and his correct interpretation, into his inner circle.

The writer of Matthew received and repeated this Markan story but drastically rewrote it:[37] the question about the greatest law is posed one of the Pharisees, a "lawyer" or "notary" (νομικός), rather than a scribe; the first "word" excludes the *shema* ("Hear, Israel, the lord your God is one," Mark 12:28; cf. Deut 6:4); and the saying proper begins with a differently worded version of the first commandment ("You shall love the Lord your God with all your

this pericope] has been marked by advocacy of various appraisals of the role of government shaped by denominational traditions and my modern ethical considerations" (785, with bibliography). For further discussion of the stakes of this argument see CAVAN CONCANON, *Profaning Paul* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021) and JOSEPH A. MARCHAL, *The Politics of Heaven: Women, Gender, and Empire in the Study of Paul* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008). For a close study of this passage and its reception, see VILHO RIEKKINEN, *Römer 13. Aufzeichnung und Weiterführung der exegetischen Diskussion* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 23; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1980).

[34] As Stefan Krauter argues, Paul's rhetoric demands submission to human rulers but seeks to provide some distance from it for the Jesus followers by means of a life lived according to a standard of love; see STEFAN KRAUTER, *Studien zu Röm 13,1–7* (WUNT 243; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 272–87. On "nature" in the gendered hierarchies assumed by Paul and his contemporaries, see BERNADETTE J. BROOTEN, *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 250–80.

[35] For discussion see, ADELA YARBRO COLLINS, *Mark: A Commentary* (ed. HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE; HERMENEIA: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 565–77: "[T]he most distinctive aspect of the double-command in Mark is the combined citation of Deut 6:4–5 and Lev 19:18. In terms of substance, the reason for bringing these two passages together was to express, in a typically Jewish(-Christian) way, the two main virtues of piety (εὐσέβεια) and justice (δικαιοσύνη) or kindness (φιλανθρωπία)" (569).

[36] In her commentary, COLLINS considers 11:1–13:37 as one unit, the "Proclamation in Jerusalem" (*Mark: A Commentary*, 512–619).

[37] On Matthean rewriting of Mark, see GARRICK V. ALLEN, "Rewriting and the Gospels," *JSNT* 41.1 (2018): 58–69.

heart [ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σοῦ], and with all your soul [ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σοῦ], and with all your mind [ἐν τῇ ὅλῃ διανοίᾳ σοῦ]," Matt 22:37; cf. Deut 6:5).[38] As in Mark, "love your neighbor as yourself" is named as secondary but equally binding to love of God; unlike in Mark, however, the clarification regarding sacrifices is omitted. Instead, Jesus silences the Pharisees with an enigmatic interpretation of Psalm 110 (LXX 109), a debate that is also present in Mark but set after Jesus's rivals had already been silenced (Matt 22:41–46; cf. Mark 12:35–37). Thus, in Matthew it is Jesus's interpretation of the Davidic Messiah, not his exegesis of the two words, that prevents his fellow Jewish rivals from questioning him further (22:46).[39]

In both Gospels, obedience to the dual love of God and neighbor, to εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη, is assumed to be the heart of divine law. Yet these writers disagreed about the larger implications of their shared premise: Are sacrifices therefore unnecessary (Mark)? Or is the dispute between Jesus and his opponents centered more squarely on messianic interpretations of the Psalms (Matthew)? And who is Jesus's fiercest legal opponent, scribes as in Mark ("Beware of the scribes," Mark's Jesus warns, 12:38) or the scribes and Pharisees as in Matthew ("The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses's seat; therefore, do whatever they teach you and follow it; but do not do as they do," 23:2)? In each Gospel, "love your neighbor" is employed to teach divergent lessons about the nature of Jesus-following Jewish difference.[40] Subsequent warnings about the unleashing of divine wrath promise that those who fail to meet Jesus's definition of love will ultimately be destroyed (cf. Rom 13:5). Still, it seems that even Jesus's followers had not reached an interpretive consensus about the implications of the saying.

Two other citations in Matthew encourage Jesus's followers to pursue additional "perfection" (τέλειος). Love of neighbor, Matthew's Jesus argues, is a minimum requirement akin to

[38] These differences and shared elements with Luke have led some scholars to argue that both Gospel writers were working from a source other than Mark. See, for example, CHRISTOPH BURCHARD, "Das doppelte Liebesgebot in der frühen christlichen Überlieferung," in CHRISTOPH BURCHARD, *Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments* (ed. DIETER SÄNGER; WUNT 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 3–26. Identifying possible reasons for these changes, as well as the various forms in which these sayings appear, are outside the scope of this paper. For further discussion, see JAN LAMBRECHT, "The Great Commandment Pericope: Mark 12,28–34 and Q 10,25–28," in *Understanding What One Reads: New Testament Essays* (ed. VERONICA KOPERSKI; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 80–101.

[39] On the "Davidssohnfrage" and interpretations of Psalm 110:1, see MAX BOTNER, *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark* (SNTS Monograph Series 174; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), with bibliography.

[40] Earlier scholarship attempted to chart the "Jewishness" of the Gospels, in part, on the basis of the attitude of each evangelist to the Jewish law. Such a discussion, however, begins with the assumption that Jesus-followers and Jews must somehow be different. A much more fruitful approach is to interpret these writers as participants in a shared literate culture populated by men interested in the significance of Jewish texts. The identity and sociological context of a given writer cannot be extracted from the literature that writer produces, especially when that writer remains anonymous. On the problem of Matthew's Jewishness in particular, see WARREN CARTER, "Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?" in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (ed. M. JACKSON-MCCABE; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 155–79. For a recent discussion of "the Matthean community" as a "Jewish sectarian group," see EUGENE EUNG-CHUN PARK, "Covenantal Nomism and the Gospel of Matthew," *CBQ* 77.4 (2015): 668–85. For a discussion of scholarly efforts to sort among Christians, Jews, and Jewish-Christians, see ANNETTE YOSHIKO REED, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

divine equanimity toward sinful humanity.[41] In the Sermon on the Mount, "love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" augments "love your neighbor as yourself" and ensures that "you will become sons of your father in heaven" (υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς; 5:43–44): [42]

> For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even toll-collectors do the same? And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing that exceeds others? Do not Gentiles do the same? (5:46–48; cf. Didache 1.3–5)[43]

Prefaced by a reminder that God "makes his sun rise on the wicked and on the good, and sends rain on the just and unjust" (5:45), these instructions place unrepentant Gentiles (the wicked) and toll-collectors (the unjust) within a shared category of persons who are to be loved for now but destined later for wrath.[44] Jesus's followers are to bestow love, like the sun and rain, on those they legitimately condemn, thereby earning the status of "sons" who will become "perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (5:38–42; 48).[45] Judgement is postponed to a later date but it will eventually arrive.[46]

