“DO NOT COVET”: THE TENTH COMMANDMENT IN PAULINE ETHICS

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Elias Coye Still IV

May 2021

APPROVAL SHEET

"DO NOT COVET": THE TENTH COMMANDMENT

IN PAULINE ETHICS

Elias Coye Still IV

Read and Approved by:

_____

Thomas R. Schreiner (Chair)

_____

Jarvis J. Williams

_____

Brian J. Vickers

Date_____

To Emily, because you embraced this project
as your own and saw it to completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums/ Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CurBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
DPL	*Dictionary of Paul and His Letters.* Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FC	Fathers of the Church

FJTC	Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HThKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
HvTSt	*Hervormde teologiese studies*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Preaching and Teaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JTSA	*Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NAC	New American Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament

NIDNTTE	*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Moisés Silva. 2nd ed. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
NIDOTTE	*New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.
PACS	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
PHSC	Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RCT	*Revista catalana de teología*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature (Lang)
STI	Studies in Theological Interpretation
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TBN	*Themes in Biblical Narrative*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries

TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

PREFACE

While many people have supported and encouraged me throughout this process, I want to especially thank my wife, Emily, who has been my dearest friend, steadiest supporter, and closest confidant. Our daughter, Natalie, arrived toward the end of this project, bringing me joy and happiness and helping me finish in her own way. Also, gratitude is due to my parents, Coye and Sherra, who were my first teachers. My father read each chapter of this project and gave me valuable feedback which greatly improved it. I am also thankful to my parents-in-law, Greg and Suzanne, who offered their home as a place for me to write at a critical point in this process when libraries and other venues were closed.

I am grateful to the faculty, administrators, and staff of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for their encouragement and investment in me. While many individuals and departments deserve gratitude, Dr. Thomas Schreiner, my faculty chair, supervised this project and invested great time and energy in it from start to finish. Dr. Jarvis Williams and Dr. Brian Vickers helped me greatly through their careful reading as members of my committee. Dr. Brian Rosner graciously agreed to be an external reader. Also, the staff of the James P. Boyce Centennial Library provided essential support in acquiring resources, even in extraordinary times. The Research Doctoral Office, led by Dr. Jonathan Pennington, created an atmosphere of excellence which challenged and motivated me. I am particularly thankful to Cheyenne Haste for her editorial help in bringing this project to completion.

Clifton Baptist Church (CBC) offered me the opportunity to serve in ministry during this project, and its pastors and members deserve gratitude. I am particularly thankful for the students in the youth ministry at CBC, who are fascinated by Scripture

and are a constant reminder to me that God speaks today through his Word.

Above all, gratitude is due to God the Father for what he has done in Jesus Christ in saving covetous sinners who were destined for the Tombs of Desire if left to their own devices.

E. Coye Still IV

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2021

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Decalogue is a foundational text in both Jewish and Christian tradition.[1] It occupies a prominent place in the Hebrew Bible,[2] early Jewish literature,[3] and early Christian writings.[4] Does it, however, influence Pauline ethics?

Initially, the evidence might seem inconclusive. Paul directly references the Ten Words only a few times in his corpus (Rom 2:21–22; Rom 7:7; Rom 13:9; Eph 6:2–3), but the references are to five distinct injunctions from the Decalogue, which suggests he was familiar with it.[5] Also, on the one hand, Paul repeatedly makes strong statements about the limitations of the law (e.g., Gal 3:19–25; Eph 4:14–15), but, on the other hand, his ethical instruction can be reminiscent of the Ten Commandments (e.g., 1 Tim 1:9–10).

In view of the complexities involved in answering the question of the influence of the Ten Words on Pauline ethics, a promising approach is to focus on a single command from the Decalogue.[6] By way of comparison, as a jeweler might extract one

---

[1] I use the terms *Decalogue*, *Ten Commandments*, and *Ten Words* interchangeably.

[2] Daniel I. Block, "The Decalogue in the Hebrew Scriptures," in *The Decalogue through the Centuries: From the Hebrew Scriptures to Benedict XVI*, ed. Jeffrey P. Greenman and Timothy Larsen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 17–19.

