

Trajectories of Justice

Ⓛ

What the Bible
Says about
Slaves,
Women,
and
Homosexuality

Robert Karl Gnuse

Trajectories of Justice

James Clarke & Co

and

The Lutterworth Press

Click on the links above to see our full
catalogue for more excellent titles in
Hardback, Paperback, PDF and Epub!

Trajectories of Justice

ISBN: 9780718844561

C

L

Would you like to join our Mailing List?

[Click here!](#)

Enjoyed this book? Why not review it on
Amazon so others can too?

[Click here!](#)

Trajectories of Justice

*What the Bible Says about
Slaves, Women, and
Homosexuality*

Robert Karl Gnuse



The Lutterworth Press

*Dedicated to
Beth, Becky, Chris, Riley, Jake, and Adam*

The Lutterworth Press

P.O. Box 60
Cambridge
CB1 2NT
United Kingdom
www.lutterworth.com
publishing@lutterworth.com

ISBN: 978 0 7188 9430 6

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A record is available from the British Library

First published by The Lutterworth Press, 2016

Copyright © Robert Karl Gnuse, 2015

Published by arrangement
with Cascade Books

All rights reserved. No part of this edition may be reproduced, stored electronically or in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher (permissions@lutterworth.com).

Contents

List of Abbreviations viii

Acknowledgments ix

1. Perspectives on Biblical Trajectories	1
2. Old Testament Law Codes and Justice for the Oppressed	18
3. Loans, Interest, and Debt that Leads to Slavery	28
4. Freedom for the Oppressed Debt-slaves	43
5. Rights for Slaves in the New Testament	63
6. Women's Rights in the Old Testament	77
7. The Dignity of Women in the Jesus Movement	92
8. The Dignity of Women in Paul and the Ancient Church	101
9. Old Testament Passages Used to Condemn Homosexuality	117
10. New Testament Passages Used to Condemn Homosexuality	142
Conclusion	161
<i>Bibliography</i>	165

Abbreviations

<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . 3rd ed. Edited by James B. Pritchard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>CTM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements
<i>NRSV</i>	New Revised Standard Version of the Bible
<i>OTL</i>	Old Testament Library
<i>SBLDS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>WBC</i>	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Acknowledgments

EVERY AUTHOR IS SUPPORTED by other people. I credit my wife, Beth, with patience as I have worked on this book since 1997 at home as well as at the office. I would like to thank Loyola University New Orleans for sabbaticals in the fall 2003 semester and in the fall 2010 semester. I would like to thank the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst for the research grant in fall 2005, and the Fachbereich Evangelische Theologie of Philipps Universität in Marburg Universität, where some of the research for this book was undertaken. I would like to thank the Interlibrary Loan Department of Loyola University for obtaining many volumes for me over the years, and the staff at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary for the use of their facilities. Finally, I would like to thank Cascade Books for their willingness to publish this work.

I would like to thank Anthony Godzieba and *Horizons* journal for permission to reprint part of my article “Breakthrough or Tyranny: Monotheism’s Contested Implications,” *Horizons* 34 (2007) 78–95, as a portion of chapter 1. This material is reprinted with the permission of Cambridge University Press. I would like to thank David Bossman and *Biblical Theology Bulletin* for permission to reprint my article “Seven Gay Texts: Biblical Passages Used to Condemn Homosexuality,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 45 (2015) 68–87, which was expanded to become chapters 9 and 10.

Biblical texts that appear in this volume come from the New Revised Standard Version translation of the Bible, and specifically from *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version*.

—Robert Gnuse

James C. Carter, SJ / Bank One Distinguished Professor of the Humanities
Loyola University New Orleans
Winter 2015.

1

Perspectives on Biblical Trajectories

Oppression in the Bible?