The next citation extends the love requirement further, in this case to demand that free followers of Jesus distribute their property to the poor (πτοχοί, 19:18–19; cf. Mark 10:17–31). After summarizing the ten words with the two, Jesus instructs a young man, "If you wish to be perfect (τέλειος), go, sell your possessions, and give money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then, come, follow me" (19:21). The man fails to honor these demands, leading Jesus to remark, "it will be hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven" (19:23). Among some New Testament scholars, this episode is interpreted as further

[41] Matthew's intensification and interiorization of Mosaic law has been labeled "radical" and distinctive in relationship to Judaism; see, for example, ÉLIAN CUVILLIER, "Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate," *New Testament Studies* 55 (2009): 144–59. But see MATTHIAS KONRADT, "The Love Command in Matthew, James, and the Didache," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Settings* (ed. HUUB VAN DE SANDT and JÜRGEN K. ZANGENBERG; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2008), 271–88. Matthew, Konradt argues, is engaged in a debate with the Pharisees over the interpretation of Torah not a reconsideration of national or ethnic boundaries. Still, "the Matthean Jesus radicalizes the love command by claiming that loving care for the well-being of others is entirely independent of how the other acts toward oneself" (273).

[42] MATTHEW GOLDSTONE argues that this expansion derives from a larger Jewish discussion of Leviticus 19:18; see his, "Rebuke, Lending, and Love: An Early Exegetical Tradition on Leviticus 19:17–18," *JBL* 136.2 (2017): 307–21.

[43] Untangling the precise relationship between Q, Matthew, and the Didache is beyond the scope of this essay. For discussion, see CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT, "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache," in *The Didache in Modern Research* (ed. JONATHAN DRAPER; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 92–128; AARON MILAVEC, "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited," *JECS* 11 (2003): 443–80; and CHRISTOPHER M. TUCKETT, "The Didache and the Synoptics Once More: A Response to AARON MILAVEC," *JECS* 13 (2005): 509–18.

[44] Perhaps the Gospel writer means to contrast unrepentant Gentiles, who are by definition wicked, with Jewish toll-collectors who, in his view, behave unjustly by contracting to collect tributes on behalf of the Roman government. See FABIAN UDOH, *To Caesar What Is Caesar's: Tribute, Taxes, and Imperial Administration in Early Roman Palestine* (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2020), 239–43.

[45] Love of Jesus's God demands that one become something other than a Gentile or tax-collector, even if Jesus is also depicted interacting with such persons (Matt 9:10; 10:3; 21:31); cf. EYAL REGEV, "Moral Impurity and the Temple in Early Christianity in Light of Ancient Greek Practice and Qumranic Ideology," *HTR* 97.4 (2004): 383–411.

[46] Compare Matt 18:17, where the evangelist instructs members of the Jesus-following assemblies to exclude those who refuse to submit to group discipline: "Let such a one be to you as a Gentile and a toll-collector."

evidence of a Matthean preference for the poor.[47] Perhaps it is that. Yet it also establishes a distinction between the followers of Jesus, who are willing to abandon property and family, and those who are not.[48] What about those who do not control property, namely most women and enslaved persons? Are they included in "perfection"? Can they become "sons"? The Gospel does not address these questions. All three Matthean references to the laws of love — one adapted from Mark, another incorporated within a longer "sermon on the mount,"[49] and a third employed to reflect upon the significance of wealth — establish love's temporal and material limits. Out-group Pharisees, Gentiles, toll-collectors, enemies, and rich persons are to be "loved," in the sense that they too must not be openly violated, even if they are the current beneficiaries of ill-gotten gains. Greeting and praying for enemies is, Matthew's Jesus asserts, the more perfect theological (and practical) strategy. Love is therefore both a disposition toward proximate others and a property arrangement, as the ten words had already established.[50] The followers of Jesus, however, instruct readers to go further by sharing and distributing property to the poor.[51]

5. Christian Love and the Philosophical Life

The ten words and the two were clearly a fertile ground upon which the parameters of Jesus-following faith (πίστις) could be variously defined and defended. Christians also employed the saying, citing the passage to ascribe meanings adapted from earlier writers while investing it with their own perspectives. The initial intra-Jewish setting of the discussion, however, gradually faded, as commonplaces about the ten words and the two were replaced by debates about the nature of love within a Christian common life (κοινωνία). The writer of Luke-Acts, for example, resituated the Markan controversy story outside of Jerusalem, transformed the scribe into a generic "lawyer" or "notary" (νομικός), employing the same term as Matthew but without describing him as a Pharisee, and described the conflation of Deuteronomy 6:4–5 and Leviticus 19:18 as an instance of continuous written scripture (10:25–29).[52] The *Epistle*

[47] WARREN CARTER, *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 71, 80; RICHARD HORSLEY, *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 152, 156–64.

[48] JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG, "Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Settings* (ed. HUUB VAN DE SANDT and JÜRGEN K. ZANGENBERG; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2008), 201–32. Kloppenborg is highly suspicious of the claim that MATTHEW has material poverty in mind: "Matthew's concern is not primarily with the poor or dispossessed outside the Jesus movement, but with negotiating relationships *within* the Jesus groups" (225).

[49] The structure of the Sermon on the Mount, DALE ALLISON points out, suggests that to be perfect in showing love, as the Father is perfect, is the climactic conclusion and epitome of Jesus' moral instruction; see his *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 195.

[50] Prohibitions against murder, adultery, theft, false witness, and covetousness presuppose a collectivity of men who protect one another by refraining from assault and honoring private property, including wives. Cf. RAINER KESSLER, "Debt and the Decalogue: The Tenth Commandment," *Vetus Testamentum* 65 (2015): 53–61.

[51] The Damascus Document also interprets the love of neighbor to mean that the poor must not be oppressed but instead should be materially supported (AKIYAMA, *Love of Neighbor*, 102–11).

