

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

Paul's Use of Leviticus 19:18:
A Comparative Analysis with Select Second Temple Jewish Texts

A Thesis Submitted to
the School of Divinity in Candidacy
for the Degree of Master of Theology

by

Corey D. Rugh
May 8, 2020

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

THESIS APPROVAL SHEET

Dr. Leo Percer, Thesis Mentor

Dr. Gary Yates, Reader

Abstract

Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 and Galatians 5:13-15 begs the question of how a command that is not repeated in the Old Testament came to the position of prominence as the summarizing and fulfilling statement of the whole law. This study aims to analyze select Second Temple Jewish texts and Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians in order to trace the uses of or allusions to Leviticus 19:18 and determine how Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 compares and differs from the selected texts. The Second Temple Jewish texts that are analyzed include the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Tobit 4:15, Bavli Shabbat 31a, the Damascus Document, and the Community Rule. The comparative analysis reveals that Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 and Galatians 5:13-15 is shaped by the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and is thus unique when compared to preceding and contemporary Second Temple Jewish texts.

Contents

Introduction	1
Leviticus 19:18 in the Old Testament	3
The Love of the Neighbor in the <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	8
Introduction.....	8
<i>Testament of Issachar, the fifth son of Jacob and Leah</i>	11
<i>Testament of Benjamin, the twelfth son of Jacob and Rachel</i>	13
Brotherly Love in <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	15
Conclusion	18
The Golden Rule in Tobit 4:15	19
The Golden Rule in Bavli Shabbat 31a	24
The Love of the Brother in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule	28
Introduction.....	28
The Damascus Document	29
The Community Rule.....	32
Conclusion	34
Paul’s Use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans and Galatians	35
Introduction.....	35
Romans 13:8-10.....	36
Galatians 5:13-15	41

Conclusion	46
Conclusion	48
Bibliography	52

Introduction

James W. Thompson comments on the uniqueness of Leviticus 19:18 by stating, “While the law has multiple statutes governing the proper treatment of others, the command to love the other appears only in Leviticus 19.”¹ In other words, the command to love “the neighbor” is not a reoccurring theme in the Old Testament (OT) and could, therefore, be labeled as a *peripheral* command. When one begins reading the New Testament (NT), however, Leviticus 19:18 surprisingly plays a significant role not only in the Synoptic Gospels but in two of Paul’s epistles, namely, his letters to the Galatians and the Romans. Leviticus 19:18 makes its first appearance (chronologically) in Galatians 5:13-15:

Now you were called to freedom, brothers (and sisters); only do not turn the freedom into a base of operations (i.e., starting point in a war) for the flesh,² but through love serve as a slave to one another. For the whole law has been fulfilled in one word, in the word (or: statement): *You shall love your neighbor as yourself* [Lev 19:18b]. But if you are biting and devouring one another, watch out that you are not consumed by one another.³

Moreover, Paul again cites Leviticus 19:18 in his seminal work, the letter to the Romans, specifically Romans 13:8-10:

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves the other has fulfilled the law. For this, *You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet* [Exod 20:14-15, 17a LXX; Deut 5:17-19, 21a LXX], and any other commandment, is summed up in this word (or: statement): *You shall love your neighbor as yourself* [Lev 19:18b]. Love does no evil to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfillment of the law.⁴

¹ James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 160.

² The NRSV, RSV, ESV, and NASB(95) translate ἀφορμήν as “opportunity.” However, ἀφορμήν is a compound word, formed from (1) ὄρη, meaning “starting point of a motion,” which is typically found in a military context, and (2) ἀπο-, meaning “away from” or “from.” It can be rendered “a place away from the starting point of a motion,” which in a military context, such as a battle between Spirit and flesh, could be understood as a “base of operations.” See David A. deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2018), 446.

³ Author’s translation. All biblical references are from the NASB unless otherwise noted.

⁴ Author’s translation.

The problem that arises is it is unclear how the peripheral commandment in Leviticus 19:18 and the action of “love” has risen to the position as the *encapsulating* and *fulfilling* “word” of the whole law. As Thompson points out, the command to love the neighbor is unique to Leviticus 19:18 alone. The OT, in general, does not lift the commandment above others, nor does it anywhere explicitly state that love fulfills the law in its entirety. The problem, then, lies in understanding how Paul comes to use Leviticus 19:18 in such a prominent way.

The recognition of this problem leads to many questions. How does Leviticus 19:18 come to be so important in Paul’s ethical teachings to the church(es) in Galatia and Rome? Furthermore, does Paul borrow the use of Leviticus 19:18 from his Lord, Jesus Christ, or does he develop it on his own from another existing tradition?⁵ In a similar vein, is Paul’s (and Jesus’s) elevation of the action of love a uniquely Christian development, or are his Jewish contemporaries also making such a move?

Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 in his letters to the Romans and Galatians has stumped many, leading to a multitude of questions like those already asked here.⁶ In this regard, the purpose of this thesis is to offer a solution to the problem by proposing that Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 is deeply shaped by the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and thus wholly unique when compared to preceding or contemporary writings within Jewish history.

⁵ For Jesus’s use of Lev 19:18, see Matt 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27; cf. Matt 5:43. Outside of Jesus and Paul, there is only one other citation of Lev 19:18, which is found in James 2:8. For a brief study on each of these passages, see Emerson Powery, “Under the Gaze of the Empire: Who Is My Neighbor?,” *Interpretation* 62, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 134-44.

⁶ Moisés Silva makes an observation about the citation of Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:14: “the presence of this citation here has baffled commentators. For many of them, it seems almost unimaginable that Paul, in the very letter where he gives his most sustained argument against the law, should now speak about the need to fulfill the law. Indeed, a few scholars (e.g., O. Neill 1972: 71) have resorted to the desperate measure of identifying this section of the letter as an editor’s interpolation.” As one can see, this “baffling” sprouts from the context of Galatians and not necessarily the overall use (or misuse) of Leviticus 19:18 by Paul. See Moisés Silva, “Galatians,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

The argument of the thesis will begin by first briefly overviewing Leviticus 19:18 in its OT context, followed by analyses of Second Temple Jewish texts that contain similar teachings influenced by or seemingly paralleling Leviticus 19:18: *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (TI2P)* from the Pseudepigrapha, Tobit 4:15 from the Apocrypha, Shabbat 31a from the Babylonian Talmud (bShabb. 31a), and the Damascus Document (CD) and the Community Rule (1QS) from the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁷ An examination of these works displays a varying tradition of ethical standards produced by Jews striving to live out God’s law faithfully in their historical setting and situation. The next section will overview Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 and Galatians 5:13-15. Finally, the last section will discuss the conclusions one can reach based on the similarities and differences between Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans and Galatians and the teachings on “loving others” found in select Second Temple Jewish Texts. The thesis will conclude by summarizing the observations of the study and arguing for the position that despite similarities, Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 is wholly unique, owing to the influence of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ on Paul’s understanding of love.

Leviticus 19:18 in the Old Testament

The command to “love your neighbor as yourself” is only a portion of Leviticus 19:18, which in its entirety reads, “You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the sons of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself; I am the LORD.”⁸ Thus, at the

⁷ N. T. Wright mentions most of these sources in his large work on Paul. See N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 1119nn325-26. It was N. T. Wright’s brief mention of Paul’s use of Lev 19:18 that inspired this work. The only comprehensive study of Lev 19:18 in Second Temple Judaism is 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 (Boston: Brill, 2018).

⁸ In the LXX, Lev 19:18 reads καὶ οὐκ ἐκδικᾷταί σου ἡ χεὶρ, καὶ οὐ μνηεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ σου, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος (“And your hand shall not take revenge, and you shall not hold a grudge against the sons of your people, and you shall love your neighbor as yourself; I am the Lord”; author’s

outset, one can see that the command to love the neighbor is coupled with two other important commands: (1) do not take *vengeance* and (2) do not *bear any grudge*. Moreover, these two commands against hateful behavior have in mind a specific recipient: “the sons of your people” or, in other words, fellow Israelites that are also members of the covenant community.⁹ The question arises, then, who exactly is the neighbor in the latter half of verse 18? More specifically, is the neighbor limited to fellow Israelites or does the term include any person?

John Hartley assumes the narrow application of the neighbor: “In this speech on holy living, it means that a person sanctifies oneself in order to act in love toward an *acquaintance*.”¹⁰ Although English speakers may understand “acquaintance” to refer to a broad category of people, even those who are essentially strangers, Hartley sees the context of Leviticus 19:18 narrowing the term to include only those in Israel with whom one has contact.¹¹ The only possible exception to the narrow application of neighbor that Hartley entertains is Leviticus 19:34, which commands for the proper care of the “stranger” (NASB) or “alien” (NRSV). He

translation). The LXX reading will become important when exploring the language used by *T12P* and other works. Leviticus 19:18 appears in the section of Leviticus known as the “Holiness Code,” which encompasses chapters 17–26. One characteristic of the Holiness Code appears within this verse, namely, the phrase “I am the LORD.” Though straightforward, the main thrust of the Holiness Code is to exhort Israel to be holy just as the LORD is holy.

⁹ It is clear from verse 17 that taking vengeance and bearing a grudge are hateful behaviors: “You shall not *hate* your fellow countryman in your heart; you may surely reprove your neighbor, but shall not incur sin because of him.” However, it could be said that taking vengeance and bearing a grudge are internal conditions that ultimately lead to hateful behavior (i.e., that which lies outside the confines of “reproving” one’s neighbor). Matthew Goldstone has observed that Sifra, a Tannaitic midrash, offers an early Jewish interpretation of Lev 19:17-18 that emphasizes three ways to rebuke the “neighbor”: cursing, hitting, and slapping. Thus, according to this interpretation of Lev 19:17-18, while one should not harbor hatred in his heart nor take vengeance or bear a grudge, it is still permissible to perform physical (and verbal) actions in instances of rebuking the neighbor. See Matthew Goldstone, “Rebuke, Lending, and Love: An Early Exegetical Tradition on Leviticus 19:17-18,” *Journal of Biblical Literature: Atlanta* 136, no. 2 (2017): 307-21. This tradition conflicts with Jesus’s teaching in Matthew 5:28-44 and Luke 6:27-35 where Jesus tells his audience not to respond to hateful behaviors by rebuking the assailants but by loving them and giving them more than what they originally sought (e.g., turning the other cheek). Therefore, the commands in Lev 19:17-18 are best understood as involving both internal conditions and external physical and verbal behaviors.

¹⁰ Emphasis added. John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word Books, 1992), 317.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 318.

does not, however, go beyond a simple mention of the verse. Instead, he concludes that the commands in Leviticus 19:18 appeal only to those within the covenant community of Israel and are meant to motivate the Israelites into considering whether they are “acting negatively or positively” towards the members of the group to which they belong.¹²

Milgrom, like Hartley, contends that “neighbor” (or his translation, “your fellow”) is limited to a “fellow Israelite,” especially since Leviticus later includes a command to love the non-Israelite or “stranger” in verse 34 (i.e., if “neighbor” refers to any human, then there would be no need to add the command to care for non-Israelites).¹³ Another piece of evidence that he cites in support of his view is the building of terms in verses 11-18 that all appeal to the fellow Israelite: “associate” (*‘āmîṭ*; vv. 11, 15, 17), “neighbor” (*rē‘ā*; vv. 13, 16, 18), “your people” (*‘ammêkâ*; vv. 16, 18), and “brother” (*‘āh*; v. 17).¹⁴ Interestingly, he argues more adamantly against the further narrowing of the term “neighbor” than the broadening. In other words, he rightly denies the possibility of understanding the term as appealing to fellow clansmen or kinsmen rather than all of Israel.¹⁵ Interpreting neighbor simply as kinsmen would mean that the commands to not hate and to love should only be performed within one’s immediate clan or family, which ultimately means that one could potentially hate the member of another clan within Israel and not breach the Holiness Code.

¹² Hartley, 318.

¹³ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1655-56. Milgrom does state that “Jesus and the rabbis gave this injunction a universal context” (p. 1654). However, Milgrom does not address how he reconciles the contradiction between his understanding of “neighbor” referring to fellow Israelites and Jesus and the rabbis’ universal interpretation. One could argue that Jesus and the rabbis were being creatively loose when interpreting the “neighbor” universally, an interpretation apparently unintended, according to Milgrom, in the context of Lev 19:18.

¹⁴ See chart in *ibid.*, 1655.

¹⁵ See also Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 272.

Hartley and Milgrom give fair and accurate arguments for the understanding of “neighbor” as referring to fellow Israelites rather than merely fellow kinsmen or to everyone universally. If one is asking who the neighbor is in Leviticus 19:18, it is right to say, based on the immediate context, that it is the fellow Israelite. However, narrowing the interpretation of Leviticus 19:18 leads to a myopic view of what it means to love in terms of achieving holiness. This is not to say that Hartley or Milgrom are off-base; rather, they do not seem to go far enough in grasping the importance of loving the non-Israelite in connection to the surrounding context of Leviticus 19:18. That is, though they mention the love of the stranger in verse 34, they treat it as if it has no bearing to the possible meaning of neighbor in verse 18 itself. For example, one may note the parallel structures of verses 18 and 34, respectively:

- a. You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the sons of your people, but
- b. you shall love your neighbor as yourself;
- c. I am the LORD.