[3] Philo asserted, "The Ten Words (οἱ δέκα λόγοι) are the heads of the laws (κεφάλαια νόμων). Philo, *Decalogue* 154.

[4] For a survey of New Testament texts which reference the Ten Words, see Craig A. Evans, "The Decalogue in the New Testament," in Greenman and Larsen, *Decalogue through the Centuries*, 29–46.

[5] For a discussion of what will be treated as the Pauline corpus in this study, see the methodology section below.

[6] Previous research demonstrates the value of focusing on one specific command from the Decalogue in Paul's ethics. See William Andrew Williamson, "The Influence of You Shall Not Murder on Paul's Ethics in Romans and 1 Corinthians" (PhD diss., University of Western Sydney, 2007).

gem from a precious piece to assess its value, the reader of Paul can study the effect of one of the Ten Commandments on Paul's moral teaching. By taking this approach, it is possible to engage closely with the complexities and nuances of the question while still getting at the influence of the whole, as assessing the value of one gem in a precious piece sheds light on the value of the entire piece.

Of course, proposing this approach raises a question: Which injunction from the Decalogue is a fitting test case? While studying any command from the Ten Words would be worthwhile, the Tenth Commandment is particularly intriguing.[7] Paul quotes it twice (Rom 7:7; 13:9), and these quotations provide a baseline for his use of it. But the quotations also raise additional questions: Is Paul using the Tenth Word for the purpose of ethical instruction, or is he citing it for another reason? Also, if Paul is using the Tenth Commandment in his moral teaching when he quotes it, does it also influence Paul's moral instruction beyond his explicit citations of it? Focusing on the Tenth Word, therefore, offers the opportunity to examine how a specific command from the Decalogue may or may not act as both a prominent and subtle influence on Paul's ethical teaching.

So, to narrow the question, does the Tenth Commandment influence Paul's moral instruction? To further clarify, I am not primarily asking the question of how Paul used the Tenth Word in his ethical instruction, or why he used it, although my findings will inevitably intersect with those questions. Instead, I am primarily asking the more fundamental question of whether the Tenth Commandment plays a discernable role in Paul's ethical instruction.[8]

I argue that the Tenth Commandment does play a formative role in Paul's

---

[7] In chap. 2, I engage with the problem of defining and numbering the Tenth Commandment. However, as a preliminary clarification, I am referring to the contents of Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 with the terms *Tenth Commandment* and *Tenth Word*.

[8] In making this distinction, I am influenced by the similar discussion in Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*, AGJU 22 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994), 13–14.

ethical instruction.[9] By "formative," I mean that the Tenth Commandment influenced and shaped Paul's ethical instruction in multiple discernable ways: (1) Paul describes and defines sin using the Tenth Commandment; (2) he connects covetousness and idolatry; (3) he links violating the Tenth Commandment to violating other prohibitions from the second table of the Decalogue; and (4) he presents covetousness as a test of faithful and unfaithful leadership.

This thesis may raise additional questions: First, is it legitimate to refer to Paul's ethical instruction? Usually, the term *ethics* refers to theoretical reflection on moral positions, and there is not a defined and systematic discussion of moral theory in Paul.[10] As James W. Thompson rightly states, "Ethics, as defined by the philosophers, is not a clearly delineated category in Paul."[11] However, while Paul does not express his moral thought in systematic fashion, he engages in clear moral reflection. When, for example, he reflects on the moral goodness of the law, illustrated by the Tenth Commandment

---

[9] As a clarification, I am not denying that there are other formative sources for Paul's ethic. In particular, the teaching of Jesus and Paul's convictions concerning the Holy Spirit undoubtedly shape his moral instruction. By way of analogy, large rivers have many tributaries and claiming that one exists is not a denial of the existence of others. In a similar way, I am making the claim that the Tenth Commandment is one "tributary" for Paul's ethic without denying or discounting others.

[10] Zimmermann helpfully distinguishes between *ethos*, which refers to "moral positions that are deemed to be valid based on custom and tradition," and *ethics*, which refers to "the systematic and theoretical examination of a lived ethos." Ruben Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love: Discovering Paul's "Implicit Ethics" through 1 Corinthians*, trans. Dieter T. Roth (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018), 1. Bourke writes, "From the time of the first Greek philosophers, ethics has had but one meaning: it is the reflective study of what is good or bad in that part of human conduct for which man has some personal responsibility." Vernon J. Bourke, *History of Ethics* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 8.