[52] Jesus asks the lawyer, "What is written in the law? How does it read?" (Luke 10:26). The lawyer responds with a continuous citation conflating both passages (10:27). This controversy provides the setting for the Lukan parable of the neighborly Samaritan (10:30–37). The writer of Luke-Acts also describes the Christian life in common, though without attributing this communion of property and spirit to "love" (Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–35); JOSHUA NOBLE, *Common Property, the Golden Age, and Empire in Acts 2:42–47 and 4:32–35* (Library of New Testament

of Barnabas treated love of neighbor as one among many divine commands, placing it within a much longer list prohibiting favoritism, grudges, infanticide, greed, and other misdeeds, apart from any direct reference to the ten words or the two (19.4–6). By contrast, labeling the saying a "royal law according to the scriptures" (νόμον βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφήν), the writer of the Epistle of James retained the sense that love of neighbor summarizes "the whole law" (2:10–11), describing it as a "law of freedom" (2:12; cf. Galatians 5:13) and employing it to warn against showing partiality to the rich (2:8; cf. Matt 19:21).[53] In the second century, Clement of Alexandria, the first Christian to develop a systematic and explicitly Christian pedagogical program, employed the passage to delineate the contours of Christian κοινωνία. Resituating the Greek philosophical maxim "friends should possess all things in common" (κοινὰ τὰ φίλων),[54] he applied "love your neighbor as yourself" to the topics equality (ἰσότης), pederasty (παιδεραστής, reinterpreted as παιδοφθόρος[55]), and the philosophical life.

Familiar with the works of Philo, which he closely engages (albeit without attribution),[56] as well as with the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the *Epistle to Barnabas*, and numerous other learned Greek writings, Clement cited "love your neighbor as yourself" on several occasions.[57] Likely informed by the *Epistle of Barnabas*, he treated both "you shall not commit adultery" (οὐ μοιχεύσεις) and "you shall not corrupt boys" (οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις) as if they were included within "the ten words" given through Moses (*Paed.* 2.10.89; *Strom.* 3.4.36.5).[58] Attributing the summary statement "love your neighbor as yourself" to the Logos as well as Moses, he noted that they are "reasonable laws and holy words" inscribed on human hearts (*Protrep.* 10.108.5).[59] Reinterpreting Matthew's argument that giving to the poor is a perfect

Studies 636; London: T & T Clark, 2020). The shared use of νομισκός by Matthew and Luke pushes against the theory that Luke employed a source other than Matthew when composing his Gospel. See MARK GOODACRE, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Biblical Studies; (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 98–104.

[53] Hearers are enjoined to behave as if they will be judged "as through the law of freedom" (ὡς διὰ νόμου ἐλευθεριάς).

[54] PLATO, *Rep.* 424a; 449c; cf. 457d; *Laws* 739c; ARISTOTLE, *Eth. Nic.* 1159b31, 1168.8, *Pol.* 1263a31, *Politics* 1265a1–8.

[55] The term παιδοφθόρος appears to have been designed to express Christian opposition to the more common term παιδεραστής, already a term of reproach; see CRAIG A. GIBSON, "Was Nicolaus the Sophist a Christian?" *VC* 64.5 (2010): 496–500.

[56] The foundational study is by ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK, *Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the* Stromateis: *An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model* (Leiden: Brill, 1988); also see DAVID T. RUNIA, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.3; Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 132–56.

[57] Clement was, ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK observes, a "bookworm"; see her essay, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods," *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996): 223–43, 227. As she also points out, Clement shares the tradition of arguing that Plato was dependent upon Moses for many of his insights; see her Introduction to *Stromateis* Book IV in *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates. Stromate IV* (ed. with introduction and notes by ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK, French trans. by Claude Mondésert; SC 463; Paris: Du Cerf, 2001), 9–10.

[58] Greek text of the *Paedagogus*: OTTO STÄHLIN and URSULA TREU, ed., *Protrepticus und Paedagogos*, vol. 1 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, GCS 12, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), here pp. 211 and GCS 52 (15): 212. Cf. *Ep. Barn.* 19.4; *Did.* 2.2.1; JUSTIN, *Dial.* 95.1.9; TATIAN, *Oratio* 8.1.11.

[59] Greek text of the *Protrepticus*: OTTO STÄHLIN and URSULA TREU, ed., *Protrepticus und Paedagogos*, vol. 1 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, GCS 12, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), 77. Cf. *Paed.* 3.12.18, where Clement explicitly cites Matt 22:40. "Plato, excellent in every way" followed Moses in his teachings (*Paed.* 3.11.54). He

application of love of neighbor, he argued that the Christian "race" (τὸ γένος) is brought to sharing all things in common (κοινωνία) by God himself, who shared the Logos with all of humanity (*Paed.* 2.12.120). A Christian who decides to share is therefore "perfect and fulfills the command: love your neighbor as yourself" (*Paed.* 2.12.120).[60]

Sharing, however, was to be limited to almsgiving to poor Christians and the promotion of Christian intellectual and spiritual "life in common." As he explains in a treatise on the Markan version of the story of Jesus and the rich young man (Mark 10:17–32), rich Christians are not meant to abandon their possessions, but, by sharing with their poorer brothers and sisters, to gain a heavenly kingdom:

> What splendid trading! What divine business! You buy incorruption with money. You give the perishing things of the world and receive in exchange for them an eternal abode in heaven (*Quis dives salvetur* 32).[61]

Citing "love your neighbor as yourself" as interpreted in the Lukan parable of the Samaritan, he asks "Who is a neighbor?" and responds: Christ. Jesus "did not point, in the same way as the Jews did, to their blood-relation (αἵματος), fellow-citizen (πολίτην), or proselyte (προσήλυτον)," when defining the term "neighbor," but revealed that he himself is the one who "has pitied us" (ἡμᾶς ἐλήσας) and healed us of the wounds of "fears, desires, wraths, sorrows, deceits and pleasures" (φόβοις, ἐπιθυμίαις, ὀργαῖς, λύπαις, ἀπάταις, ἡδοναῖς; *Quis dives salvetur* 28–29).[62] This allegorical interpretation of the direct assistance the Samaritan offers the wounded man simultaneously blames Jews for misdirecting their love and defines the divine Jesus as the true neighbor.[63] Like Christ, Christians with riches are to give out of their abundance but without giving their abundance up.

In *Christ the Educator*, Clement situated his discussion of love and commonality within a broader set of instructions on the importance of self-control (ἐγκράτεια), particularly during the Christian ἀγάπη ("love feast"), a term he both inherited and sought to restrict.[64] Echoing Paul's interpretation of "love of neighbor" as a check on fleshly desire, he insisted that the Lord's supper must be conducted with full moderation. Nuancing the tradition of the ten words and the two, he asserted that whole law and the Logos (ὁ νόμος καὶ ὁ λόγος) are summed up by the love of God and neighbor, ascribing this summary statement to Jesus (*Paed.* 3.12.18–19).[65] When properly observed, love during the Agape produces a heavenly

occasionally introduces statements by Plato with the phrase ὁ ἐκ Μωυσέως φιλόσοφος (VAN DEN HOEK, "Techniques of Quotation," 230).