- a. The stranger who resides with you shall be to you as native among you, and
- b. you shall love him as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt;
- c. I am the LORD your God.

In verse 34, the LORD instructs the Israelites to treat the stranger who resides among them as a “native” (*'ezrah*), a term often used for the Israelites themselves (e.g., Lev 23:42).¹⁶ Not

¹⁶ Joel Kaminsky takes the view of Christiana van Houten and José Ramírez Kidd that “resident alien” or “stranger” (*gēr*) in Lev 19:34 refers only to one who is a non-Israelite living in the land of Israel with the people of Israel, not non-Israelites in general. The wording of verse 34 supports this point, as it explicitly distinguishes the “stranger” as one who “resides with” the Israelites. Thus, Kaminsky argues that this command does not apply to all non-Israelites. While Lev 19:18 and 19:34 do not explicitly command that Israelites should love non-Israelites not residing with them, it is incongruous to interpret these verses in such a way that it implies that the Israelites should be indifferent towards non-Israelites not residing with them. Such an interpretation ignores the call for Israelites to place love at the center of their dealings with all people with whom they come into contact throughout their daily lives and the fact that it is unlikely that such a love-centric way of living would (or should) cease when encountering a person who lives outside of Israel. It also implies that Jesus, Paul, and the rabbis, such as Akiva and Ben Azzai (see *Sifra*, Kedoshim 4:12), were being creatively loose when they interpreted Lev 19:18 as embracing all other commandments in the Torah (and, for Jesus and Paul, the whole OT), especially in the way it teaches that one is to love *all* people. See Joel S. Kaminsky, “Loving One’s (Israelite) Neighbor: Election and Commandment in Leviticus 19,” *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*; *Richmond* 62, no. 2 (April 2008): 123-32. For a study on the background of how Lev 19:18 came to be elevated in the Second Temple period, see Henry Ansgar Kelly, “Love of

only are they to count the stranger as a native, but they are to love the stranger (native-stranger?) as themselves. They are to treat the neighbor in such a way because the Israelites were once aliens (or strangers) in the land of Egypt, and they would have remained so if it were not for the love of God, which is emphasized in the small phrase “I am the LORD your God.” Hence, the Israelite is commanded to love the neighbor and the stranger as he loves himself.¹⁷ The self does not change; likewise, the neighbor cannot love oneself yet love the stranger as oneself in a different way.¹⁸ They are, in a way, different and yet the same. Verses 18 and 34 may identify the recipient of love using two different terms, but the act of loving as oneself is the same mode of love in both instances.

In terms of achieving holiness, love properly understood in Leviticus 19 results in love for both the fellow Israelite and the stranger, but it is uncertain how this “love” is performed or what it looks like. Abraham Malamat suggests that “love” in Leviticus 19:18 should be

Neighbor as Great Commandment in the Time of Jesus: Grasping at Straws in the Hebrew Scriptures,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 60, no. 2 (2017): 265-81.

¹⁷ On the interpretation of the “neighbor” as appealing universally to all people, see Gerstenberger, 272; Mark F. Rooker, *Leviticus: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2000), 232-33; and Jay Sklar, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 246-47, who begins his commentary on Lev 19:17-18 by stating that the two verses teach Israelites how to “respond when wronged by a *fellow Israelite* [emphasis original]” but later goes on to say that the neighbor is “anyone with whom one interacts in the course of the day.” Gordon J. Wenham notes only that the terms “love” and “neighbor” are both “wide-ranging in their scope and meaning” but does not discuss to whom “neighbor” might refer. He does concede, however, that Jesus and Paul did not move beyond the meaning of Lev 19:18 when they summarized “our other duties toward our fellow men” in this command (e.g., Matt 22:39-40; Rom 13:9). Thus, it seems Wenham is comfortable interpreting “neighbor” as referring to all “fellow men.” See Gordon J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979), 269. Likewise, Allen Ross is silent when it comes to identifying the “neighbor” but remarks that it refers to “anyone in need that one encounters.” See Allen P. Ross, *Holiness to the Lord: A Guide to the Exposition of the Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 362.

¹⁸ Milgrom, 1655-56, lists four ways “as yourself” is interpreted: (1) it modifies the noun “neighbor” and means “who is a person like you”; (2) it modifies the verb “love” and means “Love (the good) *for* your fellow as you (love the good *for*) yourself” (emphasis original); (3) it stands as a separate phrase and means “for he is yourself”; and (4) it is reflexive and means “as you would have others love you.” Milgrom prefers the second option, and it is the option preferred in the interpretation of Lev 19:18 expressed in this essay. See also Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, “Commanding an Impossibility? Reflections on the Golden Rule in Leviticus 19:18B,” in *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*, ed. J. G. McConville and Karl Möller (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 38-40.

understood as meaning “to be of use to,” “to be beneficial to,” or “to assist or help.”¹⁹ This verse, then, does not command one to love in a way that is merely conceptual or emotional but in a way that is grounded in actions that are helpful for the neighbor.²⁰ The same is true for the love of the “stranger” espoused in verse 34, which is emphasized even further by the reminder that such love mirrors God’s love for them while they were strangers in Egypt (i.e., a love known through God’s actions in rescuing them).²¹ Leviticus 19:18, therefore, commands the Israelite to love the neighbor and the stranger in a way that is helpful as one would help oneself (or as one wishes to be helped by others). Accordingly, Leviticus 19:18 can act as a summary statement of the whole message of chapter 19, one that will later be used not only by Jesus and Paul but also by other Jewish teachers, such as those of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

The Love of the Neighbor in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

Introduction

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*TI2P*) is one work in a collection of Jewish texts known as the Pseudepigrapha.²² As the name suggests, all the works in the Pseudepigrapha are ascribed to individuals, mostly important figures in the Old Testament, who lived long before the actual author(s). One such text is *TI2P*, which claims to be written by the twelve sons of

¹⁹ Abraham Malamat, “‘Love Your Neighbor as Yourself’ What It Really Means,” *The Biblical Archaeology Review* 16, no. 4 (1990): 50-51.

²⁰ Jesus highlights this understanding of “love” as “to assist or help” by telling the Parable of the Good Samaritan in response to the citation of Lev 19:18b by the “expert in the law” (Luke 10:25-37). In the parable, loving the neighbor takes the form of a stranger helping another by feeling compassion for him, tending to his wounds, rescuing him, and sheltering him. In other words, both internal emotions and external actions are present in the Samaritan’s love for the neighbor.

²¹ Kiuchi, 40-45, argues that while “love” should be understood in terms of outward conduct, it also contains an emotive element. Thus, “love” in Lev 19:18 refers to “one’s total attitude to his/her neighbour.” See also Gerstenberger, 272; Hartley, 318; Kaminsky, 125; Milgrom, 1653-54; and Ross, 362.

²² H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983), 775-828.

Jacob (i.e., the “twelve patriarchs” of Israel) but was written by a Jewish author(s) sometime in the second century BC.²³ The genre of testament in terms of these Jewish writings can be summarized best by the English phrase “last will and testament.”²⁴ In other words, the testaments of the twelve sons of Jacob are their last words and teachings to their sons before the fathers die. Much like the Old Testament, it is difficult to pinpoint a single overriding theme or “center” of *T12P*. There are certainly consistent themes, but it seems the main similarity between all twelve testaments is the desire to teach the readers how to live out God-pleasing lives.

The fathers in *T12P* do not formulate the teachings strictly on God’s law, though they are undoubtedly inspired by it. Rather, they teach their sons to obey their words as an effort to promote piety or morality, not strict obedience to God’s law. One such example is the *Testament of Reuben*’s exhortation against sexual promiscuity in which he calls for his sons to abandon the desire for women by taming their flesh (1:9-10),²⁵ teach their wives and daughters to dress conservatively so as not to tempt men (chap. 5), and protect themselves from “Beliar” and the

²³ On the dating of *T12P*, see Kee, 777-78. Over the last two centuries, there has been much debate on whether *T12P* stands as a source for Jewish tradition or has been redacted too far beyond the original document by Christians that there is now no way to reconstruct the Jewish original. Robert Kugler takes the latter approach, in agreement with Marinus de Jonge and others, and rejects “the notion that textual criticism of the *Testaments* provides insight into their compositional history, much less abets the search for a pre-Christian, Jewish form of the work.” Thus, according to Kugler, the earliest possible dating of *T12P* is sometime in the second century AD. If Kugler is correct in his assessment (and agreement with de Jonge), then *T12P* is not a Jewish document written in the Second Temple period and, accordingly, cannot be used as a source for Jewish interpretations of Scripture or Jewish theology during that time. Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). See also Akiyama, 17-18. However, David deSilva has recently argued that Kugler and others are too hasty in concluding that a pre-Christian Jewish original is beyond reach. While the original document certainly cannot be fully reconstructed, *T12P* houses many ideas that would be at home in Second Temple Judaism, especially the sections concerning ethical teachings (as many of the Christian interpolations were placed in sections dealing with eschatology). David A. deSilva, “The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 23, no. 1 (September 2013): 21-68. See also M. de Jonge, “The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *Novum Testamentum* 44, no. 4 (2002): 371-92.

²⁴ James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983), 774, for his concise introduction of the genre of testament.

²⁵ Cf. 6:1, “So guard yourself against sexual promiscuity, and if you want to remain pure in your mind, protect your sense from women.”

negative circumstances he can bring on men (4:11).²⁶ Tellingly, the law is not used to support any of these teachings. Overall, the strong appeal to piety in addition to the law is best seen in 6:4: “Because in sexual promiscuity there is a place for neither understanding nor *piety*, and every passion dwells in its desire.”²⁷ Thus, one can expect that where teachings come close to Leviticus 19:18 in terms of loving the neighbor as oneself, there is an appeal to morality (and piety) in addition to God’s law.

Though each of the twelve testaments could be analyzed individually for teachings similar to Leviticus 19:18, such a full-scale treatment is beyond the scope of the current project. Therefore, only two testaments will be addressed fully: (1) the *Testament of Issachar* (*T. Iss.*) and (2) the *Testament of Benjamin* (*T. Ben.*). These two testaments are chosen in particular because they show the greatest affinity towards a tradition that resembles Leviticus 19:18 (i.e., a command to love the neighbor).²⁸ After looking at these two testaments, the third section will present the theme of *brotherly love*, which is the primary type of love taught throughout *T12P*. The section will conclude with the argument that though *T. Iss.* and *T. Zeb.* seem to hint toward a universal application of love towards the neighbor (i.e., love of all humankind, Israelite and non-Israelite alike), *T12P* as a whole understands the neighbor to be primarily the fellow Israelite. However, one cannot ignore the fact that *T12P* includes pieces of a tradition in which Leviticus 19:18 (and, thus, love of neighbor) is understood universally.

²⁶ *T. Reub.* 4:11 reads, “For if promiscuity does not triumph over your reason, then neither can Beliar conquer you.”

²⁷ Emphasis added. Kee states in note 6a that “[t]he blending of cultural backgrounds is evident here, in that *eusebeia*, which is a common place Hellenistic ethical term for piety, is here used apparently as a translation of *hēšed*, from which the Hasidim took their name.” See Kee, *T12P*, 784.

²⁸ *T12P* nowhere explicitly cites Lev 19:18. The intention of this study is to find and describe areas of the testaments where they seem to resemble a teaching similar to Lev 19:18. While one could certainly argue that the absence of Lev 19:18 may indicate that the authors did *not* have it in mind during the writing of *T12P*, the similarity in language seems to suggest otherwise.

Testament of Issachar, the fifth son of Jacob and Leah

Issachar, according to *T. Iss.*, was a humble farmer who did his best to serve the Lord and take care of all those in need. Like many of the other testaments, Issachar promotes the possession and practice of integrity, a valuable virtue that exemplifies Issachar's character: "In the integrity of my heart, I supplied everything from the good things of the earth to all the poor and oppressed" (3:8).²⁹ It is in relation to this sort of charitable love that Issachar exhorts his sons: "Keep the Law of God, my children; achieve integrity; live without malice, not tinkering with God's commands or your neighbor's affairs. Love the Lord and your neighbor; be compassionate toward poverty and sickness" (5:1-2).³⁰ There are two main points to consider in this text: (1) the appeal to God's law and (2) the double command to love the Lord and the neighbor.³¹

Unlike the majority of the twelve testaments, *T. Iss.* repeatedly appeals to God's law as a foundation for ethical teaching. In this text, the command to "Love the Lord and your neighbor" is not merely a part in a system of piety but is rooted in the law of God. Hence, the command to love the Lord and neighbor is authoritative because it was originally a commandment provided

²⁹ Kee, 803.

³⁰ Ibid. Cf. 3:3-4: "I was no meddler in my dealings, nor was I evil or slanderous to my neighbor. I spoke against no one, nor did I disparage life of any human." Here one can see a possible allusion to Leviticus 19:17-18 as he denies any hateful behavior towards his neighbor, especially in being slanderous. Cf. 4:1-2: "Now, listen to me, children, and live in integrity of heart, for in it I have observed everything that is well-pleasing to the Lord. The genuine man does not desire gold, he does not defraud his neighbor, he does not long for fancy foods, nor does he want fine clothes."