I HAVE TOO OFTEN heard said or seen in print that the oppression of women, the centuries-long existence of slavery, the justification for war, the pollution of our environment, and other woes of human society result from statements in the Bible as well as from the teachings of monotheistic faiths. I have had my college students say as much at the beginning of a course, usually as a prelude to a statement that explains why they have no commitment to the church. Over the years I have written several works to demonstrate the opposite—that the biblical tradition speaks a message of liberation, human freedom, egalitarianism, human dignity, and social reform.¹ Critics of the biblical tradition who attribute the source of such woes to the Bible can indeed point to the message of fundamentalist preachers, who have used the Bible in the modern age to subordinate women, attack homosexuality, attack the theory of evolution, affirm the inferiority of African Americans, and defend the notion of a just war as the solution to most international crises. In the early nineteenth century such preachers also justified the existence of slavery. But I maintain that the fundamentalist use of the Bible on these issues is a misuse of the Bible. A deeper understanding of the biblical text in its historical context reveals it to be a document that elevates

1. Gnuse, *You Shall Not Steal*; Gnuse, *No Other Gods*, 274–97; Gnuse, *Old Testament and Process Theology*, 141–57; Gnuse, “Breakthrough or Tyranny,” 78–95; Gnuse, *No Tolerance for Tyrants*.

humanity, strives for human equality, and attempts to lead society forward in terms of respect for the poor, the oppressed, women, and others so often crushed by the social and economic forces in our world. It is for the purpose of reclaiming the Bible's message of liberation that I have written this volume. I shall contend that the biblical tradition, as it developed, increasingly sought to provide rights and dignity for both slaves and women, so that from our modern perspective, abolitionism and women's equality are the natural outgrowths of the biblical message. In regard to the biblical understanding of homosexuality, I shall maintain that the biblical text itself does not condemn a loving and committed relationship between two free, adult members of the same sex. Those who speak disparagingly of the biblical text as an oppressive document on these issues do not really understand its deeper message.

Critical intelligentsia who so quickly condemn the Bible and its message fail to appreciate two important realities. First, the biblical texts were generated in the first millennium BCE (for the Old Testament) and in the first century CE (for the New Testament). They were products of an era in so many ways repressive, an age of patriarchy and imperial oppression by military empires. The biblical texts cannot help but reflect the values of that age, especially when straightforward narratives describe the everyday happenings of life. If we desire to know the values and the beliefs of the biblical authors, we are best advised not to read the stories, which, of course, reflect the mores of the common society. Rather, we should turn our attention to the laws that the authors sought to impress upon society, to the prophetic oracles spoken by those critics of religious and social values, to the classical prophets, and to the writings of the New Testament—especially to Paul. We should observe where the values of the everyday society lay, and how the values of the biblical authors stood in tension with them. We should compare the writings of the Bible with the culture of that age, and we should not compare them to our own values. We live two thousand years later, and much of our egalitarian progress, which has moved us beyond the values of the biblical authors, was inspired by those very same authors.

The second overlooked reality about the Bible is that the biblical tradition itself reflects ongoing social progress. We would acknowledge readily that in terms of democratic social values our modern society has moved beyond the social values and beliefs of the biblical text. But what is not acknowledged is that an evolutionary process occurs on several issues within the history of the biblical tradition itself. That evolutionary process

or trajectory reflects how the biblical authors increasingly sought to redress the wrongs of society in the oppression of the poor and women. That evolutionary process is what has inspired us over the years. In effect, the evolving trajectory of values in the Bible encourages us to move beyond where the authors were in their own beliefs. The Bible is not to be viewed as a static and timeless work; rather, it inspires an evolutionary trajectory that begins with it and moves forward into the future. Thus, when we read a biblical text, we should ask, what was the point of the author in articulating what we read, and how would that transform itself into our values today? For example, when a biblical passage is critical of slavery in the first millennium BCE without necessarily calling for the elimination of slavery, that message should really translate into abolitionism in the modern era, as it did in nineteenth-century America. The same is true on other issues. We are called upon to go further in social reform than the biblical authors ever could have done with the limitations placed upon them by their society.

In a previous work I observed how the biblical texts inspired political thinkers in America in the eighteenth century. From 1760 to 1805 American political authors drew 34 percent of their citations from the Bible, compared to 22 percent drawn from Enlightenment thinkers, 18 percent from Whig authors, 11 percent from common law, and 9 percent from classical sources.² Democracy did not exist in the first millennium BCE, but biblical ideas carried to their logical conclusion ultimately resulted in the emergence of democratic thought. I observed that eighteenth-century American political thinkers quoted the biblical text more than any other resource. (They were, of course, deists, not Christians in the traditional sense.) That is what I mean by an evolving trajectory. The Bible invites us to move beyond where the biblical authors were intellectually; the Bible invites us to participate in an ongoing evolving trajectory. The evolution we can observe in the Bible is an ongoing process that has surfaced most dramatically in Western society over the past four centuries (after the interlude of the Low Middle Ages and the High Middle Ages between us and the biblical era). These intervening centuries between the biblical era and ours may have kept some radical concepts in the biblical text from surfacing.