[60] πάρεστί μοι, διὰ τί μὴ μεταδῶ τοῖς δεομένοις; ὁ γὰρ τοιοῦτος τέλειος ὁ τὸ ΄ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν᾽ πληρώσας (GCS 12: 229).

[61] Greek text with English translation by G. W. BUTTERWORTH, *Clement of Alexandria. The Exhortation to the Greeks. The Rich Man's Salvation. To the Newly Baptized* (LCL 92; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919), 336–39.

[62] LCL 92:328–31.

[63] REIMER ROUKEMA, "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity," *VC* 58.1 (2004): 60–62.

[64] See ANDREW MCGOWAN, "The Myth of the 'Lord's Supper': Paul's Eucharistic Meal Terminology and Its Ancient Reception," *CBQ* 77 (2015): 503–21, 510–12. Self-control is, as J. Warren Smith pointed out to me, the moral condition for love of neighbor in Clement. If one lives moderately, one can afford to share from one's resources, which in turn subjects the rich man to the training of the poor man.

[65] As ROBERT G. T. EDWARDS shows, the decalogue was also an important source for Clement's exposition of true Christian knowledge (*gnosis*) in *Stromata* Book 6; see his "Clement of Alexandria's Gnostic Exposition of the Decalogue," *JECS* 23.4 (2015): 501–28.

feast (εὐχία) and an earthly meal (δεῖπνον) capable of illustrating what true "sharing and generosity" (κοινωνικῆς καὶ εὐμεταδότου) are like (*Paed.* 2.1.6.1). Foolish men, however, risk becoming "enslaved" (δεδουλωκέναι) at the sight of exotic foods (2.1.11) and women become "slavish" (ἀνδραποδώδης) when they greedily drink and eat instead of remembering the Lord (*Paed.* 2.2.33). By contrast, self-controlled Christians avoid vulgar behavior, thereby signaling their distinction from animals and slaves: "if we want to urge to excellence (ἐπ᾽ ἀρετὴν) among those who feast with us," he pointed out, "we should refrain from luxurious foods all the more" (2.1.10).[66]

In the *Miscellanies*, Clement applied love of neighbor not only to encourage self-control but also to counter the view that commonality (κοινωνία) implies relinquishing private property, an egalitarian argument he attributes to the "Carpocratians."[67] Blaming their heresy on a misunderstanding of Plato (in fact, the Carpocratians appear to have understood Plato quite well), Clement condemns them for misinterpreting equality and turning their "love feast" into an orgy (*Strom.* 3.2.10.2).[68] According to Carpocrates's son Epiphanius, Clement reports, divine justice (δικαιοσύνη) involves a "sharing together with equality (κοινωνίαν τινὰ εἶναι μετ᾽ἰσότητος)"[69] made evident throughout the cosmos (*Strom.* 3.2.6).[70] Thus, God makes no distinctions between "rich or poor (πλούσιον ἢ πένητα), people or ruler (δῆμον ἢ ἄρχοντα), foolish and wise (ἄφρονάς τε καὶ τοὺς φρονοῦντας), feminine and masculine (θηλείας ἄρσενας) and free and enslaved (ἐλευθέρους δούλους)" (*Strom.* 3.2.6.2–3; cf. Galatians 3:28). Using the eye as an example — eyesight is given to all in equal share, whether male or female, rational or irrational — Epiphanes further argues that it was law, not God, that created division and distinction in the world: "'mine' and 'yours' were introduced through laws," he claims, and the fruits of the earth were no longer held in common (*Strom.* 3.2.7.3–4). Divine justice, however, joins commonality with equality:

[66] This argument encodes a political as well as a theological cosmology within a theory of "good table manners," as BLAKE LEYERLE has argued ("Clement of Alexandria on the Importance of Table Etiquette," *JECS* 3.2 [1995]: 123–41). Cf. KEITH BRADLEY, "Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction," *JRS* 90 (2000): 110–25.

[67] These recommendations participated in a vigorous contemporary discussion in which some (like Clement) defended private property and the household while others (like "the Carpocratians," as Clement describes them) went "too far" in overturning private ownership, daring to share wives as well as goods in common. See, for example, PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA in *Special Laws*: "The mother of justice is equality" (ἰσότης) and is a "light" (φῶς) or a "sun" (ἥλιος) that "orders all things well on heaven and earth by laws and divine statutes" (4.42§§230–31; LCL 341:150–51). Democracy therefore models this well-ordered cosmos best, Philo continued, promoting "health in bodies and excellent conduct in souls" (ἔν τε αὖ σώμασιν ὑγεία καὶ ἐν ψυχαῖς καλοκἀγαθία; *Spec. leg.* 4.42§§237; LCL 341:154–55). Since all human beings are equal, he added, servants (θεράποντες) differ from masters in fortune (τύχη) but not in nature (φύσως; 3.25§137; LCL 320:562–63). The Greek moralist PLUTARCH interpreted "life in common" differently; in his *Life of Agis and Cleonenes*, he depicts the decision by the Spartan kings to attempt to establish equality and commonality (ἰσότητα καὶ κοινωνίαν) among the entire populace as a colossal failure (7§798; LCL 102:14–15). "In truth," PLUTARCH claims, men who "act in conformity with the desires and impulses of the populace" are mere "servants" (ὑπέρεται) and rulers in name only (ὄνομα δ᾽ἀρχόντων ἔχουσιν; Preface.1§795; LCL 102:2–3).

[68] GCS 52 (15): 200.

[69] ILLARIA RAMELLI calls attention to the importance of κοινός and related terms in the writings attributed to Epiphanius by Clement (*Social Justice and the Legitimacy of Slavery: The Role of Philosophical Asceticism from Ancient Judaism to Late Antiquity* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016], 129).

[70] GCS 52 (15): 198. Heaven is stretched across the whole earth, the night displays the stars before all, and the sun's light is poured out by God, enabling all who can see to see.

> Thus God, having made everything in common for humanity, gathering the female to the male and in the same way joining all the animals, showed that justice is commonality with equality (τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἀνέφηνεν κοινωνίαν μετ'ἰσότητος; *Strom.* 3.2.8.1–2).[71]

Men and women as well as slaves and masters should therefore enjoy an equal share in the divine benefits.