³¹ In the Greek manuscripts, the phrase "love the Lord and your neighbor" in *T. Iss.* 5:2 reads, ἄλλα ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Κύριον καὶ τὸν πλησίον [ὑμῶν] (lit. "but you shall love the love and [your] neighbor). The phrase "Love your neighbor as yourself" in Lev 19:18 in the LXX reads, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν ("but (or and) you shall love your neighbor as yourself"). The linking of the verb "love" (ἀγαπάω, which is used for "love" consistently throughout *T12P*) with "neighbor" (πλησίος) in *T. Iss.* 5:2 echoes the same combination in Lev 19:18. However, *T. Iss.* 5:2 swaps the singular "you" for the plural "you," drops out the "as yourself," and links loving the neighbor with loving the Lord. The intentional coupling of love for the Lord and the neighbor is similar to Jesus's teaching in the Synoptic Gospels (i.e., Matt 22:37-39; Mark 12:30-31; Luke 10:27). For the Greek manuscripts of *T12P*, see R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Edited from Nine Mss. Together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908).

by the Lord. Even when Issachar commands his children to “achieve integrity,” he goes on to define integrity as the act of “not tinkering with God’s commands.” There is nothing wrong with the venture to follow or teach a moral code, but an appeal to God’s law as something special and unique is biblical. The OT does not produce ethics for ethic’s sake but rather for the sake of the relationship between the Holy Lord and His (ideally) holy people, especially regarding the Holiness Code in Leviticus. Issachar seems to embrace this worldview. Thus, one can see a close connection between the parallel imperatives to (1) “Keep the Law of God” and (2) “Love the Lord and your neighbor.”

Issachar commands his sons to love both the Lord and the neighbor. The two are intimately and naturally linked together. As the testament comes to an end, Issachar tells his children one last time, “I joined in lamentation with *every oppressed human being*, and shared my bread with the poor. I did not eat alone; I did not transgress boundaries; I acted in piety and truth all my days. The Lord I loved with all my strength; likewise, I loved *every human being* as I love my children” (7:5-6).³² The author assumes that loving the Lord goes hand in hand with loving the neighbor. It seems Issachar is motivated to love his neighbor as a result or extension of his love for the Lord (and perhaps because of integrity). These few verses also display who exactly the neighbor is in this context: “every human being.” The *Testament of Issachar* is thus an example of the universal application of the command to love the neighbor as oneself.

³² Emphasis added. Kee, 804. It is particularly interesting that Issachar states that he loved the Lord with all his “strength” in conjunction with loving “every human being.” Charles, 115, prefers the manuscript evidence for καρδίας (“heart”) but notes that other manuscripts use ἰσχύος (“strength”). Regardless, this combination of loving the Lord to a certain degree coupled with loving the neighbor is similar to Jesus’s coupling of Deut 6:5 (“Love the LORD your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength”) with Lev 19:18, though neither καρδία nor ἰσχύος are used in Deut 6:5 LXX.

Testament of Benjamin, the twelfth son of Jacob and Rachel

The main thrust of *T. Ben.* is to set an example of what a good, righteous, and pious man looks like.³³ For such an example, Benjamin naturally picks the figure of Joseph, Benjamin's only full brother. The author of *T. Ben.* does not offer the reader a colorful description of Benjamin as found of Issachar in *T. Iss.* Rather, *T. Ben.* weaves certain ethical teachings with the story of Joseph, who is presented as embodying all the characteristics Benjamin wishes his sons to subsume. One such example comes when he gives his sons a handful of commands:

love the Lord God of heaven and earth; keep his commandments; pattern your life after the good and pious man Joseph.... *Fear the Lord and love your neighbor.* How many men wanted to destroy him [Joseph], and God looked out for him! For the person who *fears God and loves his neighbor* cannot be plagued by the spirit of Beliar since he is sheltered by God. Neither man's schemes not [*sic*] those of animals prevail over him, for he is aided in living by this: by the love which he has toward his neighbor. (3:1, 3-5).³⁴

Similar to *T. Iss.*, there are two observations worth exploring further: (1) the appeal to the commandments of God and (2) the double command to fear the Lord and love the neighbor.

At first glance, one can see that *T. Ben.* contrasts *T. Iss.* in its preference of the phrase "commandments of God" rather than "the Law of God." Though there is a difference of terms, the phrase "the commandments of God" is another way of referring to the law of God. Accordingly, later in the text, Benjamin again commands his sons to "do the truth, each of you to his neighbor; keep the law of the Lord and his commandments" (10:2-3). The same points made above concerning *T. Iss.* are applicable also for *T. Ben.*: The command to love one's neighbor is closely linked with keeping the law of the Lord and His commandments.

A significant change occurs, however, in *T. Ben.*'s phrasing of the double command: "fear the Lord and love your neighbor" (3:3). Fear plays an interesting role by sheltering one

³³ For the *Testament of Benjamin*, see Kee, 825-28.

³⁴ Emphasis added. *Ibid.*, 825-26.

from the spirit of Beliar. The act of fearing the Lord is more than mere fright but expresses true awe at the greatness, magnitude, sovereignty, etc. of the God of the universe. To fear the Lord also means that “the Lord is his lot” or that one trusts the Lord as one’s only source of all things. Despite the change of terms, the author again retains the double command aimed at both the Lord and the neighbor. Love of the Lord and love of the neighbor are intrinsically linked.

Unlike *T. Iss.*, *T. Ben.* shows no indication of a universal application of love in terms of the neighbor. In fact, the term seems to be limited only to one’s fellow Israelite, which is supported by the contrasting of how one is to love one’s neighbor and the story of how the eleven brothers failed to love Joseph appropriately. There may be one exception where Benjamin states that a good man “is merciful to all, even though they may be sinners” (4:2). “All,” however, does not necessarily appeal literally to “all” people, as even Israelites can be called “sinners” (e.g., Num 32:14; Isa 1:28; 13:9; 33:14; Amos 9:10).

A narrow reading is further supported when three verses later, Benjamin continues to explain that the good man “loves the person who has the gift of the good spirit as he loves his own life” (4:5). The one to be loved is described as having the “gift of the good spirit.” There is no follow-up on how one knows another has such a gift, but the overall context assumes either the fellow Israelite who is concerned with obeying God’s commandments or the poor and oppressed (Israelites?) whose situation has led to the possession of the good spirit. Thus, one could potentially argue for either a narrow or universal application of love in this verse, but the comparison of love for the neighbor and the hate of the brothers of Joseph seems to indicate that the author of *T. Ben.* has in mind one’s fellow Israelite. Overall, *T. Ben.* primarily views the neighbor as the fellow Israelite, but it is nonetheless clear that love for the neighbor as found in Lev 19:18 seems to lie behind Benjamin’s ethical teachings. In terms of the narrow interpretation

of love for the neighbor, the next section will overview the repeating theme of brotherly love found in *T12P*.

Brotherly Love in *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

Just as *T. Ben* displays a narrow application of neighborly love, the majority of *T12P* proclaims that the Israelites should be concerned primarily with loving their fellow Israelite brothers, which is indeed the narrow understanding of the term “neighbor.” In order to offer a full account of the theme’s occurrence in *T12P*, this section will proceed by quoting primary material. The point is not to drown the reader in quotations that quite frankly cannot be fully appreciated outside the full context but to carry forward the evidence that *T12P* displays the continuous theme of brotherly love as well as a few more examples of a universal application of love for the neighbor. The terms **love**, **neighbor**, and **brother(s)** are bolded so that the reader will be able to follow the theme through each testament.

Testament of Reuben

I call to witness the God of heaven that you do the truth, each to his **neighbor**, and that you show **love**, each to his **brother** (6:9).

Testament of Simeon

And you, my children, each of you **love** his **brothers** with a good heart, and the spirit of envy will depart from you (4:7).

Testament of Judah

...listen to Judah, your father, for these things [i.e., sexual promiscuity and love of money] distance you from the Law of God, blind the direction of the soul, and teach arrogance. They do not permit a man to show mercy to his **neighbor** (18:3).

Testament of Zebulon

Now, my children, I tell you to keep the Lord’s commands; show mercy to your **neighbor**, have compassion on all, not only human beings but to dumb animals.... Have mercy in your inner being, my children, because whatever anyone does to his **neighbor**, the Lord will do to him (5:1, 3).

Being compassionate, I gave some of my catch to every stranger. If anyone were a traveler, or sick, or aged, I cooked the fish, prepared it well, and offered each person according to his need, being either convivial or consoling. Therefore the Lord made my

catch to be an abundance of fish; for whoever shares with his **neighbor** receives multifold from the Lord. I fished for five years, sharing with every person I saw, and sufficing for my father's household. Summers, I fished; winters, I tended the flock of my **brothers** (6:4-8).

Now I will tell you what I did. I saw a man suffering from nakedness in the wintertime and I had compassion on him: I stole a garment secretly from my own household and gave it to the man in difficulty. You, therefore, my children, on the basis of God's caring for you, without discrimination be compassionate and merciful to all. Provide for every person with a kind heart. If at any time you do not have anything to give to the one who is in need, be compassionate and merciful in your inner self. For when my hand could not find the means for contributing to a needy person, I walked with him for seven stades, weeping; my inner being was in torment with sympathy for him (7:1-4).

You also, my children, have compassion toward every person with mercy, in order that the Lord may be compassionate and merciful to you. In the last days God will send his compassion on the earth, and whenever he finds compassionate mercy, in that person he will dwell. To the extent that a man has compassion on his **neighbor**, to that extent the Lord has mercy on him (8:1-3).

Testament of Dan

Each of you speak truth clearly to his **neighbor**, and do not fall into pleasure and troublemaking, but be at peace, holding to the God of peace. Throughout all your life **love** the Lord, and one another with a true heart (5:2-3).

Testament of Gad

Beware, my children, of those who hate, because it leads to lawlessness against the Lord himself. Hatred does not want to hear repeated his commands concerning **love** of **neighbor**, and thus it sins against God (4:1-2).

Now, my children, each of you **love** his **brother**. Drive hatred out of your hearts. **Love** one another in deed and word and inward thought.... **Love** one another from the heart, therefore, and if anyone sins against you, speak to him in peace. Expel the venom of hatred, and do not harbor deceit in your heart. For if anyone confesses and repents, forgive him (6:1, 3).

Testament of Asher

He who cheats his **neighbor** provokes God's wrath; he who serves falsely before the Most High, and yet has mercy on the poor, disregards the Lord who uttered the Law's commands; he provokes him, and yet he alleviates the plight of the poor day laborer (2:6).

Testament of Joseph

So you see, my children, how many things I endured in order not to bring my **brothers** into disgrace. You, therefore, **love** one another and in patient endurance conceal one another's shortcomings. God is delighted by harmony among **brothers** and by the intention of a kind heart that takes pleasure in goodness (17:1-3).

An extensive analysis of each testament is beyond the scope of this study. There are, however, a few observations worth exploring further. First, there is an extensive amount of material pulled from *T. Zeb.* This is due to the fact that, like *T. Iss.*, *T. Zeb.* strongly appeals to the universal application of love toward all people as the neighbor. Zebulon even goes so far as to tell of a time when he stole clothes from his household in order to clothe a man during the winter. One could hardly find a clearer understanding of the universality of neighbor than 17:2: “You, therefore, my children, on the basis of God’s caring for you, *without discrimination be compassionate and merciful to all.*”³⁵ Unlike *T. Iss.* and *T. Ben.*, *T. Zeb.* does not couple loving the Lord with loving the neighbor.

Second, the appeal to love, whether of the more general neighbor or of the specific brother, is linked to the commandments or law of God. *T. Jud.* exhorts the sons to stay away from sexual promiscuity and love of money because they lead one away from the law of God and also hinder one’s ability to show mercy to one’s neighbor. *T. Zeb.* calls for two parallel commands: “keep the Lord’s commands” and “show mercy to your neighbor.” He also bases love of neighbor on God’s love for the sons. *T. Asher* makes the interesting argument that unloving action towards the neighbor is equivalent to disregarding “the Lord who uttered the Lord’s commands.”

Third, similar to the second point, many of the patriarchs teach their sons to love *both* the Lord and the neighbor. *T. Dan.* first exhorts the sons to “speak truth” to the neighbor and then commands them to love the Lord throughout their entire lives and to love “one another with a true heart.” *T. Gad* offers what seems to be a negative version of the pattern seen so far, as Gad explains that hate leads to the disobedience of the command of God to love the neighbor and is,

³⁵ Emphasis added.

thus, a sin against God. Similarly, *T. Ash.* describes the unloving individual as one who “provokes God’s wrath” and disregards the Lord, tying love of neighbor and regard for God together in a two-for-one package.