What I will seek to explore in this short book are those aspects of biblical expression in behalf of the poor and the oppressed that appear to demonstrate development within the biblical tradition. The two issues

2. Gnuse, *No Tolerance for Tyrants*, 6–8; Lutz, “Relative Influence of European Writers,” 189–97, esp. 192.

addressed by biblical texts, which appear to reflect an evolution of thought primarily, are the amelioration of the woes of slavery, along with the concomitant causes of enslavement, and the rights of women in a patriarchal culture. To me, the texts connected to these two issues reflect the dynamic nature of the biblical text as an ever-changing and evolving intellectual tradition seeking to elevate the dignity and the rights of all human beings. We should never quote the Bible as a static resource to tell where we should stand on social issues; rather, we should observe the spirit of the biblical text and ask: What is the deeper message, and where is it telling us to go with our own actions?

Intellectual Revolution in the Bible

Over two and a half thousand years ago a religious and intellectual revolution began. We still live in the midst of that ongoing, not-yet-finished revolution. Perhaps because our individual lives are so short, or because we do not readily sense the great patterns of history in our everyday lives, we fail to realize that we still live in that continuing revolution, which is changing the religious, intellectual, and social assumptions of human culture. Historians speak of the Neolithic Revolution, a period of time approximately from 9500 to 4500 BCE when agriculture spread across the Old World, and it encompassed more than four millennia in its process. But historians still call it a revolution. Analogously, we are into the third millennium of this yet unfinished revolution, and though slightly over two thousand years might seem to be a long time, it is still a revolution.

The revolution of which I speak is the emergence of monotheistic religious beliefs with their concomitant intellectual and social values. We might be tempted to refrain from applying the term *revolution* to a process that endures for millennia and appears to us to have been an established part of our worldview. But in reality, the religious and moral revolution generated by the biblical authors has been going on for a short period of time compared to the vast eons of time involved in human evolution. Human history, which has elapsed since we first settled in villages around 9500 BCE in the Near East, is but a cosmic wink, and the period of time involved in the emergence of monotheism is but a fraction of that.

The emergence of the values of justice and egalitarianism in the biblical testimony was not only revolutionary for its age, but evolutionary: that is, we may observe the stages of development within the biblical tradition,

especially as we move from the Old Testament to the New Testament. An intellectual or religious breakthrough requires many years to unfold as the implications are worked out in the social-cultural arena of human existence. Thus I speak of the monotheistic process, which we can observe in the biblical text, as one that is still emerging in our own age as we continue to develop the implications of the text. For example, the Old Testament was critical of the oppressive aspects of slavery, the New Testament sought to abolish the distinction between slave and free in the Christian community, and ultimately Christianity in its liberal social manifestation gave rise to the modern abolitionist movement. For years I have used the expression “emergent monotheism” to describe the process wherein the beliefs and social values of monotheistic faith have been unfolding in society. Recognition of this process in human culture should lead us consciously to will to continue and advance the monotheistic “revolution” and “evolution” in our own age, as we advocate justice and equality in our modern world.

Modern scholars in the past generation have begun to sense that monotheism did not emerge among the Israelite people with Moses in the thirteenth century BCE, as once we assumed in the scholarship of previous generations. Rather, Israelites or Judahites did not become monotheistic in a real sense until the Babylonian exile of the sixth century BCE or even later. The religious experience of the people until then was one of polytheism. Great religious spokespersons, such as the classical prophets, and religious reform movements of Hezekiah and Josiah, provided the preliminary stages for the emergence of monotheism among the Judahites during and after the sixth-century-BCE exile.

The new scholarly view that polytheism was regnant among Israelites until the exile has been undergirded both by archaeological discoveries and by a fresh look at the various texts in the Bible that testify to the diversity of religious belief in Israel and Judah. Much of this information we had in our possession for years, especially the biblical texts. The breakthrough in our scholarly paradigms emerged as scholars were willing to look at all the information in a new way. Now scholars are more willing to speak of a development of monotheism in ancient Israel until the time of the exile, and some speak of a developmental process that continued down even into the Maccabean period of the second century BCE or even into the Christian era.