[11] After making this clarification, Thompson does use the term *ethics* in describing Pauline thought. James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 5. However, others shy away from the term altogether. Meeks, for example, opts to refer to *morality* as opposed to *ethics* when referring to early Christian texts. Wayne A. Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 3–5. Speaking of New Testament ethics broadly, Leander E. Keck writes, "Much that passes for New Testament ethics makes into ethics what is not really ethics at all but a heterogeneous mass of imperatives, counsels, parables, narratives, and theological statements that pertain to the moral life without actually being 'ethics.'" Leander E. Keck, "Rethinking 'New Testament Ethics,'" *JBL* 115, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 3–4. Also, Gupta surveys reasons for avoiding the term *ethics* in earlier scholarship, including the belief that early Christian anticipation of the return of Christ precluded the development of an ethical system. Nijak K. Gupta, "New Testament Ethics," in *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Nijak K. Gupta (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 254–57.

(Rom 7:7), or concludes that the Tenth Commandment is fulfilled in love (Rom 13:9), the use of the term *ethics* is warranted as a description. Furthermore, as evidenced by 1 Thessalonians 4:1, Paul instructed churches regarding "how [they] should walk and please God" (τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν θεῷ). Also, the well-observed shape of most Pauline letters, containing dedicated sections on moral instruction, testifies to the importance of ethical teaching as an aspect of Paul's ministry and ongoing communication with his churches.[12] To put it simply, Paul's congregations needed answers to the question, "How should we live?" Consequently, Paul gave those answers, which means his instruction was ethical in nature. So, while Paul does not present a comprehensive ethical system, he does prioritize moral instruction and reflects on correct living in his writings. By claiming that the Tenth Commandment played a formative role in Paul's ethical instruction, I am arguing that the Tenth Commandment was an influence on that aspect of Pauline thought and ministry.

Second, when Paul's statements about the law are considered (e.g., Gal 3:19–25; Eph 4:14–15), is it still possible to maintain that the Tenth Commandment played a role in his ethical instruction? To be sure, Paul makes strong statements about the cessation, limitations, and impotency of the law, and there is a significant body of scholarship which attempts to synthesize and explain his thought on precisely that question.[13] However, I am not attempting to engage with that debate directly. Instead, I am going to claim that Paul clearly views the Tenth Commandment, in particular, as authoritative for his churches (even if there is also a sense in which believers are no longer under the law), and I focus on demonstrating this assertion without attempting to

---

[12] Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 3.

[13] To give a few of many possible examples, Brian S. Rosner, *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013); James D. G. Dunn, ed., *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2001); Thomas R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993).

resolve the broader question of Paul and the law.[14]

Methodology

To demonstrate this thesis, I am undertaking an exegetical, historical, and canonical study.[15]

Exegetical

This study is exegetical in the sense that it is an attempt to closely read ancient texts using the standard methods of exegesis.[16] Therefore, throughout this project, close attention will be paid to syntax, and, at points, the tools of lexical analysis will be employed to make precise claims regarding the language of covetousness in the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish literature, and Paul.[17] For example, when it comes to the meaning of

---

[14] Watson evocatively describes the discussion around Paul and the law as "a constellation of interrelated 'problems' as fixed and stable as the stars in the night sky." Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 253.

[15] In the following discussion, I am influenced by Zimmermann, who has reflected extensively on methodology for doing ethics in the New Testament and advocates for pursuing the study of "implicit ethics" in Paul. By characterizing Paul's ethics as "implicit," he communicates several ideas. First, he is simply observing that Paul's ethical thought is not preserved in a systematic ethical treatise. Instead, it is found in situational communication. Second, he is drawing on reader response literary theory to place the text, as opposed to the author, in primary focus. He also raises questions regarding the coherence of Pauline thought and the fragility of knowledge regarding the historical Paul. Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 5–9. See also Ruben Zimmermann, "The 'Implicit Ethics' of New Testament Writings: A Draft on a New Methodology for Analysing New Testament Ethics," *Neotestamentica* 43, no. 2 (2009): 399–423. While I am indebted to Zimmermann, I disagree with aspects of his methodology and find other parts unnecessary for my project. For example, he advocates for a structuralist approach to reading Paul which only concerns itself with the text and not the author. In contrast, I appeal to historical information regarding Paul's Second Temple context and some information about Paul contained in Acts. Therefore, I am not adopting his methodology wholesale but critically adopting portions of it.