Finally, a majority of the testaments speak of loving the neighbor in terms of loving the brother(s). In other words, the term “neighbor” is narrowed down to mean only “the fellow Israelite.” *T. Reub.* “calls to witness” that the sons are truthful with their neighbors and show love to their brothers. Since the construction of the verse is in parallel, “neighbor” should be naturally understood as meaning “brothers.” *T. Sim.* has only one command to love, and it is strictly limited to the brother (i.e., the term “neighbor” does not appear in the text). Though the universal appeal of *T. Zeb* has already been mentioned, *T. Zeb.* also speaks briefly about loving the brother, as Zebulon describes his actions of habitually tending his brothers’ flocks. After *T. Dan.* warns the sons that hatred leads to disregard for the Lord, Dan exhorts his sons to love each other’s fellow brother. *T. Jos.* provides one of the most detailed accounts of brotherly love, as Joseph describes how much his merciful actions portrayed the love for his brothers.

Conclusion

Many references throughout T12P pertain to a teaching on how one is to love the neighbor. *T. Iss.* and *T. Ben.* were analyzed separately in order to show the close relationship between the command to follow God’s law and commandments and the command to love the neighbor. The analysis of these two works also shows that the double command to love the Lord and love the neighbor makes an appearance and plays an important role in exhorting the sons of the patriarchs to fulfill such commands. The study provided quotations from most of the testaments in order to highlight the prevalence of neighborly and brotherly love.

Overall, there are three categories in *T12P* for how one can interpret the range of meaning of the term “neighbor”: (1) narrowly, as in loving one’s fellow Israelite (i.e., brother); (2) universally, as in loving any and every human being; and (3) ambiguously, as the text does not specify between the first two options. The mere presence of a universal interpretation of neighbor is crucial for the present study. It shows that at the time of the writing of *T12P* (second-century BC), there existed a tradition where the command to love the neighbor as found in Leviticus 19:18 was understood as teaching that one is to love *all people*, Israelite and non-Israelite alike. However, the overwhelming presence of a narrow interpretation of neighbor shows that the author was influenced by a tradition where loving the fellow Israelite was of primary importance. After all, the Israelites were a people connected by ethnicity, cultic ritual, a special history, faith in the Lord, and eschatological expectations. In other words, they shared a similar, if not a completely identical, worldview. Regardless, when one considers the whole of *T12P*, one begins to grasp the overwhelming exhortation to call the sons of the patriarchs to love their fellow Israelites, despite the few exceptions of universal application.³⁶

The Golden Rule in Tobit 4:15

The book of Tobit, written around 250-175 BC, offers an entertaining story about how a handful of righteous Jews embody God’s law and live faithful lives in service of God and their fellow Jews.³⁷ The main character, Tobit, performs many actions that set an example for how a

³⁶ Another Pseudepigraphal book that mentions teachings concerning the love of the neighbor in a fashion resembling Lev 19:18 is *Jubilees*. Specifically, such teachings occur in *Jubilees* 7:20; 20:2; 35:20, 22, 24, 26; 36:4, 8; 37:23; 46:1. On the background of *Jubilees* as well as a commentary on the text, see O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 35-142. On the use of Lev 19:17-18 in *Jubilees*, see Atar Livneh, “‘Love Your Fellow as Yourself’: The Interpretation of Leviticus 19:17-18 in the Book of *Jubilees*,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 18, no. 2 (2011): 173-99.

³⁷ For the dating of Tobit, as well as a fuller introduction and larger analysis of the book of Tobit, see David A. deSilva, “Tobit,” in *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker

Jew is to subsume and display an ethos that is pleasing to God. Specifically, Tobit exemplifies righteousness by faithfully attending the festivals in Israel (Tob 1:6), offering sacrifices at the temple (Tob 1:6-7), taking care of orphans and widows (Tob 1:7), upholding endogamy (i.e., marrying within one's own people, especially one's own tribe) (Tob 1:9), avoiding the breaking of the kosher laws (Tob 1:10-11), and burying the bodies of his fellow Jews (Tob 1:17). The other characters in the story, Anna (Tobit's wife and Tobias's mother), Tobias (Tobit's son), and Sarah (Tobit and Tobias's relative in the tribe of Naphtali), also display righteousness in the choices that they make. While Tobit and Anna (and a few other minor characters) represent righteous Jews who are older in age, Tobias and Sarah stand as characters who are coming of age, as they both face hardships and must decide which choices are the right ones to take in remaining faithful to God. Tobit, therefore, is best described as a story that offers its readers, young and old, examples of how a Jew may live a righteous and God-pleasing life.

In the second chapter of Tobit, Tobit runs into a bit of bad luck (Tob 2:7-10). Shortly after returning from burying a fellow Jew's body, he lies down in the courtyard of his house and falls asleep. Unfortunately for him, he falls asleep against a wall where birds are perched above him, and the droppings of the birds fall directly into Tobit's eyes, which eventually causes him to go blind despite attempted treatment. The reader is then told that Tobit remains blind for four years; he becomes completely vulnerable and relies on others to take care of him. Feeling ashamed and useless, Tobit offers a prayer to God in chapter three, where he proclaims that it would be better for him "to die than to see so much distress in my life and to listen to insults" (Tob 3:6).³⁸ Tobit, who is expecting God to honor his request for death, sends his son Tobias to

Academic, 2018), 58-82. The book of Tobit is one writing in a collection of works known as the Apocrypha or, to the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Russian Orthodox Churches, the Deuterocanon.

³⁸ Unless otherwise noted, all references to Tobit are in the *New Revised Standard Version*.

retrieve money he left with Gabael. Before sending his son off, however, Tobit gives his *testament* to Tobias, much like the patriarchs do in *T12P*.³⁹

In his testament to Tobias in chapter four, Tobit includes a long list of commands for his son to follow, and one of the commands of particular interest for this study is Tobit 4:15a: “And what you hate, do not do to anyone.”⁴⁰ This sort of command is referred to as the “Golden Rule,” though it is here formulated as the negative version (i.e., do *not* do instead of *do*).⁴¹ Although it may at first not seem obvious as to why a study on the use of Leviticus 19:18 would include texts espousing the Golden Rule, Leviticus 19:18 loosely fits the pattern of the Golden Rule and is usually defined as the Golden Rule of the OT; thus, any occurrence of the Golden Rule in Jewish texts is likely an allusion to Leviticus 19:18.⁴² Therefore, the negative version of the Golden Rule in Tobit 4:15a is counted among the texts that make up the tradition of Leviticus 19:18 in Second Temple Judaism.

Similar to the exploration of Leviticus 19:18 in *T12P* above, it is pertinent to identify to whom Tobit 4:15a applies. In other words, does it apply to actions done for fellow Jews or is it a general principle that applies to actions done for any person? Since Tobit serves as a story that

³⁹ Irene Nowell points out that Tobit’s instruction in chapter four resembles wisdom literature such as the Wisdom of Ben Sira (e.g., Sir 3:1-16; 7:27-28). The genre of wisdom and testament are closely related, but considering Tobit is leaving Tobias a list of commands before his expected death, it seems that Tobit 4 falls into the genre of testament. See Irene Nowell, *Jonah, Tobit, Judith*, New Collegeville Bible Commentary (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2015).

⁴⁰ In the LXX, Tobit 4:15a reads, καὶ ὃ μισεῖς, μὴ δὲνὶ ποιήσῃς (“and what you hate, do to no one”).

⁴¹ On the possible source of Tobit’s version of the Golden Rule, see deSilva, “Tobit,” 80-81 and Robert J. Littman, *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Boston: Brill, 2008), 93.

⁴² Milgrom, 1653, links Lev 19:18 with other occurrences of the Golden Rule, such as bShabb. 31a, Sir 28:4, Matt 7:2, and Luke 6:13. One example of the Lev 19:18 as a form of the Golden Rule is seen in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* Lev 19:18, which states, “Be not revengeful, nor cherish animosity against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor himself, as though there be (cause of) hatred with thee thou mayest not do (evil) to him: I am the Lord.” The command to “love thy neighbor himself” is coupled with the negative version of the Golden Rule “thou mayest not do (evil) to him.” The translation of *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* is from J. W. Etheridge, trans., *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch: With the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee*, vol. 2 (New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1968)

aims to teach its audience ethical standards that are God-pleasing, clarifying the application of this Golden Rule is important to understanding the development of the tradition surrounding Leviticus 19:18 in Second Temple Judaism. There are two specific areas to explore: (1) the overall context of the book of Tobit and (2) the immediate context of Tobit 4:15a.

As mentioned above, the book of Tobit is primarily concerned with telling a story of how a small group of Jews live in a way that is loyal to God's law and, thus, is God-pleasing. This story of Tobit and his family aims to teach its Jewish audience a set of values. As David deSilva states, "These values sought to dispose the audience to engage in behaviors that would sustain the Jewish minority culture amid the Gentile world."⁴³ Therefore, the major purpose of the book of Tobit is to influence the daily living of Jews, not Gentiles. Accordingly, the sections of Tobit that teach a list of ethical standards and commands, such as chapter four, are for Jews and are meant to be lived out by Jews in relation to other Jews. This does not mean that these values could not extend into Jewish relations with Gentiles, but Tobit does not address this issue.

In addition to the overall context and purpose of the book of Tobit, the immediate context of Tobit 4:15a also gives indicators for how one is to understand its application. First, the testament section of chapter four begins with Tobit telling Tobias to "revere the Lord all your days, my son, and refuse to sin or to transgress his commandments." Remaining faithful to the Lord's commandments, therefore, is the goal of each proceeding statement, including the Golden Rule. Second, in his speech, Tobit clarifies that Tobias should "give alms" only to those "who practice righteousness" (Tob 4:6). A similar statement is made several verses later: "Place your bread on the grave of the righteous, but give none to sinners" (Tob 4:17). While fellow Jews could certainly be labeled "sinners," it is unlikely that any Jew would describe a Gentile as

⁴³ deSilva, "Tobit," 66.

“righteous.” Therefore, Tobit indicates that Tobias should perform charitable acts for righteous Jews, not all people. Third, after Tobit orders Tobias to marry a woman within his people and not a foreign woman, he summarizes his request again by stating, “So now, my son, love your kindred, and in your heart do not disdain your kindred, the sons and daughters of your people, by refusing to take a wife for yourself among them” (Tob 4:13). This is the only occurrence of “love” in the list of commands, and it comes in the form of Tobit urging Tobias to marry within his own people. By upholding endogamy, Tobias shall show that he loves his brothers and sisters.⁴⁴

Overall, it is clear from the larger context of Tobit and the immediate context of Tobit 4:15a that the Golden Rule, “And what you hate, do not to anyone,” is applicable to Jews in their relationships with other Jews (specifically, it is applicable to Tobias in his relationships with his kindred). “Anyone,” then, is limited to any Jew with which Tobias, or another Jew, comes into contact, especially those who are righteous. Therefore, the Golden Rule in Tobit 4:15a expresses a command to perform unhateful actions primarily toward the fellow Israelite, which is a narrow understanding and interpretation of Leviticus 19:18.

The negative version of the Golden Rule is interesting in that it does not promote action in benefit of the fellow Israelite based on *love* but on the basis that one should not do to another what one *hates*. That is, the negative version of the Golden Rule promotes *neutral* actions, not positive ones. One can follow the command to do not to another what one hates by simply ensuring that one does not perform negative actions against the neighbor. This does not mean that not doing what one hates to another could lead to positive actions, which it seems to mean in

⁴⁴ For a fuller study on the importance of kinship in the book of Tobit, especially as one of the major themes of the book, see Vincent T. M. Skemp, “Adelphos and the Theme of Kinship in Tobit,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 75, no. 1 (1999): 92-103.

the immediate context of Tobit 4:15a. Rather, it does not, on its own, command what Leviticus 19:18 does: loving actions that benefit the neighbor. In summary, Tobit 4:15a uses the negative Golden Rule, which falls in the tradition of Leviticus 19:18, in a narrow way by implying that the command be performed in relations with fellow Jews only. Such a use of the negative version of the Golden Rule can be seen in other Jewish texts, especially Shabbat 31a in the Babylonian Talmud.⁴⁵

The Golden Rule in Bavli Shabbat 31a

One of the more famous examples of the Golden Rule within Judaism is Hillel's negative version of it in Bavli (i.e., the Babylonian Talmud) Shabbat 31a (bShabb. 31a): "What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbour."⁴⁶ According to Jewish tradition, Hillel the Elder, along with Shammai the Elder, is one of the fathers of the rabbinic movement within Judaism who lived in the first century BC and partially into the first century AD.⁴⁷ Although this qualifies Hillel as a Jewish teacher living during the time of the Second Temple, the Bavli was not completed until sometime between AD 500-750, which is long after the Second Temple period.⁴⁸ However, for the present study, it is assumed that the Bavli tells a story that comes from oral tradition and involves what Hillel would have taught during his life, though it is wise to clarify that it is not entirely certain if the story is historical or even represents a tradition that reflects the milieu of

⁴⁵ On the connection between Bavli Shabbat 31a and Tobit 4:15a, see deSilva, "Tobit," 66 and Littman, 93.

⁴⁶ All translations of the Bavli come from Isidore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*, trans. H. Freedman (London: Soncino, 1935).

⁴⁷ David C. Kraemer, *A History of the Talmud* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 167.