Certain assumptions and ideas in the biblical text could not be fully developed in that initial biblical age. They would be realized only in the

“fullness of time,” or when human culture was ready for their fuller actualization in the social arena. To put it another way, emergent monotheism creates a trajectory, an ongoing developmental process of religious beliefs and social imperatives. This process over the years would bring about greater equality and respect for all people, the abolition of slavery, concern for the poor, the affirmation of human rights for everyone, and various social reform movements. It might appear that it took a long time for the monotheistic beliefs of Judaism and Christianity to bring about these advances in western European society; but ideas and practices cannot be implemented immediately by an initial monotheistic breakthrough, nor are all the implications to be found in the minds of those initial contributors to the movement. Such values reside in the overall belief system latently, and they await the time in human history when they can become manifest. In the past few centuries, Western culture has become ready to work out the fuller implications of monotheistic faith in the social arena.

My Response to Critics

My thesis may be dramatically challenged by contemporary authors who maintain that biblical religion and monotheism do not represent a great intellectual and religious breakthrough that brings equality and justice, but rather that biblical religion and monotheism engender the repression and even violence that has plagued Western culture for those many years. My critics would postulate that monotheism has justified tyrannical governments, the institution of slavery, and the subordination of women to men in society. In part, this entire book has been written as a response to their observations.

A classic advocate of these views is Regina Schwartz, who has issued a stern challenge to the biblical tradition by declaring that monotheism produces violence and oppression.³ She opines that belief in one God implies that God favors a group of people, gives them a unique identity, and inspires them to exclude or attack others. This attitude has been passed from the Old Testament to Christianity. Covenants in particular lead the religious community to focus its identity and thus scapegoat others outside that community. The Bible mandates love of the neighbor only until the neighbor challenges our identity, and then that “neighbor” must be resisted

3. Schwartz, *Curse of Cain*. I have responded to her arguments in the past in greater detail, “Breakthrough or Tyranny,” which provides the basis for much of this chapter.

and opposed. Monotheism brings people together so they do not fight each other for scarce resources such as land and wealth, but when monotheism is combined with the “particularism” of a covenant relationship, it becomes oppressive. The gods of other peoples are idols, and if those people worship idols they become abominations.⁴ Thus, Schwartz can say that God prefers some (Abel, Israelites) and excludes others (Cain, Canaanites)—hence the title of her book: *The Curse of Cain*. Since Schwartz refers to examples such as slavery and the oppression of women, reference to her thesis is appropriate for the scope of this volume.

Schwartz observes that identity is connected to owning land, which reinforces human desire to possess, defend, and conquer. Monotheism becomes political when divinely promised land is bequeathed from God and its possession is maintained by obedience to that God. For then people will defend the land militarily to prove they are obedient. After Judah’s sins sent the people into the sixth-century-BCE exile, the return and renewed obedience, especially with the increased emphasis upon purity for the people, led to xenophobia. The exodus freed the slaves, which then led to the conquest of Palestine, wherein the formerly oppressed slaves became the oppressors who killed Canaanites. We have seen this same phenomenon happen again in the twentieth century; the once oppressed become the oppressors.

The biblical story of exodus, conquest, and Davidic rule created a nationalistic particularity in the form of a tradition for the later Judahites, and the narrative still influences our thinking today. Past oppression, such as slavery in Egypt, justifies violence against others. Universalism, proclaimed by a monotheism that declares that all people worship the same God, theoretically could create a toleration of others, but often it generates imperialism that seeks to conquer and absorb others.

Schwartz articulates the rebuttal to her own thesis, however, when she says that the biblical text must be interpreted differently. Ethical values are affected by scarcity of food, water, land, and other precious resources, which must be shared by people for self-survival. Monotheism proclaims that the resources are to be had by the chosen few, and others are to be excluded. Schwartz declares that the biblical text must be plumbed so that an “ethic of scarcity” may be replaced by an “ethic of plenitude,” in which all humanity shares in the world’s resources. I would declare that the biblical text indeed proclaims such an ethic, and monotheistic universalism may generate toleration rather than imperialism. Schwartz observes that

4. Schwartz, *The Curse of Cain*, 33.

the worship of one god does not necessarily produce a violent notion of identity, but when monotheism is combined with particularism, the combination creates a collective identity for people to set themselves apart from others.⁵ I agree, but I would say that the problem is not with the Bible but with how the Bible has been used and interpreted. The greatest misuse occurs when the biblical message is taken out of its social-historical context, and especially when the message of certain biblical texts is no longer seen as part of an evolutionary trajectory that calls upon us to “move beyond” cultural values contemporary with those biblical authors. I hope to show that the biblical texts on slavery and women encourage us to move beyond the reform that those biblical authors initially envisioned and to affirm an even greater degree of equality and freedom.