[16] As Zimmermann rightly observes, the study of New Testament ethics is fundamentally a study of texts; therefore, the analysis of the language of Pauline texts plays a foundational role. Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 32–42. For this study, the primary texts in view will be the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish literature, and early Christian writings, with the Pauline corpus being given the closest attention.

[17] For a helpful introduction to lexical work, see Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*, rev. and exp. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994). For an overview on recent discussions in New Testament lexicography, see Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 72–90. As a clarification, this study will not be a full-scale comparative lexical study, as exemplified by John Frederick, *The Ethics of the Enactment and Reception of Cruciform Love: A Comparative Lexical, Conceptual, Exegetical, and Theological Study of Colossians 3:1–17*, WUNT 2 487 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 28.

the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible, the meaning of two terms, חמד (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) and אוה (Deut 5:21), is one of the most important factors in determining the meaning of the Tenth Commandment. Or, in Paul, the meaning and usage of the term πλεονεξία (e.g., Col 3:5) will be crucial for this study.

In addition to paying close attention to specific lexemes, this study also examines the conceptual and thematic connections between the Tenth Commandment and other texts.[18] While this sensitivity is important for several reasons, one is that ethical concerns may be displayed in different ways in different genres.[19] In an occasional letter the Tenth Commandment may be directly cited (e.g., Rom 7:7, 13:9); however, in narrative literature in the Hebrew Bible, a character may be portrayed as violating the Tenth Commandment, although it is not directly cited (e.g., 1 Kgs 21:1–19). In such cases, conceptual and thematic evidence will play a vital role where there may not be direct lexical markers.

Also, while Paul cites the Tenth Commandment twice (Rom 7:7; 13:9), this study goes beyond explicit citations in an attempt to identify more subtle patterns of influence, focusing on what is often referred to as intertextuality[20] or inner-biblical

---

[18] In his study of emotion in the New Testament, Elliot rightly cautions that defining vocabulary is not the sole key to analyzing emotion, and his caution equally applies to the study of the language of covetousness in Paul. Matthew A. Elliot, *Faithful Feelings: Rethinking Emotion in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2006), 125–29. Thus, while being precise regarding the language of covetousness is an essential prerequisite for this project, it is not the full scope of the project. While Frederick, for example, undertakes a comparative lexical study, he rightly emphasizes the need for additional exegetical, theological, and conceptual study to interpret lexical data. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 28.

[19] For a discussion of genre and its bearing on ethics, see Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 39–42.

[20] Emadi, who has capably and helpfully traced scholarly discussions of intertextuality, observes that intertextuality is usually defined in biblical studies as "the phenomenon of how later writers incorporate earlier texts for rhetorical, poetic, literary, and (in the case of biblical studies) theological purposes." Samuel Emadi, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading," *CurBR* 14, no. 1 (October 2015): 10. For a survey of the approaches and terminologies related to intertextuality in Old Testament studies, see Geoffrey D. Miller, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research," *CurBR* 9, no. 3 (June 2011): 283–309. Hays has largely set the terms of the conversation when it comes to intertextuality in New Testament studies. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989). As Emadi traces, Hays towers over the conversation in biblical studies, and later scholars are heavily indebted to his original work. Emadi, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship," 10–13. For example, Beale self-consciously

allusion.[21] Since the study of indirect references to texts can be a subjective enterprise, there have been many attempts to put forward criteria for identifying allusions and echoes. Richard B. Hays, for example, proposes seven criteria for identifying echoes: availability,[22] volume,[23] recurrence,[24] thematic coherence,[25] historical plausibility,[26] history of interpretation,[27] and satisfaction.[28] Throughout this study, I employ criteria like