⁴⁸ David Halivni, *The Formation of the Babylonian Talmud*, trans. Jeffrey L. Rubenstein (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). Halvini argues for a system of dating the Talmud that challenges the tradition view, which usually dates the completion of the Talmud between AD 450-550. For example, Kraemer, 134, dates the completion of the Talmud around AD 500. To accommodate this discrepancy, this essay states the range of completion as somewhere between AD 500-750.

thoughts abounding in the Second Temple period. Regardless, the study will move forward with this assumption and treat bShabb. 31a in the context of the other Second Temple Jewish texts highlighted here.

Bavli Shabbat 31a begins a series of stories that revolve around the testing of both Shammai and Hillel. The opening story tells of two men who wagered a bet that one of them could make Hillel angry by continually asking him questions (a bet that he loses). The story begins, however, with the opening line, “Our Rabbis taught: A man should always be gentle like Hillel, and not impatient like Shammai” (bShabb. 30b). Thus, the opening story and the stories that follow, including Hillel’s pronouncement of the negative Golden Rule, aim to teach the reader to be like Hillel, namely, to be patient.⁴⁹ After the opening story, bShabb. 31a provides three stories about a “heathen” (i.e., a Gentile) who goes to both Shammai and Hillel and asks to be converted to Judaism on certain conditions. In each story, Shammai becomes impatient and chases the man away, while Hillel is patient and usually accepts the conditions put forth, though he inevitably teaches the proselyte a lesson.

In the story of interest for this study, a certain Gentile goes to Shammai and Hillel and asks each one to “[m]ake me a proselyte, on condition that you teach me the whole Torah while I stand on one foot.”⁵⁰ Shammai responds by beating the man with the “builders cubit” that was in his hand. Hillel, however, responds by telling the man, “What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbour: that is the whole Torah, while the rest is the commentary thereof; go and learn it.”⁵¹ There are three areas to explore: (1) the identity of the neighbor, (2) the use of the negative

⁴⁹ Jacob Neusner, “The Golden Rule in Classical Judaism,” *The Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 11, no. 2 (2008): 302.

⁵⁰ Epstein, 140.

⁵¹ Ibid.

version of the Golden Rule, and (3) the summation of the entire Torah within the negative Golden Rule.

As with the allusions to Leviticus 19:18 in other texts, the identity of the neighbor in bShabb. 31a is crucial in understanding how the author applied the command. Jacob Neusner comments that “in both positive and negative formulations [of the Golden Rule], the focus is on ‘your fellow,’ and in context that excludes the stranger.”⁵² However, Neusner does not address the identification of the man in the story as a “heathen” and the fact that it is this heathen that is the one who is to “go and learn it,” that is, the summation of the Torah in the negative Golden Rule. It is unlikely that the Gentile was to understand that Hillel was telling him to not do what he hates only when it concerned Jews. Since there is no further explanation of the negative Golden Rule, it is difficult to identify how Hillel himself would have understood the command in terms of his own ethical standards and worldview. With the little information provided, the identification of the neighbor seems to point toward a more universal application.

Similar to Tobit 4:15, bShabb. 31a also frames the Golden Rule in the negative form (i.e., do *not* do instead of *do*). Accordingly, the negative Golden Rule encourages its doer to determine which actions one should take based on what one *hates* rather than in terms of *love*. The same points made above concerning Tobit 4:15a also apply for bShabb. 31a. Abiding by the negative formulation of the Golden Rule would require no more than *neutral* actions. While one could certainly go on to produce positive actions (i.e., actions that are beneficial to the receiver), the negative Golden Rule does not promote such actions on its own as Leviticus 19:18 does. It does, however, endorse an attitude that seeks peace with others.

⁵² Neusner, 295. Neusner does go on to mention the comments of Rabbi Akiva and Ben Azzai in Sifra, the latter of whom interprets the “neighbor” in Leviticus 19:18 to be any human.

One characteristic that is unique to bShabb. 31a is the summation of the entire Torah in the negative Golden Rule.⁵³ While some Second Temple Jewish texts link Leviticus 19:18 or the Golden Rule to “the Law,” such as *T12P*, no other text outside of bShabb. 31a summarizes the whole Torah in the Golden Rule (whether formulated positively or negatively). The Gentile, as well as the reader of the Bavli, receiving Hillel’s teaching is to recognize that one is to view all ethical or moral standards, and more, in the Torah through the lens of the negative Golden Rule. Though Hillel does not proceed to say more about what he means by this, the stories in bShabb. 31a and other places in the Bavli that involve Hillel show that he embodies the negative Golden Rule. In all his actions toward the Gentiles that come to him, Hillel is patient, wise, and considerate, and he maintains peace with them despite their seemingly bothersome presence and requests. He does not, one can assume, do to others what is hateful to him. By embodying the negative Golden Rule, Hillel also sets the example for how one can embody the whole Torah.

If it truly represents the thinking and teaching of Hillel the Elder, bShabb. 31a marks an important development in the use of Leviticus 19:18 (or the tradition surrounding it) during the Second Temple period in terms of a universal interpretation of neighbor, which aligns with certain portions of *T12P*, and, especially, the placement of the Golden Rule as a summation of the entire Torah. Moreover, the negative formulation of the Golden Rule, as opposed to the positive formulation, places bShabb. 31a in a group with Tobit 4:15, as the promotion of not doing to others what one hates is different from the promotion of doing to others what is loving and beneficial (in a way that mirrors God’s love) to others as one would do (or wish others to do)

⁵³ Jesus summarizes the whole OT under Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 in Matt 22:40: “On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets.” As discussed below, Paul famously summarizes the whole law under Lev 19:18 in Rom 13:8-10 and Gal 5:13-15.

for oneself. Such a universal, negatively formulated, and exalted use of Leviticus 19:18 is, however, entirely abandoned in one well-known Jewish group, namely, the Essenes at Qumran.

The Love of the Brother in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule

Introduction

The Damascus Document (CD) and the Community Rule (1QS) were written by sectarian Jewish communities, whose members were referred to as the Essenes, living on the western shore of the Dead Sea around 200-70 BC.⁵⁴ Although the general trend in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is to refer to one community living in Qumran, recent studies propose that it is likely more accurate to envision the Dead Sea Scrolls as a product of multiple sectarian communities that shared a worldview. Regardless, because of shared vocabulary and ideas, CD and 1QS seem to stem from the same community or, at least, similar communities.⁵⁵ This section assumes that this is the case and treats CD and 1QS as belonging in the same stream of tradition, especially when it comes to using Leviticus 19:18. This section aims to show that the use of Leviticus 19:18, or allusion to it, is narrow in application and promotes loving and beneficial actions toward the fellow members of the community, which is not surprising considering the community (or communities) that produced CD and 1QS was sectarian in nature.

⁵⁴ Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 2nd ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 1, 14.

⁵⁵ Akiyama, 96-99.

The Damascus Document

In CD VI–VII, the author sets forth stipulations for how a member of the “covenant” is to refrain from entering the Temple to “light His altar in vain” (CD VI, 11-12).⁵⁶ The author, in essence, describes the actions a member of the community is to take in order to be holy before God. An allusion to Leviticus 19:18, though altered to fit the sectarian context, is listed among the list of holy actions: “They shall set aside the holy things according to the exact teaching concerning them. They shall love each man his brother as himself; they shall succor the poor, the needy, and the stranger. A man shall seek his brother’s well-being and shall not sin against his near kin” (CD VI, 19–VII, 1). Specifically, the line of concern is, “They shall love each man his brother as himself.”⁵⁷

The listing of the command to love one’s brother as oneself among actions to be done in order to promote holiness fits the original linking of loving the “neighbor” in Leviticus 19:18 and holiness. Similar to Leviticus 19:18, CD VI, 20-21 promotes an attitude and actions toward others that keep the doer in right relationship with God and with others, as performing actions that are beneficial for a brother is likely to ensure that there is peace between both parties. By loving the brother, the member of the sect maintains his holy status before God, especially in terms of being able to stand before God’s altar.⁵⁸ Accordingly, the effort of the member of the

⁵⁶ All quotations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from Vermes’s translation. Where appropriate, comparisons are made to Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996).

⁵⁷ Martínez’s translation reads, “for each to love his brother like himself” (p. 37).

⁵⁸ Some scholars argue that the Essenes maintained complete separation from the Temple in Jerusalem. In this view, CD VI, 19–VII, 1, and the surrounding context, is a subtle call for the members of the community to separate themselves from the Temple in exchange for entering the “New Covenant.” It seems more likely based on CD VI, 11 that the brother who has entered the covenant is to practice all the following holy actions in order to access the Temple properly, unlike some other Jews who show no regard for holy living and still enter the Temple. See Akiyama, 104-5.

sect to maintain a peaceful and loving relationship between him and his brothers simultaneously maintains his peaceful and loving relationship with God. The horizontal relationships with fellow covenant members are intimately tied to the vertical relationship with the covenant God, and such a right relationship with one's brothers is what is needed, according to the author of CD, to enter into the presence of God in the Temple. Overall, even though there are a few differences, CD VI, 20-21 carries forward the original linking of loving the neighbor or, here, brother as oneself and holiness.

One significant difference between CD VI, 20-21 and Leviticus 19:18 is the swapping of the word "neighbor" for "brother." The term "brother" functions as an in-group term that refers only to the fellow members of the covenant group to which one belongs. This emphasis on the "brother" matches the general sectarian nature of the Essenes who cloistered themselves away from the populace of Jerusalem in order to create a community where they could serve as the faithful remnant to God. Interestingly, however, CD VI, 21 goes on to say that "they shall succor the poor, the needy, and the stranger."⁵⁹

While the majority of CD, as well as 1QS, is concerned with the interrelationships between covenant members, there is also an emphasis on how the sect members interact with those outside the group(s). Although the poor, the needy, and the stranger are not the objects of the love command, it is surprising that the command to help these groups immediately follows the command to love the brother as oneself. It seems that a loving attitude toward the brother sets one up to be able to help those outside the group who are in need. However, the type of help or the overall form of "love" that is aimed at the brother is different from the type of help aimed at

⁵⁹ Vermes, 134.

those who are non-brothers but are in need.⁶⁰ In other words, the defining line between brother and non-brother is emphasized and is not abandoned for a universalization of love. Even if one attempted to argue for a sort of universalizing of love to include outsiders, the poor, the needy, and the stranger refer to fellow Israelites, not Gentiles, outside of the sect; the furthest bounds of universalization would only extend to the Israelites. The context, however, does not allow such a universalization, and the care for the desolate outsiders is not the same as the love extended to the fellow sect member.

In addition to CD VI, 20-21, there occurs a lengthy treatment on Leviticus 19:17-18 in CD IX, 2-8:

Every vow by which man vows another to destruction (cf. Lev. xxvii, 29) by the laws of the Gentiles shall himself be put to death. And concerning the saying, *You shall not take vengeance on the children of your people, not bear rancor against them* (Lev. xix, 18), if any member of the Covenant accuses his companion without first rebuking him before witnesses; if he denounces him in the heat of his anger or reports him to his elders to make him look contemptible, he is one that takes vengeance and bears rancor, although it is expressly written, *He takes vengeance upon His adversaries and bears rancor against His enemies* (Nah. I, 2). If he holds his peace towards him from one day to another and thereafter speaks of him in the heat of his anger, he testifies against himself concerning a capital matter because he has not fulfilled the commandment of God which tells him: *You shall rebuke your companion and not be burdened with sin because of him* (Lev. xix, 17).⁶¹

The command to love one's neighbor or brother as oneself (i.e., Lev 19:18b) does not appear in this section, which deals with conflict among members of the sect, but the use of Leviticus 19:17-18a further illuminates the narrow interpretation of the love command with its surrounding context as applying to the sect members only.

⁶⁰ Serge Ruzer defines the phrase "as yourself" in CD VI, 20-21 as referring to "one who belongs to your group of chosen ones (belonging to the same New Covenant)." Serge Ruzer, "From 'Love Your Neighbour' to 'Love Your Enemy': Trajectories in Early Jewish Exegesis," *Revue Biblique* 109, no. 3 (July 2002): 380.

⁶¹ Emphasis original. Vermes, 139-140.

The author of CD teaches the sect members not to vow “another to destruction by the law of the Gentiles,” not to accuse a brother without “first rebuking him before witness,” and not to hold on to anger (i.e., hold a grudge) toward a brother. If they do any of these three actions, they break the commands of Leviticus 19:17-18a. Moreover, these actions, through the citing of Leviticus 19:17, are labeled as sins. To sin against the brother by wrongly accusing him or holding a grudge against him is a failure to obey the command to love the brother as oneself. This section, therefore, serves as an illustration of how one should *not* act if one wishes to love the brother as oneself as commanded in CD VI, 20-21. The use of Leviticus 19:17-18 to promote peace and love among the brothers of the sect also occurs, though implicitly, in the Community Rule.

The Community Rule

At the outset of the Community Rule (1QS), the “Master” states that he “[shall teach the sai]nts to live (?) {according to the Book} (4Q255, 257) of the Community [Rul]e, ... that they may love all that He has chosen and hate all that He has rejected, ... and that they may love all the sons of light, each according to his lot in God’s design, and hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his guilt in God’s vengeance” (1QS I, 1, 3-4, 9-10).⁶² The teacher commands the sect members to love and hate based on God’s own love for what He has chosen and God’s own hate for what He has rejected. Even when the groups are further defined as the “sons of light” and “sons of darkness,” respectively, the love and hate are still reliant on God’s “design” and apportioned “vengeance.”⁶³ Tellingly, the main thrust of the opening section is sectarian in

⁶² Editing original. Vermes, 98-99.