What Schwartz really attacks is a misuse of biblical accounts by modern believers who use them literally to address contemporary issues and call for some form of continued subordination of other people. Old biblical narratives must be understood critically as an earlier stage in the history of religious evolution. Modern Jews and Christians view the narratives of the Old Testament through later texts: Jews use the Talmud, and Christians use the New Testament, as the hermeneutical key by which to understand and appropriate the values of those older biblical texts. Thus, some values of the older texts, such as war against one’s national enemies, have been transcended by later traditions of Christianity and Judaism. Schwartz forgets, as do most believers in the Judeo-Christian tradition, that earlier and cruder values espoused by the biblical text are overturned by later revelation and human religious insight in the evolutionary trajectory, which are inspired by that very same biblical text. The problem lies with modern believers who fail to use the later biblical traditions to reinterpret the more primitive early elements in the Bible. We must view the biblical tradition-generating process as truly an organic, ever-changing, evolutionary process.

Robert Goldenberg also directs his attention to authors who declare that there is monotheistic intolerance in the Old Testament and Judaism, and his observations also can be used to respond to Schwartz’s position.⁶ Goldenberg admits that preexilic Israelites were largely polytheists and that only after the exile did Judahites become monotheistic. After the Judahites became truly monotheistic, they had mixed attitudes toward other religionists from the late biblical period through the rabbinic period. While some

5. Ibid., 31

6. Goldenberg, *Nations That Know Thee Not*, 1–108.

condemned the religions of the Gentiles, other Judahites believed that all people worshipped the Judahite God indirectly. This became especially true during the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Some Judean authors called for the conversion of Gentiles, while others advocated leaving them alone, as long as they did not convert Judeans to their Graeco-Roman values. With such mixed opinions expressed by Judean authors, one cannot declare that the religion of the Judeans was an intolerant religion, as Schwartz and others do. Goldenberg's thesis argues only that Judean monotheism does not give rise to intolerance; it does not discuss whether monotheism legitimates tyranny and patriarchal oppression for its own believers. Following Goldenberg, if monotheistic Judean religion is not monolithic about other religions, by inference neither does monotheistic Judean religion legitimate oppressive values on other social issues, such as slavery and women's rights.

Monotheism and Equality

Some authors and historians suspect that the rise of monotheistic religious belief elevates one deity and subsequently legitimates the elevation of one ruler on the earth. When that one ruler declares there is only one true god, and he or she worships that deity, that ruler will forcibly convert other people. Thus, a monotheistic state will conquer and absorb other peoples into its own political and religious structures. Monotheistic faith, then, lends support to the national goals of imperial conquest. Zealous monotheists create an irony in their desire to convert all people. For if you reject the religion of others, conquer and convert them, this shows that you fight for a particular religion and a particular deity, not a universal and loving God of all people. According to critics of monotheism, when a multitude of gods is present in the universe, individual believers can exhibit diverse lifestyles because each person is excused from the demands of one particular jealous god. This permits greater freedom of human actions. Monotheism, by contrast, demands submission of the will to one God and the ritual and ethical demands of that one deity. Polytheism thus permits greater diversity and human religious individuality.⁷

These observations may be true for the Achaemenid Persian Empire (550–330 BCE) and the Sassanian Persian Empire (100–600 CE) with Zoroastrianism as the imperial faith, and for the various Arabic empires

7. Marquard, "Lob des Polytheismus," 40–58; Comblin, "Monotheism and Popular Religion," 91–99; Veyne, *Roman Empire*, 216; Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth*, 37–60.