Clement strongly objects to this argument. A failure to acknowledge the importance of distinction not only misinterprets Plato, he claims, but also misconstrues Christian κοινωνία by transforming it into an excuse for sexual immorality: "Overturning lamps, the light is put out" and the Carpocratians engage in a form of "prostituted righteousness" (τὴν πορνικὴν ταύτην δικαιοσύνην) that involves doing whatever they desire; "such is the commonality of their love-feast" (δὲ ἐν τοιαύτῃ ἀγάπῃ τὴν κοινωνίαν), he sarcastically remarks (*Strom.* 3.2.10.1). "It seems to me," he adds, that their condemnable activity is rooted in a misunderstanding of "what Plato says in the *Republic*, 'wives are common possessions of all,'" but Plato, he clarifies, simply meant that women are "held in common" prior to marriage because they are available to all as a potential wife but, after marriage, become the possession of only one man (*Strom.* 3.2.11.2).[72] Epiphanius is therefore incorrect not only in his understanding of Plato but also in his view that the law should be rejected.

Perhaps Epiphanius had a point (assuming Clement is representing his views accurately). Laws, divine or human, do introduce distinctions into the world. Moreover, envisioning God as a lawgiver who loves humanity into subjection makes love a guarantor not of equality but of domination. (Domination by means of self-control was precisely what Clement and so many of his contemporaries were after.[73]) Still, the debate Clement stages between himself and the "Carpocratian heretics" places both groups firmly within an elite philosophical discussion about the nature of the "life in common," whether Mosaic law was celebrated as a source of divinely given order or blamed as an origin of distinction and inequality. Both Clement and Epiphanius present anti-Jewish arguments, both claim Plato to defend their own understandings of Christian κοινωνία, and both respond to topics that presuppose an audience of educated free men.[74] Carpocrates and Epiphanius may have recommended that slaves be manumitted and women be treated as equal members of their Christian assemblies, and not

[71] GCS 52 (15): 199.

[72] Plato, however, did make such an argument (*Rep.* 499d), though not in precisely these terms. He also qualified his views in the *Laws* by suggesting that a city in which the educated few share wives, children, and property in common seems impossible (739c). Perhaps Clement draws his strong censure and his alternative interpretation of what Plato must have meant from Epictetus 2.4.8-10: "What then, you say; are not women by nature common property (αἱ γυναῖκες κοιναὶ)? I agree. And the little pig is the common property of the invited guests…Come now, is not the theatre the common property of the citizens? When, therefore, they are seated there, go, if it so pleases you, and throw someone of them out of his seat. In the same way women also are by nature common property" (Greek text with English translation by W. A. OLDFATHER, *Discourses, Books I and II*, vol. 1 of *Epictetus. The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments* [LCL 131; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925], 234–37).

[73] PETER BROWN, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

[74] The questions they pursue — Should wives be held in common? Should educators pursue erotic relationships with their younger male counterparts? Does love demand equality for all? — depend upon a homosocial world where women, children, and enslaved persons are objects to be managed by responsible men.

only for the sake of overturning lamps.[75] Clement also taught that free women should be fully educated though without challenging the view that women are by definition imperfect in comparison to men.[76] "Love your neighbor" played a role in supporting each of these arguments. The impact of this rhetoric on the practical lives of second-century Christians, however, remains opaque and, in any case, the leaders of this debate are free, educated men with resources to share.

6. Love's Labors

Among the first literate followers of Jesus, Leviticus 19:18 contributed to the articulation of a law obedient way of exhibiting fidelity to the God of Israel and his Messiah Jesus.[77] From the second century, the phrase participated in delimiting different ways of becoming both Christian and a participant in the "philosophical life." As a summary of the ten words and the two and as a slogan among those interested in Christian κοινωνία, "love your neighbor" was productively pulled into disputes about the nature of private property, ownership, and sharing. In none of these examples, however, was love defined as "understanding, creative, redemptive good will toward all [people]."[78] Instead "love your neighbor as yourself" was repeatedly employed to produce distinctions between various in- and out-groups, even when "perfection" was the goal. The claim that Christ and the Christians uniquely discovered and then promoted universal love is therefore difficult to substantiate. Does a proper response to God's love demand a redistribution of property? Surely Jesus's initial literate followers would have rejected Clement of Alexandria's anti-Jewishness, but would they have condemned his defense of love as a form of inequality and subjection? Does a postponement of justice until some future date ever bring about justice? When and for whom? Is leaving the slaughter of the unrighteous to God a form of "love"? Whatever God does or does not do, will the Christian heirs of "love your neighbor" ever manage to regard their proximate others as Others to be

[75] The actual practices of "the Carpocratians" are buried under polemic and therefore unrecoverable. See JENNIFER WRIGHT KNUST, *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 145–57; AVERIL CAMERON, "How to Read Heresiology," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.3 (2003): 471–92; ALAIN LE BOULLUEC, *Clément d'Alexandrie et Origène*, vol. 2 of *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature greque IIe-IIIe siècles* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985), 299–305. MICHAEL ALLEN WILLIAMS, who remains skeptical of the possibility that "the Carpocratians" were engaged in the acts of which they are accused, accepts that Epiphanius's treatise was an actual source written in support of "free love"; see his *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 168, 185–86.

[76] Cf. MUSONIUS RUFUS in CORA E. LUTZ, *Musonius Rufus, "The Roman Socrates* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), 20–49. On the education of daughters and the "manliness" they may attain, see ELIZABETH A. CASTELLI, "Virginity and Its Meaning for Women's Sexuality in Early Christianity," *JFSR* 2.1 (1986): 76–77 and DANIEL ULLUCCI, "Ungendering Andrea," in *A Most Reliable Witness: Essays in Honor of Ross Shepard Kraemer* (ed. SUSAN ASHBROOK HARVEY et al.; Brown Judaic Studies 358; Providence, RI: Brown University, 2015), 275–84. On Plato, see DAVID M. HALPERIN, "Why is Diotima a Woman? Platonic Eros and the Figuration of Gender," in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of the Erotic Experience in the Ancient World* (ed. DAVID HALPERIN, JOHN J. WINKLER, and FROMA I. ZEITLIN; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 257–308.

[77] On the significance of the growing literacy of the Jesus movement, see esp. CHRIS KEITH, *Jesus Against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014). Also see KEITH HOPKINS, "Christian Number and its Implications," *JECS* 6.2 (1998): 185–226.

[78] MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., "Christmas Sermon," 256–57.

"loved," even if all that is required is that these Others are neither murdered nor exposed to dispossession and abuse?