⁶³ Ari Mermelstein sees “the sectarian requirement to align the member’s emotions with those of God” as a sign of the group’s intense belief that they had been divinely elected. Ari Mermelstein, “Love and Hate at Qumran: The Social Construction of Sectarian Emotion,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, no. 2 (2013): 245-9. Additionally, Krister

nature, as the sect members are commanded to love their brothers and hate those who are outsiders, which clarifies that love is reserved only for the in-group.

The document returns to the focus of maintaining loving and peaceful relationships between members throughout the document: “For according to the holy design, they shall all be in a Community of truth and virtuous humility, of *loving-kindness* and good intent one toward the other” (1QS II, 24).⁶⁴ The sect members are to have in their hearts “abundant charity” or “great charity towards all the sons of truth” (1QS IV, 3, 5).⁶⁵ Such loving-kindness and charity should create an attitude toward the brother in a way that he is never led to break the commands of Leviticus 19:17-18: “Let no man address his companion with anger, or ill-temper, or obdu[racy, or with envy prompted by (4Q258)] the spirit of wickedness. Let him not hate him [because of his uncircumcised] heart, but let him rebuke him on the very same day lest he incur guilt because of him” (1QS V, 25-26–VI, 1).⁶⁶

The prohibition of holding onto anger toward a brother and the instruction to rebuke the brother as soon as possible mirrors the teaching in CD VI, 20-21, which explicitly cites Leviticus 19:17-18 as the foundational text. It is likely, therefore, that 1QS V, 25-26–VI, 1 also uses Leviticus 19:17-18 as a background text, though implicitly. Accordingly, 1QS takes the love command and its surrounding context and applies it narrowly to the interrelationships between sect members. In this regard, the sect utilizes “love” in purely ethical means, emphasizing love

Stendahl explores the odd relationship between hate and non-retaliation in 1QS, especially as it relates to Rom 12:19-21. The teacher encourages the Essenes to hate outsiders who are not sons of light while simultaneously emphasizing that they are not to retaliate against outsiders because God will eventually seek vengeance (1QS X, 17-20). Krister Stendahl, “Hate, Non-Retaliation, and Love,” *Harvard Theological Review* 55, no. 4 (October 1962): 343-55.

⁶⁴ Emphasis added. Vermes, 100.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 102.

⁶⁶ Editing original. *Ibid.*, 105.

only when it concerns sustaining peace between fellow members, especially when conflict arises. Moreover, IQS makes the dichotomy between the brother and the outsider even more distinct by commanding that the sect members *hate* those who are not a part of the in-group. This use is far from a universalization of Leviticus 19:18 and represents, along with CD, an understanding that love is reserved primarily for one's brother.

Conclusion

The Damascus Document and the Community rule stand as two documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls that use Leviticus 19:18 to instruct the sect members to love the brother so as to solve conflicts in a way that maintains peaceful relations. The focus on loving the brother as oneself interprets and applies Leviticus 19:18b narrowly, and only after one ensures that he is loving the brother is he to care for any outsider who is poor, needy, or a stranger (CD VI, 20-21). In other instances, the teacher commands the members to hate those whom God has rejected, namely, those who have not remained faithful to God's commandments as His holy people (IQS I, 3-4). This sectarian application of Leviticus 19:18 also shows that "love" is understood as pertaining to ethical behavior toward fellow sect members. It is, in other words, much like the negative Golden Rule found in Tobit 4:15 and bShabb. 31a in that it primarily promotes an attitude and behavior that encourages peace between brothers, not necessarily an emphasis on performing beneficial actions toward the brother. Additionally, in many respects, the framework of love that is to be held by the sect members does not extend beyond the in-group (the only possible exception being CD VI, 21). Although one may argue that Leviticus 19:18 instructs Israelites to love only fellow Israelites, the further narrowing of the term "neighbor" to "brother" (i.e., only some Israelites as opposed to all Israelites) reinterprets the command. Overall, CD and

1QS use Leviticus 19:18 in the context of holiness and conflict resolution, which is loyal to its original context, but apply the love command narrowly to include only fellow sect members.

Paul's Use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans and Galatians

Introduction

Within a few centuries after the Essenes, an ex-Pharisaic Jew who pledged allegiance to Israel's Messiah wrote to the Christians in Rome and Galatia. In those letters, Paul summarized the "whole law," or states that the "whole law" is fulfilled, in one command: Leviticus 19:18. Many commentators have noted that Paul likely carries on the tradition of Jesus's identification of the great commandment (i.e., the combination of Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18) as found in Matthew 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-34; and Luke 10:25-37. Paul does not give any internal clues that he is referring specifically to Jesus's teaching, but the overall use and application of Leviticus 19:18 in connection to the summation of the law makes it probable that Paul has His teaching in mind. One noticeable difference of Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 from Jesus's is the absence of the connection to Deuteronomy 6:5, which is perhaps because of Paul's focus on the believers' behavior toward one another and their failure to live a life centered on love for one another.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, the main purpose of analyzing Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 and Galatians 5:13-15 alongside select Second Temple Jewish texts is to analyze how the use and application of Leviticus 19:18 compares and contrasts.⁶⁸ In this regard, this section argues that Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in both Romans and Galatians is intimately connected

⁶⁷ Deut 6:5 reads, "You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might."

⁶⁸ For studies that trace every use of Leviticus 19:18 in the NT, see Akiyama; Victor Paul Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972).

to the love made known through Jesus's death on the cross and the Spirit's pouring out of such love in believers, which naturally leads to loving the neighbor as oneself.

Romans 13:8-10

Paul quotes Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10:

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves the other has fulfilled the law. For this, *You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet* [Exod. 20:14-15, 17a LXX; Deut. 5:17-19, 21a LXX], and any other commandment, is summed up in this word (or: statement): '*You shall love your neighbor as yourself*' [Lev 19:18]. Love does no evil to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfillment of the law.⁶⁹

Paul seems to have developed these exhortations in order to teach his congregations how to act in situations that require an already established ethic, and Romans 12:9-21 has already introduced the ethical standard of love. This section, 13:8-10, follows the section where Paul calls the Romans not to resist the government and precedes a lengthy section, 14:1–15:3, on caring for both the “weak” and the “strong” in relation to the eating of certain foods. Thus, the command to love one another supported by Leviticus 19:18 comes between two situations that require a Christian to practice love for the neighbor, one civic and the other ecclesial. The focus here is to attempt to grasp how Paul uses Leviticus 19:18 in order to shed light on how he has developed it as a summary of the whole law.

First, Paul claims that the one who loves the other “has fulfilled the whole law.”⁷⁰ Earlier in the letter of Romans, Paul comments on the law's inability to set humanity free from sin and

⁶⁹ Author's translation.

⁷⁰ In the Greek, Rom 8:8b reads, ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. It is interesting that Paul decides to use the perfect tense for “has fulfilled” rather than the present tense, which would read, “For the one who loves the other *fulfills* the law.” Although commentators speculate as to why Paul used the perfect tense, such as eschatological fulfillment, it could be that Paul has in mind a *specific* person who loved “the other,” namely, Jesus. On the use of the passive tense here, see Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd ed., The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2018), 505-6.

death and instead states, “what the law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh, so that the *requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us*, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit” (8:3-4).⁷¹ Accordingly, Paul claims that Jesus’s death was a condemnation of sin and the opening for the law to be *fulfilled* in those who walk according to the Spirit (i.e., Christians). “Love” is not mentioned in 8:3-4, but Paul clearly states that God sent Jesus “as an offering for sin” so that the law might be “fulfilled in us.” In Paul’s mind, the fulfillment of the law in Jesus’s followers is intimately tied to Jesus’s death. If one moves further toward the beginning of the letter, one finds that Paul has already stated, “God’s love has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us. . . . God proves his own love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom 5:5, 8).⁷² While the law or its fulfillment is not mentioned in this pericope, it is important to note that Paul has already, in Romans 5, coupled together love and Jesus’s death on the cross.⁷³

⁷¹ Emphasis added. A subtle feature of 8:3-4 is the mention of all three Persons of the Trinity in connection to the fulfillment of the law in those who have faith in Jesus through his death on the cross.

⁷² Similar to Rom 8:3-4, in Rom 5:5, 8, Paul mentions all three Persons of the Trinity when detailing how God has shown His love for His people by sending His Son to die on the cross and also sending the Holy Spirit to pour that love into people’s hearts.

⁷³ It is surprising that the majority of commentators make no connection between Paul’s citation of love using Leviticus 19:18 and his earlier comments concerning the fulfillment of the law (Rom 8:3-4) and his statements on how God’s love has been made known to humans through Jesus’s death on the cross (Rom 5:5, 8). The full picture that Paul presents is that God’s love is poured into the hearts of believers, the very love made known through Jesus’s death on the cross, God sent His Son to condemn sin in the flesh so that the law may be fulfilled in those who walk according to the Spirit, and believers participate in the fulfillment of the law when they “love the neighbor” as themselves. The two themes of Rom 13:8-10, love and the fulfillment of the law, are inextricably linked to Jesus’s death for sinners. Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical on the Epistle to the Romans: Romans 9-16*, International Critical Commentary (New York: T&T Clark, 1979), 673-79; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, Word Biblical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 774-83; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 804-15; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2012), 500-2; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2016), 902-5; Moo, *Romans*, 826-34; Robert Mounce, *Romans: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1995), 196-7; Grant R. Osborne, *Romans*, The IVP New Testament Commentary (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 348-51; J. Paul

When Romans 13:8-10 is read with Romans 8:3-4 and 5:5, 8 in mind, the statement that love fulfills the law (or that one who loves the other has fulfilled the law) seems to communicate that love can only fulfill the law because Jesus first fulfilled it in His people by dying on the cross, and the love that the Roman Christians, and all Christians, are called to display is the same love known through the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. To love “the other” as oneself, therefore, moves beyond a simple exhortation toward proper ethical behavior and becomes Paul’s call to the followers of Jesus to live into the reality of love known through Jesus’s death and show the same type of sacrificial love as Christ displayed toward any human God places before them. Although love is displayed through specific actions, it is also a constant state of being, a reality, one that should be lived in all areas of life, for all those who have died and been made alive again in Christ.

Second, Paul furthers his statement that love for the other fulfills the law by quoting four separate commandments that come from the “Second Table” of the Decalogue, which deals with right relationships between humans.⁷⁴ As Schreiner states, “the context is decisive here, for the commandments cited in verse 9 are from the Mosaic law,” or in other words, Paul is not simply quoting ethical principles but the core of the law itself, which deals with the “horizontal” plane of relationship (i.e., human-to-human relations).⁷⁵ Paul takes the core commandments of the law that deal with human relations and universalizes them to appeal to all humans, not merely an in-

Sampley, *Walking in Love: Moral Progress and Spiritual Growth with the Apostle Paul* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 161, though he does later emphasize the cross (p. 289); Thomas R. Schreiner, *Paul: Apostle of God’s Glory in Christ* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 325-7; and Ben Witherington III, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2004), 315-17.

⁷⁴ Paul quotes commandments 7, 6, 8, and 10 from Deut 5:17-21 in LXX B. Cranfield, 677; Dunn, 778; Jewett, 810; Longenecker, *Romans*, 904; Mounce, 196; Osborne, 350; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 691.

⁷⁵ Schreiner, *Romans*, 692.

group. Since Romans 13:8-10 proceeds a section concerning the Romans' relationships with those outside the congregation, the "other" and the "neighbor" should be understood as universally appealing to all of humankind.⁷⁶ Additionally, the fact that Paul's audience is both Jewish and Gentile means *both* Jew and Gentile can fulfill the law by loving the neighbor; the command of Leviticus 19:18 is no longer a thoroughly Jewish in-group way of life (cf. Tobit 4:15; bShabb. 31a).⁷⁷

Third, after citing Leviticus 19:18, Paul comments, "Love does no wrong to a neighbor" (Rom 13:10). On this phrase, James Dunn states, "This is in fact the negative form of the 'golden rule.'"⁷⁸ The coupling of Leviticus 19:18 and the negative Golden Rule appears also in Tobit 4:15 and bShabb. 31a, as explored above. Paul, therefore, utilizes a connection that is familiar in the wider milieu of Jewish thought. It is a move by Paul that emphasizes the fact that those who are in Christ should perform loving actions positively (i.e., in a beneficial and helpful way) and refrain also from taking negative actions toward the neighbor in an effort to maintain peace.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Cranfield wisely reflects on who the "other" is in Rom 13:8-10: "The definite article before 'other' is important—it has a generalizing effect. Fulfilment of the law involves not just loving someone other than oneself, but loving *each* man whom God presents to one as one's neighbour by the circumstance of his being someone whom one *is in a position to* affect for good or ill. The 'neighbour' in the NT sense is not someone arbitrarily chosen by us: he is given to us by God." Cranfield, 676. For an argument that the "other" and "neighbor" refer to fellow believers only, see Jewett, 807; Kruse, 500. Jewett's insistence that this passage be interpreted in the context of the "love feast" is pure conjecture. The passage's placement certainly begs that it be seen as instructive for the Romans in how to treat one another when it comes to the eating of food (14:1–15:3), but Paul does not mention any sort of specific feast. Rather, the context of Rom 13:8-10 suggests that the summation of the law under Lev 19:18 and its proper fulfillment in love of the "other" is meant for all situations in which the Roman believers find themselves.