(630–1918) with Islam. Christians likewise used religious belief to sustain empire. Constantine the Great of Rome in the fourth century CE saw the use of Christianity as a tool to rule a united Roman Empire and to marshal its energy in order to conquer Sassanian Persia.⁸ This pattern of Christian imperialism may be observed throughout western European history, including Western colonial expansion into the Third World in the past five hundred years. It appears that empire and monotheism go together to produce oppression, at least historically.

On the other hand, some authors suggest that monotheistic thought may introduce both intolerance and openness into various religious communities.⁹ What may be stressed for a people in a particular situation depends upon who is most responsible for articulating monotheistic faith and bringing it to the masses.

If monotheistic belief is supported by the state or an empire, it will stress the monarchical aspects of the one deity in order to legitimate kings and the institution of the monarchy. This form of monotheism articulates the analogy of one God in the heavens ruling all people as the parallel to one ruler on the earth ruling all his subjects. This is monotheism “from above,” a religion imposed upon the subjects by the elite to legitimate their power. But if monotheism is generated from the people, especially poor and marginal people, such as the ancient Judahites or early Christians, the existence of one God in the heavenly realm implies that all people in the earthly realm must worship that one deity and stand as equals before that one deity. This metaphor will be critical of kings and kingship, for the ideology legitimated by “monotheism from above” puts the king into a more direct relationship with the deity, and the monotheism of the people rejects such an exaltation of a mere human being to divine or semidivine status. This is why there is so much critique of kings and kingship in the biblical tradition, as I have elsewhere sought to demonstrate.¹⁰ The biblical tradition contains monotheism “from below,” a faith system from the people. For the biblical texts were generated by people who were the underdogs and the oppressed folk of their age.

Tikva Frymer-Kensky aptly observes that the biblical narratives speak of women and honestly acknowledge their subordinate status in the

8. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth*; and Harris, *World of the Bible*, 164.

9. Petersen, “Israel and Monotheism,” 92–107; Michaels, “Monotheismus und Fundamentalismus,” 51–57; Gross, “Religious Diversity,” 349–55.

10. Gnuse, *No Tolerance for Tyrants*.

patriarchal society in which they lived. However, the biblical narratives never characterize the women in a prejudicial fashion, disdaining them for their weak and subordinate status, as was common in the Hellenistic literary tradition, but rather portray them in ways very similar to how men are described. This, says Frymer-Kensky, is because the biblical authors belonged to the people of Israel or the later Judahites, who themselves were a weak and subordinate people in an age of oppressive world empires. Hence, the women in their roles were analogous to the people of God, and so no prejudicial portrayal of women is forthcoming from the biblical narratives, but instead the women often seem to be lauded for their ability to survive as “tricksters.” The portrayal of women, to a certain extent, serves as a model of behavior for the biblical audience, people also trying to learn how to survive in an overwhelming world as underdogs.¹¹ The biblical tradition reflects the vision of the world from the perspective of the underdogs, the slaves, and the oppressed. Theirs is truly “monotheism” from below. Hence, in the legal tradition, as we shall observe later, there is special attention paid to elevating the status of slaves and women.

Critical historians recently have observed that the monotheism of the Judahites was brought to the masses due to the efforts of the scribal and priestly elite, and perhaps was abetted by the government in Jerusalem in the postexilic period after 500 BCE. Prior to the Babylonian exile in the sixth century BCE, Hezekiah's (710–700 BCE) and Josiah's (622–609 BCE) reforms in Judah used strong-arm methods to accomplish what appears to have been monotheistic reform. After the exile, the efforts of Ezra, such as the exclusion of foreign wives, appear rather abrasive and tyrannical. Nonetheless, in the great scheme of power politics of that age, the preexilic Judahite kings and postexilic Judahite priestly leadership must still be accounted as part of the oppressed, small powers in a world of gargantuan political forces, even when their religious reform was sponsored by those foreign powers (as with Ezra and Nehemiah). They are still the “underdogs.” Thus, their efforts can be seen as giving rise to a “religion from below,” a religion of the masses and the oppressed.

A healthy monotheism encourages freedom of the deity in the divine realm to act without the constraints of the other divine wills, but it should also affirm freedom and equality of people in the human realm as believers relate equally to that one deity. As that God is free in the divine realm, so also the devotees are free in their actions in the earthly realm. When the

11. Frymer-Kensky, *Reading the Women of the Bible*, xvi–xvii, xxi.