A different account of the uses of this saying is surely possible. For example, it would have been possible to emphasize instead the central roles that women, freed, and enslaved persons actually played both in the Jesus movement and developing Christianity; they, too received "love your neighbor as yourself" as if it were addressed specifically to them.[79] It would also have been possible to highlight the engagement of the saying by the few literate freed persons who ascended to the ranks of pedagogue and philosopher; these Christians contributed a great deal to what became "Christianity."[80] Moreover, love, desire, and personhood likely played out very differently in the intimate spaces of Greek, Roman, Jewish and Christian households, where what was written and what persons actually did likely diverged, and in significant ways.[81] Other possible loves can and do find a way.[82] Other histories of reception could and should be written. There is no external check on what "love your neighbor" must mean. Still, among those in a position to make and enforce law, this commandment has proven to be an effective alibi for the erasure, effacement, and rejection of various Others. A first, rather meagre step towards undermining that history of reception is to acknowledge it.

7. Postlude: Fire

In a letter written to his nephew James on the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, James Baldwin declared: "It is not permissible that the authors of devastation should also be innocent. It is the innocence which constitutes the crime."[83] Christian love has been foundational to American-sponsored killing, theft, sexual violence, and willed ignorance for as long as there have been European colonists on the North American continent. Eventually there was an Emancipation Proclamation and a Civil War. Eventually the Presbyterians (as well as other Protestant denominations throughout the United States) split over the question of slavery, despite the best efforts of Blanchard and Rice. But the long-standing American love affair with innocent destruction continues unabated. Perhaps there is a biblical or historical study of love of neighbor and its receptions that can catch up with the murderers and expose the crime. Perhaps, as Baldwin predicted, time will eat away at the foundations of this current "kingdom" and destroy its doctrines "by proving them to be

[79] Cf. BERNADETTE J. BROOTEN, "Early Christian Enslaved Families (1st–4th C.)," in *Children and Family in Late Antiquity: Life, Death and Interaction* (ed. CHRISTIAN LAES et al.; Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 15; Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 111–34 and BERNADETTE J. BROOTEN, "Der lange Schatten der Sklaverei im Leben von Frauen und Mädchen," in *Dem Tod nicht glauben: Sozialgeschichte der Bibel: Festschrift für Luise Schottroff zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. FRANK CRÜSEMANN et al.; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2004), 488–503.

[80] Cf. MARY ANN BEAVIS, "Six Years a Slave: The *Confessio* of St. Patrick as Early Christian Slave Narrative," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 85.4 (2020): 339–51.

[81] "Natural" and "divinely sanctioned" differences quickly fall apart once actual human lives are involved. Cf. JORUNN ØKLAND, *Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian discourse of Sanctuary and Space* (London: T & T Clark, 2004); RUTH WESTGATE, "Space and Social Complexity in Greece from the Early Iron Age to the Classical Period," *Hesteia* 84.1 (2015): 47–95; F. MIRA GREEN, "Witnesses and Participants in the Shadows: The Sexual Lives of Enslaved Women and Boys," *Helios* 42.1 (2015): 143–62.

[82] See, for example, SAIDIYA V. HARTMAN, *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval* (New York: Norton, 2019).

[83] BALDWIN, *Fire*, 6.

untrue."[84] But, in the meantime, "the entire sum of our achievement" seems to be "to unleash the power to exterminate ourselves," not only by means of nuclear war, the instrument of annihilation Baldwin named in 1962, but also by our willingness to make the beautiful earth, the very source of the claim that God loves us, uninhabitable.[85] "An invented past," Baldwin continues, "can never be used; it cracks and crumbles under the pressures of life like clay in a season of drought."[86] Any biblical or historical scholarship that attempts to claim innocence on the basis of the saying "love your neighbor as yourself," that debates the fine points of law and interpretation while death reigns outside the church and university door, that urges those doing the dying to wait, be patient, because they, too, may someday be brought into the circle of "love," is an invented past that must finally crumble. To quote Baldwin, "God gave Noah the rainbow sign. No more water, the fire next time."[87] Fires are raging and there is no time to waste.

Bibliography

AGAMBEN, GIORGIO. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by DANIEL HELLER-ROAZEN. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

AGAMBEN, GIORGIO. *State of Exception*. Translated by KEVIN ATTELL. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

AHMED, SARA. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York and London: Routledge, 2015.

AKIYAMA, KENGO. *The Love of Neighbour in Ancient Judaism: The Reception of Leviticus 19:18 in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, the Book of Jubilees, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums) 105. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

ALLEN, GARRICK V. "Rewriting and the Gospels." *JSNT* 41.1 (2018): 58–69.

ALLISON, DALE. *Studies in Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.

BAGNALL, ROGER S., ROBERTA CASAGRANDE-KIM, AKIN ERSOY, CUMHAR TANRIVER, and BURAK YOLAÇAN. *Graffiti from the Basilica in the Agora of Smyrna*. New York: New York University Press, 2016.

BALDWIN, JAMES. *The Fire Next Time*. Originally published New York: Dial Press, 1963. Repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

BEAVIS, MARY ANN. "Six Years a Slave: The *Confessio* of St. Patrick as Early Christian Slave Narrative." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 85.4 (2020): 339–51.

BERGER, KLAUS. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu; ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament.* Teil I: *Markus und Parallelen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

[84] BALDWIN, *Fire*, 60.
[85] BALDWIN, *Fire*, 65: "We have taken this journey and arrived at this place in God's name. This, then, is the best that God (the white God) can do."
[86] BALDWIN, *Fire*, 87.
[87] BALDWIN, *Fire*, 126: "If we do not now dare everything, the fulfillment of that prophecy, recreated from the Bible in song by a slave, is upon us: *God gave Noah the rainbow sign, No more water, the fires next time!*"

BLANCHARD, JONATHAN, and NATHAN LEWIS RICE. *A debate on slavery: held on the first, second, third, and sixth days of October, 1845, upon the question: is slave holding in itself sinful, and the relation between master and slave, a sinful relation?* Cincinnati, OH: W. H. Moore, 1846.

BOTNER, MAX. *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark*. SNTS Monograph Series 174. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

BOYARIN, DANIEL. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

BRADLEY, KEITH. "Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction." *JRS* 90 (2000): 110–25.

BROOTEN, BERNADETTE J. *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

BROOTEN, BERNADETTE J. "Der lange Schatten der Sklaverei im Leben von Frauen und Mädchen." Pages 488–503 in *Dem Tod nicht glauben: Sozialgeschichte der Bibel: Festschrift für Luise Schottroff zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by FRANK CRÜSEMANN et al. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2004.

BROOTEN, BERNADETTE J. "Early Christian Enslaved Families (1st–4th C.)." Pages 111–34 in *Children and Family in Late Antiquity: Life, Death and Interaction*. Edited by CHRISTIAN LAES, KATARIINA MUSTAKALLIO, and VILLE VUOLANTO. Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 15. Leuven: Peeters, 2015.