⁷⁷ Dunn, 781.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 780. See also Schreiner, *Romans*, 646.

⁷⁹ Dunn sees minor difference between the negative and positive formulations of the Golden Rule. While the distinction should not be based on Christian and Jewish categories, the two formulations *are* different in terms of the message they convey and the attitude they command. As mentioned above, the negative Golden Rule focuses more on *not* taking negative actions against another, especially in an effort to maintain peace. The result is, at least, a *neutral* relationship in which peace is had. The positive formulation of the Golden Rule, as seen in Leviticus 19:18, focuses more on performing positive and beneficial actions toward the neighbor. The result is a relationship where love is clearly expressed and leaves the neighbor better off after the love is displayed. There is some overlap, of course, but the difference is noticeable. *Ibid.*, 781.

Last, and most importantly, Paul cites Leviticus 19:18 as *the* summary statement for *any* commandment that one may conjure up (cf. bShabb. 31a). The love as expressed in Leviticus 19:18, Paul says, is the fulfillment of the law. There are two ways one could interpret the way Leviticus 19:18 fulfills the law: (1) the command to “love you neighbor as yourself” replaces all the other commandments or (2) the command *focuses* the other commandments (i.e., one must consider the command to love in every instance of another commandment). In answering this question, Moo suggests that “the former alternative seems to be closer to the truth. The Christian, who belongs to the New Covenant people of God, is no longer ‘under the [Mosaic] law,’ the law for the Old Covenant people of God; he is under a ‘new law,’ ‘the law of Christ’ (see Gal. 6:2 and 1 Cor. 9:19-21).”⁸⁰ Accordingly, the love that Paul speaks of here is seemingly a unique attribute possible only through Christ for those in Christ.⁸¹

The placement of Leviticus 19:18 as a summary statement for the whole law is a profound development. Moo mentions that “[v]arious Jewish authors refer to the commandment to love the neighbor in Lev. 19:18, but it was given no special prominence in Judaism generally. Therefore, the central position that Paul gives the commandment echoes Jesus.”⁸² One important detail that Moo misses is that though Jesus teaches that Leviticus 19:18 is part of the greatest commandment, Paul occupies a special position by being able to develop Leviticus 19:18 in a time that is post-crucifixion of Christ. In other words, Paul stands in a place in history that follows the death of Jesus, and his teaching of Leviticus 19:18, though reflecting Jesus’s

⁸⁰ Moo, *Romans*, 833. See also Dunn, 778; Longenecker, *Romans*, 904-5. This does not mean that the OT commandments are no longer useful for Christians. As Moo suggests, Paul seems to move Lev 19:18 to the center of “the law” by which followers of Christ are to live as opposed to the Mosaic Law. It seems that Paul assumes that all the other commandments will naturally be accomplished by living out the one summarizing and fulfilling command to love the neighbor as oneself.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 831.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 815.

teaching, develops the idea further because he is fully aware of what Jesus accomplished on the cross, which is an aspect Jesus's hearers did not comprehend. Paul, as well as any follower of Christ living post-crucifixion, has the special privilege of knowing that loving the neighbor is truly possible only because Christ has made it possible through the ultimate act of love carried out in history: His crucifixion. Seifrid puts it another way when he says, "The commandment to love the neighbor is a word that has become reality in Jesus Christ."⁸³ Additionally, it is only through the indwelling presence of the Spirit that one may bear the fruit of love (cf. Rom 5:5, 8; Gal 5:22). Therefore, Paul can say in Romans 8:3-4 and 13:8-10 that Jesus's death creates the possibility that through the Spirit, the law may be fulfilled by loving the neighbor. Paul understands that loving the neighbor (and thus fulfilling the law) is only possible because of Jesus, His death on the cross, and the Spirit.

Galatians 5:13-15

In addition to Romans 13:8-10, Paul also quotes Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 15:13-15:

Now you were called to freedom, brothers (and sisters); only do not turn the freedom into a base of operations (i.e., starting point in a war) for the flesh,⁸⁴ but through love serve as a slave to one another. For the whole law has been fulfilled in one word, in the word (or: statement): *You shall love your neighbor as yourself* [Lev 19:18b]. But if you are biting and devouring one another, watch out that you are not consumed by one another.⁸⁵

Although the primary verse under consideration in this essay is verse 14, the surrounding

⁸³ Mark A. Seifrid, "Romans," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 683.

⁸⁴ The NRSV, RSV, ESV, and NASB(95) translate ἀφορμὴν as "opportunity." However, ἀφορμὴν is a compound word, formed from (1) ὄρμη, meaning "starting point of a motion," which is typically found in a military context, and (2) ἀπο-, meaning "away from" or "from." It can be rendered "a place away from the starting point of a motion," which in a military context, such as a battle between Spirit and flesh, could be understood as a "base of operations." See deSilva, *Galatians*, 446; Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 376.

⁸⁵ Author's translation.

context, especially verses 13 and 15, informs how one is to interpret Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 as it pertains to exhorting the Galatians to develop a proper attitude and behavior toward their fellow believers. The main issue at hand in Paul's letter to the Galatians is their dangerous move toward accepting and practicing the boundary markers of the Mosaic law, such as circumcision, dietary laws, and calendar or festival observances. Paul uses many forms of argumentation in an attempt to convince the Galatians that in Christ, one is no longer a slave to sin, the law, or other systems that induce legalism. In fact, all those in Christ have been granted freedom, but this freedom does not mean that believers are free to do whatever they like. There is, in other words, a balance between legalism and libertinism for the followers of Christ.⁸⁶ In verse 13, Paul makes a rhetorical turn by telling the Galatians that if they insist upon being slaves, as they would be if they followed the law, then they should serve as slaves to one another "through love."⁸⁷ Accordingly, Paul's warning in verse 15 concerning their possible devouring of one another is an indication that the Galatians' behavior could lead to the disintegration of their community and the relationships therein.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Timothy George, *Galatians: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1994), 337; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, vol. 41, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 238; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 321; Witherington, *Galatians*, 385.

⁸⁷ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), 241: "It is as though he [Paul] said, 'If you must live in slavery, here is a form of slavery in which you may safely indulge—the slavery of practical love for one another.'" This does not mean that the Galatians should love the neighbor because they are forced to do so; rather, they are to use the freedom they have been granted to love others. As deSilva points out, such a positive use of slavery draws the biblically saturated mind to the exodus, where Israel exchanged slavery to Egypt for slavery to God (*Galatians*, 448). See also Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 324.

⁸⁸ George, 345; Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 349; Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (New York: HarperOne, 1996), 33; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 325-6.

As in Romans 13:8-10, Paul cites Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:13-15 in connection with the “fulfillment” of the law. Contrary to Romans, however, Paul does not list Leviticus 19:18 as the summation of the law; rather, he states that the “whole law” has been fulfilled in Leviticus 19:18 itself.⁸⁹ The verb “fulfill” appears in the perfect tense, indicating a past action with present results, hence the translation “has been fulfilled.”⁹⁰ One possible way of interpreting Paul’s use of the perfect tense here is to understand Jesus as “the implied agent of the passive verb ... who ‘fulfills’ the whole law ... in his life by going to the cross as the ultimate embodiment and pattern of sacrificial love.”⁹¹ While on the surface this interpretation may seem like conjecture, there are other hints in the wider context of Galatians that indicate that Paul understood love, in particular, as primarily centered on the death of Jesus, which would lead him to conclude that the fulfillment of the whole law in the love of the neighbor as oneself (Lev 19:18) is intimately connected to Jesus’s death on the cross.

There are two key texts in Galatians that provide further information on how Paul is using Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:14: Galatians 2:20 and 5:22. In Galatians 2:20, Paul gives one of his few reflections on how Jesus has impacted him personally: “and I (myself) am no longer living, but Christ is living in me; and that (life) which I am now living in the flesh, I am living in faith, the one (i.e., the faith) in the Son of God who loved me by handing himself over for me.”⁹² Paul, having been crucified with Jesus Christ, has died, and now Jesus lives in Paul.

⁸⁹ Moo, *Galatians*, 346-7.

⁹⁰ In the Greek, “has been fulfilled” reads *πεπλήρωται*. On the importance of noting the perfect tense of the verb, see deSilva, *Galatians*, 450-1; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 242-3; Moo, *Galatians*, 346-7.

⁹¹ Moo, *Galatians*, 348.

⁹² Author’s translation. Many translations translate the final *καὶ* as the standard conjunction “and,” but it seems best to translate it epexegetically in order to show the implied connection between the “Son of God” loving Paul by handing Himself over for him. Love is what prompts Jesus to hand Himself over; therefore, the Son of God’s “love” and the handing over of Himself are inseparable for Paul.

Only through Jesus's indwelling is Paul truly made alive, and the life Paul now lives is lived in faith in the Son of God who displayed His love for Paul by handing himself over to die on the cross. This is the type of living that Paul wishes the Galatians to develop. Galatians 2:20 shows that for Paul, Jesus's love is known through His death, and faith in the Son of God who died on the cross should cause believers to live into the reality of such love and extend it to others (cf. Rom 5:8). Thus, when Paul later quotes Leviticus 19:18 as what fulfills the whole law, he undoubtedly has in mind the love known through Jesus's death.

The second text that provides further context for the interpretation of how Paul uses Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:15 is Galatians 5:22. Shortly after Paul quotes Leviticus 19:18, he tells the Galatians that "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such things there is no law."⁹³ On the surface, it is easy to spot the appearance of both "love" and "law," a connection that likely continues the thought of Galatians 5:14. Additionally, Paul links love and law with the Spirit who produces fruit in believers. The Spirit's production of love in believers is an important idea for Paul, one that appears also in Romans 5:5. Since the fruit of love is a product of the Spirit who indwells believers and since such love is known through Jesus's handing Himself over to death, love is a fruit only those in Christ can know and share. In other words, it is only those who have faith in the Son of God who died for others who have the Spirit producing the fruit of love within them. Against such fruit there is no law because the whole law has been fulfilled in one word: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev 19:18).

⁹³ Author's translation. While it may seem strange, and grammatically incorrect, to state that the fruit of the Spirit "is" a whole list of things instead of "are," Paul, perhaps intentionally, uses the third person singular form of the verb "to be," which is translated "is."

When Galatians 5:14 is read with Galatians 2:20 and 5:22 in mind, the statement that the whole law is fulfilled in Leviticus 19:18 seems possible only because Jesus fulfilled the law by loving others in that He willingly handed Himself over to die on the cross, and the love that Christians are to share with the neighbor is a product of the Spirit who indwells them.⁹⁴ The call to love the neighbor as oneself, then, is more than an ethical exhortation, though it certainly prompts a transformation of behavior. It is a way of life in faith that extends the love known through Jesus's death to the neighbor. After all, if Christians have been crucified with Christ and it is Him who lives in Christians, the result is that Christ's love, produced by the Spirit, is a natural attribute in those who live in faith.

One major variation in Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:14 from Romans 13:8-10 is the application of the "neighbor" primarily to fellow Christians as opposed to any human. In Galatians, Paul is concerned with writing to the believers in an attempt to correct their behavior as it pertains to the correct view of the gospel and its many implications for Christian living. Paul does not address how believers should relate to those outside of the community in

⁹⁴ Although many commentators miss the connection between the citation of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 and Jesus's death, the same is, fortunately, not true for the commentators of Galatians 5:13-15. See George, 340: "More than anywhere else the freedom that results in slavery of love is exemplified in the passion and death of Jesus Christ.... For Paul true freedom and true theology were centered in the crucified Christ."; Michael J. Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001), 157: "Paul's notion of love is peculiar, linked to his understanding of the cross as the expression of God's love in Christ."; Hays, 37, though he fails to see the overall importance of love in Paul's thought; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 243: "So it is love—love that responds to Christ's love and that expressed a new existence in Christ (cf. 2:20)—that motivates the ethical life of a Christian, with the results of that love ethic fulfilling the real purport of the Mosaic law."; Moo, *Galatians*, 348; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 325: "Love does not go around the moral norms of the law, nor does it violate them, but it does transcend them. Indeed, the call to love probably reflects 'the law of Christ' (6:2), and Christ himself modeled that love in his self-giving for his people (2:20)."; Witherington, *Galatians*, 382: "Christ is the one who has truly manifested love, the one who has truly taken on the form of a slave and served others, even to the point of dying for them (Phil. 2). He is the paradigm and the measuring rod of love." Cf. Bruce, 239-42; deSilva, *Galatians*, 443-52; Craig S. Keener, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 461-5; Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 183-4.

Galatia.⁹⁵ However, it is unlikely that Paul believed that the Galatians were to love only their fellow believers and not those outside the community. Again, if the Galatians are called to be like Paul in his dying and living to Christ, then love for the neighbor should not cease once the believers interact with those who are not among the in-group. Thus, although Paul does not stress the application of Leviticus 19:18 to those outside the community, it is not a stretch to infer that the command to love the neighbor should always apply despite the identification of the neighbor.⁹⁶

Conclusion

In Romans 13:8-10, Paul lists Leviticus 19:18 as the word in which the whole law is summarized, thus linking love and law together in a unique fashion. Additionally, the one who loves one's neighbor as oneself "has fulfilled the law," a fulfillment that is likely connected to the previous statement in Romans 8:3-4 where Paul states that God sent His Son so that the law may be fulfilled in Christians. Furthermore, Paul's earlier expression in Romans 5:5, 8 that the love made known through Jesus's death on the cross is poured out into the hearts of believers by the Spirit links "love" with Jesus's death. Thus, Romans 13:8-10 and Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 is predicated on the knowledge that love has been made known through Jesus's death, has been poured out into the hearts of Christians by the Spirit, and, as a result of the two previous conditions, may fulfill the law as believers love the neighbor as oneself. The fact that Romans 13:8-10 proceeds a long exhortation for the Romans to respect and obey outside authorities, the "neighbor" likely refers to all humans, not merely the in-group.

⁹⁵ Witherington, *Galatians*, 384. Witherington does note, however, that Gal 6:10 does state how the Galatians are to relate to other Christians outside of Galatia.

⁹⁶ Keener, 463-4; Moo, *Galatians*, 346; Witherington, *Galatians*, 384.

In Galatians 5:13-15, Paul uses Leviticus 19:18 in the context of exhorting the Galatians to use their freedom in Christ to serve one another as slaves through love. The reason Paul gives for serving one another through love is the proclamation that the law has been fulfilled in one word, namely, Leviticus 19:18. The use of the perfect tense for the verb “fulfill,” as in Romans 13:9, denotes an action that has occurred in the past with results in the present. The action that Paul has in mind is likely what he expressed in Galatians 2:20: Paul has been crucified with Jesus, it is Jesus who now lives in Him, and the life he now lives he lives in faith in the Son of God who loved him by handing himself over to death. Paul knows that Jesus loves him because He died for him, and it is this love that fulfills the law and allows those in whom Christ lives to continue to love the neighbor. Moreover, Galatians 5:22 states that love is the fruit of the Spirit, meaning that only those who are in Christ and in whom the Spirit dwells are capable of knowing and sharing love, particularly love for one’s neighbor as oneself. Unlike Romans 13:8-10, however, the “neighbor” seems to refer primarily to the fellow Christians, not every human, but it is difficult to fathom that Paul would limit the love brought forth by Jesus and the Spirit only to the in-group.

Although Paul’s use of Leviticus 19:18 addresses specific circumstances among the Roman and Galatian communities, there are similarities between Romans 13:8-10 and Galatians 5:13-15: (1) there is a connection between Leviticus 19:18 and the law, which means there is a connection between love and law; (2) Leviticus 19:18 summarizes and fulfills the whole law; (3) “love,” for Paul, is intimately connected to Jesus’s death on the cross, which fulfilled the law in believers, and its pouring out or production as fruit in the believer; and (4) the “neighbor” in Leviticus 19:18 includes both the members of the Christian communities and any other human.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to analyze select Second Temple Jewish texts and Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians in order to trace the uses of or allusions to Leviticus 19:18. Before analyzing either block of material, a section overviewed Leviticus 19:18 in its original context, concluding that "love" is best understood as referring to actions, and attitudes, that are beneficial for the receiver of the action and that the "neighbor," though referring primarily to fellow Israelites, could refer to those who are not fellow Israelites (cf. Lev 19:34). Among the Second Temple Jewish texts, five sources were studied: (1) the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* from the Pseudepigrapha, (2) Tobit 4:15 from the Apocrypha, (3) Shabbat 31a from the Babylonian Talmud, and (4) the Damascus Document and (5) the Community Rule from the Dead Seas Scrolls.

The analysis of *TI2P* resulted in three minor observations: (1) there is a clear link between the Law or commandments of God and the exhortation to love the neighbor (whether universally or narrowly understood), (2) a double command to love the Lord and to love the neighbor appears, showing that the two also go hand-in-hand, and (3) though there a few exceptions, the majority of the testaments allude to or echo Leviticus 19:18 with the understanding that the neighbor is primarily the fellow Israelite. The major observation, however, was that *TI2P* displays hints of a tradition that understands the neighbor to be loved as *every* person, Israelite and non-Israelite alike.

Tobit 4:15 contains the negative formulation of the Golden Rule, which instructs the reader to not do to others what one hates. In line with the book of Tobit's overall emphasis on proper Jewish behavior and law observance, the allusion to Leviticus 19:18 in Tobit 4:15 understands the "neighbor" to be only fellow Israelites, especially those in one's own clan (i.e.,

for Tobit, the tribe was Naphtali). Additionally, in the immediate context of the negative Golden Rule, Tobit instructs Tobias to follow the Lord's commandments, which implicitly displays a connection between the negative Golden Rule and the law. Since "love" does not appear in Tobit 4:15, the negative Golden Rule commands that one refrain from performing negative actions against the fellow Israelite in order to maintain peace as opposed to performing positive actions that benefit the other.

Similar to Tobit 4:15, Bavli Shabbat 31a houses another negative Golden Rule that, according to tradition, comes from the lips of Hillel the Elder. At the request of a Gentile to be taught the Torah while he stands on one foot, Hillel responded simply by stating that the Gentile should not do to others what he hates. Hillel then concludes that the negative Golden Rule is the whole Torah and that everything else is commentary. Thus, for Hillel, the law is summarized in the negative Golden Rule. Since Hillel is speaking to a Gentile, his allusion to Leviticus 19:18 shows that there is a broadening of the term "neighbor" to refer to those outside of the in-group.

The Damascus Document and the Community Rule are the first two Second Temple Jewish texts considered here that explicitly quote Leviticus 19:18. In line with the sectarian nature of the communities at Qumran, both documents use Leviticus 19:18 in order to instruct the sect members to love one another and to behave accordingly. Tellingly, however, the Damascus document swaps the term "neighbor" for "brother," indicating that Leviticus 19:18 is to apply to in-group members and not those who are outsiders. The Community Rule takes this one step further in instructing the group to hate those whom God has rejected (i.e., those who are outside the community). At Qumran, "love" was reserved for fellow sect members, and its main use was to settle conflicts within the community peacefully and to encourage group unity.

The overview of Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Romans 13:8-10 resulted in three minor observations: (1) the act of loving "the other" fulfills the whole law, (2) Paul understands the "other" to be the "neighbor," which is understood universally, and (3) Leviticus 19:18 is, according to Paul, an adequate summary of any and every commandment in the law. Thus, like *TI2P*, Tobit 4:15, and bShabb. 31a, there is a close link between the whole law or commandments of God and the command to love the neighbor. However, Paul, unlike Jesus and *TI2P*, does not offer a double command to love the Lord and the neighbor. He instead understands the love of neighbor to be possible only through Jesus Christ and the cross, which fully displays the love of God for humankind by removing sin and death and giving the Spirit who pours such love into the hearts of believers (cf. Rom 5:5, 8; 8:3-4).

Similar to Romans 13:8-10, Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 in Galatians 5:13-15 leads to three minor observations: (1) Christians should use the freedom gained in Christ to serve others through love, (2) the command to love one's neighbor as oneself in Leviticus 19:18 fulfills the "whole law," and (3) Paul understands the neighbor to refer to fellow believers but certainly does not limit it to the in-group. In accord with Romans 13:8-10, the major observation is that Paul understands love and its fulfillment of the law through Leviticus 19:18 in terms of Jesus's handing Himself over to death (Gal 2:20) and the production of love in the believers as a fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22). Thus, Leviticus has fulfilled the whole law because Jesus chose to die on behalf of others and sent the Spirit to produce the fruit of love (and others) in believers.

One of the main research questions for this thesis is whether Paul carried on the use of Leviticus 19:18 from a tradition during the Second Temple period. There are certainly similarities between Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 and its use in Second Temple Jewish texts, such as the connection to God's law or commandments, its ability to summarize the whole law,

and an emphasis on maintaining good in-group relations. However, Paul is unique, though in line with Jesus, in his declaration that the love of one's neighbor as oneself *has fulfilled* the whole law. Moreover, what sets Paul apart is not necessarily his continuation of the tradition of Jesus's teaching concerning Leviticus 19:18 but his view that "love," especially love of one's neighbor, is always understood through the lens of Jesus's death on the cross and Christians' dependence on the Spirit who produces such love in their hearts. Love of one's neighbor as oneself, then, is more than an ethical exhortation in Paul's letters; it is a reminder that love is a product of the Spirit who indwells all those who declare faith in the Son of God and His work on the cross. In essence, to love one's neighbor as oneself is to participate in a love that requires the Triune God (Rom 5:5, 8; 8:3-4) and extends beyond any human's ability to conjure up a lofty virtue called "love." Thus, Paul's use of Leviticus 19:18 is dependent on the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and therefore unique when compared to preceding and contemporary Second Temple Jewish texts.

Bibliography

- 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. Boston: Brill, 2018.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- Charles, R. H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Edited from Nine Mss. Together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical on the Epistle to the Romans: Romans 9-16*. International Critical Commentary. New York: T&T Clark, 1979.
- deSilva, David A. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 23, no. 1 (September 2013): 21-68.
- _____. *The Letter to the Galatians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2018.
- _____. "Tobit." In *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*, 58-82. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 9-16*. Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988.
- Epstein, Isidore, ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. Translated by H. Freedman. London: Soncino, 1935.
- Etheridge, J. W., trans. *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch: With the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee*. Vol. 2. New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1968.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996.

- George, Timothy. *Galatians: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. The New American Commentary. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1994.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Goldstone, Matthew. "Rebuke, Lending, and Love: An Early Exegetical Tradition on Leviticus 19:17-18." *Journal of Biblical Literature; Atlanta* 136, no. 2 (2017): 307-21.
- Gorman, Michael J. *Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- Halivni, David. *The Formation of the Babylonian Talmud*. Translated by Jeffrey L. Rubenstein. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1992.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. New York: HarperOne, 1996.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Jonge, M. de. "The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Novum Testamentum* 44, no. 4 (2002): 371-92.
- Kaminsky, Joel S. "Loving One's (Israelite) Neighbor: Election and Commandment in Leviticus 19." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology; Richmond* 62, no. 2 (April 2008): 123-32.
- Kee, H. C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 1:775-828. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983.
- Keener, Craig S. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. "Love of Neighbor as Great Commandment in the Time of Jesus: Grasping at Straws in the Hebrew Scriptures." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 60, no. 2 (2017): 265-81.
- Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. "Commanding an Impossibility? Reflections on the Golden Rule in Leviticus 19:18B." In *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*, edited by J. G. McConville and Karl Möller. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Kraemer, David C. *A History of the Talmud*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2012.

- Kugler, Robert A. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Littman, Robert J. *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Livneh, Atar. “‘Love Your Fellow as Yourself’: The Interpretation of Leviticus 19:17–18 in the Book of *Jubilees*.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 18, no. 2 (2011): 173-99.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Vol. 41. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2016.
- Malamat, Abraham. “‘Love Your Neighbor as Yourself’ What It Really Means.” *The Biblical Archaeology Review* 16, no. 4 (1990): 50-51.
- Mermelstein, Ari. “Love and Hate at Qumran: The Social Construction of Sectarian Emotion.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, no. 2 (2013): 237-63.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17–22*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 2nd ed. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2018.
- Mounce, Robert. *Romans: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. The New American Commentary. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1995.
- Neusner, Jacob. “The Golden Rule in Classical Judaism.” *The Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 11, no. 2 (2008): 292-315.
- Nowell, Irene. *Jonah, Tobit, Judith*. New Collegeville Bible Commentary. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2015.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Romans*. The IVP New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Powery, Emerson. “Under the Gaze of the Empire: Who Is My Neighbor?” *Interpretation* 62, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 134-44.
- Rooker, Mark F. *Leviticus: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. The New American Commentary. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2000.

- Ross, Allen P. *Holiness to the Lord: A Guide to the Exposition of the Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Ruzer, Serge. "From 'Love Your Neighbour' to 'Love Your Enemy': Trajectories in Early Jewish Exegesis." *Revue Biblique* 109, no. 3 (July 2002): 371-89.
- Sampley, J. Paul. *Walking in Love: Moral Progress and Spiritual Growth with the Apostle Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Galatians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- _____. *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- _____. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.
- Seifrid, Mark A. "Romans." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Silva, Moisés. "Galatians." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Skemp, Vincent T. M. "Adelphos and the Theme of Kinship in Tobit." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 75, no. 1 (1999): 92-103.
- Sklar, Jay. *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2014.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Hate, Non-Retaliation, and Love." *Harvard Theological Review* 55, no. 4 (October 1962): 343-55.
- Thompson, James W. *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979.
- Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 2:35-142. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998.

_____. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2004.

Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.