BROWN, PETER. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

BURCHARD, CHRISTOPH. "Das doppelte Liebesgebot in der frühen christlichen Überlieferung." Pages 3–26 in CHRISTOPH BURCHARD. *Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by DIETER SÄNGER. WUNT 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

BUTTERWORTH, G. W. *Clement of Alexandria. The Exhortation to the Greeks. The Rich Man's Salvation. To the Newly Baptized*. LCL 92. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

CAMERON, AVERIL. "How to Read Heresiology." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.3 (2003): 471–92.

CASTELLI, ELIZABETH A. "Virginity and Its Meaning for Women's Sexuality in Early Christianity." *JFSR* 2.1 (1986): 76–77.

CARTER, WARREN. *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.

CARTER, WARREN. "Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?" Pages 155–79 in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Edited by M. JACKSON-MCCABE. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

CHARLES, RONALD. *The Silencing of Slaves in Early Jewish and Christian Texts*. London: Routledge, 2019.

COLLINS, ADELA YARBRO. *Mark: A Commentary*. Edited by HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE. HERMENEIA: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

COLLINS, JOHN J. "The Neighbor and the Alien in Leviticus 19." Pages 185–198 in *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal: Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan*. Edited by T. M. LEMOS, JORDAN D. ROSENBLUM, KAREN B. STERN, and DEBRA SCOGGINS BALLENTINE. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2021.

CONCANON, CAVAN. *Profaning Paul*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021.

COOPER, KATE, and JAMIE WOOD, eds. *Social Control in Late Antiquity: the Violence of Small Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

CUVILLIER, ÉLIAN. "Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate." *New Testament Studies* 55 (2009): 144–59.

EDEN, KATHY. *Friends Hold All Things in Common*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

EDWARDS, ROBERT G. T. "Clement of Alexandria's Gnostic Exposition of the Decalogue." *JECS* 23.4 (2015): 501–28.

ESLER, PHILIP. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

FLUSSER, DAVID. "The Ten Commandments and the New Testament." Pages 219–46 in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*. Edited by BEN-ZION SEGAL, Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990.

FREDRIKSEN, PAULA. "Paul's Letter to the Romans, the Ten Commandments, and Pagan 'Justification by Faith.'" *JBL* 133.4 (2014): 801–8.

FREDRIKSEN, PAULA. *Paul, the Pagans' Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

FURNISH, VICTOR PAUL. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

GAGER, JOHN G. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

GARNSEY, PETER. "Pythagoras, Plato and communality: a note." *Hermathanea* 179 (2005): 77–87.

GIBSON, CRAIG A. "Was Nicolaus the Sophist a Christian?" *VC* 64.5 (2010): 496–500.

GLANCY, JENNIFER A. *Slavery in Early Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

GLANCY, JENNIFER A. "The Sexual Use of Slaves: A Response to Kyle Harper on Jewish and Christian Porneia." *JBL* 134.1 (2015): 215–29.

GOLDSTONE, MATTHEW. "Rebuke, Lending, and Love: An Early Exegetical Tradition on Leviticus 19:17–18." *JBL* 136.2 (2017): 307–21.

GOODACRE, MARK. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Biblical Studies. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

GREEN, F. MIRA. "Witnesses and Participants in the Shadows: The Sexual Lives of Enslaved Women and Boys." *Helios* 42.1 (2015): 143–62.

HALPERIN, DAVID M. "Why is Diotima a Woman? Platonic Eros and the Figuration of Gender." Pages 257–308 in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of the Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*. Edited by DAVID HALPERIN, JOHN J. WINKLER, and FROMA I. ZEITLIN. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

HARLOW, LUKE E. *Religion, Race, and the Making of Confederate Kentucky, 1830–1880*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

HARPER, KYLE. *Slavery in the Late Roman world, AD 275–425*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

HARRILL, J. ALBERT. *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 32. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.

HARRILL, J. ALBERT. "The Use of the New Testament in the American Slave Controversy: A Case History in the Hermeneutical Tension between Biblical Criticism and Christian Moral Debate." *Religion and American Culture* 10.2 (2000): 149–86.

HARRILL, J. ALBERT. *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

HARTMAN, SAIDIYA V. *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval*. New York: Norton, 2019.

HAVERGAL, FRANCES R. "Take My Life and Let It Be." No. 404 in *Pilgrim Hymnal*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1958.

HESCHEL, SUSANNAH. *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

HODGE, CAROLINE JOHNSON. *If Sons, then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

HOEK, ANNEWIES VAN DEN. *Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the* Stromateis: *An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

HOEK, ANNEWIES VAN DEN. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996): 223–43.

HOEK, ANNEWIES VAN DEN. Introduction to *Stromateis* Book IV in *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates. Stromate IV*. Edited with introduction and notes by ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK. French translation by CLAUDE MONDÉSERT. SC 463. Paris: Du Cerf, 2001.

HOPKINS, KEITH. "Christian Number and its Implications." *JECS* 6.2 (1998): 185–226.

HORSLEY, RICHARD. *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

JAKOBSEN, JANET R., and ANN PELLEGRINI. *Love the Sin: Sexual Regulation and the Limits of Religious Tolerance*. New York: New York University Press, 2003.

JEWETT, ROBERT. *Romans: A Commentary*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.

KEITH, CHRIS. *Jesus Against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

KESSLER, RAINER. "Debt and the Decalogue: The Tenth Commandment." *Vetus Testamentum* 65 (2015): 53–61.

KING, MARTIN LUTHER JR. "The Letter from the Birmingham Jail." Pages 313-30 in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Edited by JAMES MELVIN WASHINGTON. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

KING, MARTIN LUTHER JR. *Why We Can't Wait*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

KING, MARTIN LUTHER JR. "A Christmas Sermon on Peace." Pages 256–57 in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Edited by JAMES MELVIN WASH-INGTON. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

KLOPPENBORG, JOHN S. "Poverty and Piety in Matthew, James, and the Didache." Pages 201–32 in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Edited by HUUB VAN DE SANDT and JÜRGEN K. ZANGENBERG. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2008.

KNUST, JENNIFER WRIGHT. *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

KNUST, JENNIFER. "Miscellany Manuscripts and the Christian Canonical Imaginary." Pages 99–118 in *Ritual Matters: Material Remains and Ancient Religion*. Edited by CLAUDIA MOSER and JENNIFER KNUST. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary 13. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.

KONRADT, MATTHIAS. "The Love Command in Matthew, James, and the Didache." Pages 271–88 in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Edited by HUUB VAN DE SANDT and JÜRGEN K. ZANGENBERG. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2008.

KOTROSITS, MAIA. *Rethinking Early Christian Identity: Affect, Violence, and Belonging*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

KRAUTER, STEFAN. *Studien zu Röm 13,1–7*. WUNT 243. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

LAMBRECHT, JAN. "The Great Commandment Pericope: Mark 12,28–34 and Q 10,25–28." Pages 80–101 in *Understanding What One Reads: New Testament Essays*. Edited by VERONICA KOPERSKI. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

LE BOULLUEC, ALAIN. *Clément d'Alexandrie et Origène*. Vol. 2 of *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature greque IIe-IIIe siècles*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.

LEDEGANG, FREDDY. "The Interpretation of the Decalogue by Philo, Clement of Alexandria and Origen." Pages 245–254 in *Origeniana nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of His Time*. Edited by G. HEIDL and R. SOMOS in collaboration with C. NÉMETH. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

LEUTZSCH, MARTIN. "Nächstenliebe als Antisemitismus? Zu einem Problem der christlich-jüdischen Beziehung." Pages 77–95 in *„Eine Grenze hast Du gesetzt": Edna Brocke zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by EKKEHARD W. STEGEMANN and KLAUS WENGST. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2003.

LEYERLE, BLAKE. "Clement of Alexandria on the Importance of Table Etiquette." *JECS* 3.2 (1995): 123–41.

LUTZ, CORA E. *Musonius Rufus, "The Roman Socrates*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

MACK, BURTON. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988.

MARCHAL, JOSEPH A. *The Politics of Heaven: Women, Gender, and Empire in the Study of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

MARCHAL, JOSEPH A., ed. *After the Corinthian Women Prophets*. Semeia Studies 97. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.

MBEMBE, ACHILLE. "Necropolitics." Translated by LIBBY MEINTJES. *Public Culture* 15.1 (2003): 11–40.

MCGOWAN, ANDREW. "The Myth of the 'Lord's Supper': Paul's Eucharistic Meal Terminology and Its Ancient Reception." *CBQ* 77 (2015): 503–21.

MILAVEC, AARON. "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited." *JECS* 11 (2003): 443–80.

NIKOLAUS, JULIA S. "The Study of Slavery: Past Issues and Present Approaches." *JRS* 26 (2013): 651–62.

NIXON, ROB. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.

NOBLE, JOSHUA. *Common Property, the Golden Age, and Empire in Acts 2:42–47 and 4:32–35*. Library of New Testament Studies 636. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

ØKLAND, JORUNN. *Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian discourse of Sanctuary and Space*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

OXENHAM, JOHN. "In Christ There Is No East or West." No. 414 in *Pilgrim Hymnal*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1958.

PARK, EUGENE EUNG-CHUN. "Covenantal Nomism and the Gospel of Matthew." *CBQ* 77.4 (2015): 668–85.

RAMELLI, ILLARIA. *Social Justice and the Legitimacy of Slavery: The Role of Philosophical Asceticism from Ancient Judaism to Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

REED, ANNETTE YOSHIKO. *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

REGEV, EYAL. "Moral Impurity and the Temple in Early Christianity in Light of Ancient Greek Practice and Qumranic Ideology." *HTR* 97.4 (2004): 383–411.

RHODES, JANE. *Mary Ann Shadd Cary: The Black Press and Protest in the Nineteenth Century*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

RIEKKINEN, VILHO. *Römer 13. Aufzeichnung und Weiterführung der exegetischen Diskussion*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 23. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1980.

RIPLEY, C. PETER et al., eds. *The Black Abolitionist Papers vol. II Canada: 1830–1865*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

ROMINGER, LAURA. "The Bible, Commonsense, and Interpretive Context: A Case Study in the Antebellum Debate over Slavery." *Fides et Historia* 38.2 (2006): 35–54.

ROUKEMA, REIMER. "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity." *VC* 58.1 (2004): 60–62.

RUNIA, DAVID T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.3. Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

SÁNCHEZ, DAVID, ed. "Burton Mack and the Loss of Our Innocence," *JAAR* 83.3 (2015): 826–57.

SANDERS, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

SHANER, KATHERINE A. *Enslaved Leadership in Early Christianity*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

SHARPE, CHRISTINA. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. DURHAM, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.

SHARPE, CHRISTINA. "And to Survive." *Small Axe* 22.3 (No. 57; November 2018): 171–80.

SHURTLEFF, ERNEST W. "Lead on, O King Eternal." No. 375 in *Pilgrim Hymnal*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1958.

SMITH, MITZI J. *Womanist Sass and Talk Back: Social (In)Justice, Intersectionality, and Biblical Interpretation*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018.

STROUP, CHRISTOPHER. *The Christians Who Became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City*. Yale: Yale University Press, 2020.

TUCKETT, CHRISTOPHER M. "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache." Pages 92–128 in *The Didache in Modern Research*. Edited by JONATHAN DRAPER. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

TUCKETT, CHRISTOPHER M. "The Didache and the Synoptics Once More: A Response to Aaron Milavec." *JECS* 13 (2005): 509–18.

UDOH, FABIAN. *To Caesar What Is Caesar's: Tribute, Taxes, and Imperial Administration in Early Roman Palestine*. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2020.

ULLUCCI, DANIEL. "Ungendering Andrea." Pages 275–84 in *A Most Reliable Witness: Essays in Honor of Ross Shepard Kraemer*. Edited by SUSAN ASHBROOK HARVEY, NATHANIEL DESROSIERS, SIRA L. LANDER, JACQUELINE Z. PASTIS, and DANIEL ULLUCCI. Brown Judaic Studies 358. Providence, RI: Brown University, 2015.

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST. "Prayers of Confession." No. 19 in *Pilgrim Hymnal*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1958.

WESTGATE, RUTH. "Space and Social Complexity in Greece from the Early Iron Age to the Classical Period." *Hesteia* 84.1 (2015): 47–95.

WILLIAMS, MICHAEL ALLEN. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

WIRE, ANTOINETTE CLARK. *The Corinthian Women Prophets*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

WISCHMEYER, ODA. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der paulinischen Aussagen über die Liebe (ἀγάπη)." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 74.3 (1983): 222–36.

WISCHMEYER, ODA. "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe bei Paulus. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung." Pages 137–61 in Wischmeyer, Oda. *Von Ben Sira zu Paulus: Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Texten, Theologie und Hermeneutik des Frühjudentums und des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by EVE-MARIE BECKER. WUNT 173. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

WISCHMEYER, ODA. *Liebe als Agape: Das frühchristliche Konzept und der moderne Diskurs*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

WISCHMEYER, ODA. "Leviticus 19,18. The Text and Some Stations in the History of its Reception." *Cristianesimo nella storia* 2 (2020): 553–69.