---

recapitulates, with slight modification, Hays' method. G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 32–34. See also Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, BibInt 96 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 13–40. Allen helpfully traces the responses to and critiques of Hays and cautions against misapplying his criteria. David Allen, "The Use of Criteria: The State of the Question," in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS 597 (New York: T & T Clark, 2020), 129–41. When it comes to applying this approach to the study of the influence of the Old Testament on the ethic of Paul, Rosner articulates a similar approach when he writes, "The word 'use' is thus used in this book in its wider sense to include not only explicit use of Scripture but also what might be called implicit and instinctive use of Scripture. Our concern is not just to catalogue how often Paul cites Scripture for ethics, but to ask to what extent Scripture is the basis of Paul's ethics, regardless of whether this is given explicit indication." Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics*, 17–18.

[21] Meek contends for more clarity by scholars when using the term intertextuality. In particular, he advocates against using the term to describe any study which is focused exclusively on the written text, is diachronic, or uses criteria. Rather, he suggests writers should use the term *inner-biblical allusion*. Russell Meek, "Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology," *Biblica* 95, no. 2 (2014): 283–84. Sommer carefully distinguishes between intertextuality and allusions and echoes: "Intertextuality is concerned with the reader or with the text as a thing independent of its author, while influence and allusion are concerned with the author as well as the text and reader." Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 8–9. As Kowalski shows, however, scholars have signified a wide range of ideas with the term *intertextuality*. Beate Kowalski, "Selective Versus Contextual Allusions: Reconsidering Technical Terms of Intertextuality," in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS 597 (New York: T & T Clark, 2020), 86–95. In this study, therefore, I will simply be using the term *intertextuality* in its broader sense, as is common scholarly practice, using it to signify simply a writer incorporating another text for his or her own purposes.

[22] "Was the proposed source of echo available to the author and/or original readers?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 29.

[23] "The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant." Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 30.

[24] "How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same Scriptural passage?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 30.

[25] "How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 30.

[26] "Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could his readers have understood it?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 30.

[27] "Have other readers, both critical and precritical, heard the same echoes?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 31.

[28] "With or without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense?" Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 31. According to Hays, this is not only the final,

these; however, I do not adopt a particular set of criteria as a methodology and apply them systematically. Instead, I will primarily be looking for lexical and conceptual similarities to the Tenth Commandment and appeal to other criteria when necessary.

Historical

This study is historical in the sense that it will be sensitive to the historical contexts and backgrounds of Pauline texts, which inform how the Tenth Commandment may have influenced Paul. "Norms," Ruben Zimmermann writes, "are shaped within a linguistic and cultural community."[29] When it comes to the Tenth Commandment, that is certainly the case. It occurs originally in the Hebrew Bible, and it was discussed and applied in later Jewish literature. Paul, therefore, received the Tenth Commandment through a tradition.[30] As Brian Rosner argues, the reception history of the Hebrew Bible plays an important role in understanding its use in the moral teaching of Paul. He writes, "Early Jewish moral teaching represents an intermediary stage which stands between the Scriptures and Paul and mediates Scripture to Paul."[31] Therefore, I investigate the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish literature,[32] and early Christian texts

---

but the most important test.

[29] Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 48. Zimmermann goes on to write, "The meaning and relevance of individual norms arise precisely within this context and draw their ability to persuade from it. In order to be able to evaluate a specific reference to a norm it is necessary, in the first instance, to determine the cultural imprint and context of a norm" (48–49).

[30] As Watson puts it, Paul participated in a "three-way conversation" where texts from the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish interpretations of those texts, and Paul's reading of the same texts make up the conversation. Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 1–5.

[31] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics*, 26. For a defense of this approach, see Rosner, 26–58. Rosner concludes, "The Scriptures not only directly influenced Paul's ethics through his use of Scripture, but also indirectly through his familiarity with Jewish moral teaching, which itself distilled and developed Scripture. In part, Paul heard the moral demands of Scripture through this Jewish 'filter' when he formulated the ethical instruction recorded in his epistles. He did not receive his Bible in a vacuum" (57).

[32] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "What Is Second Temple Judaism?," in *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (London: T & T Clark, 2020), 1:1–19; Daniel M. Gurtner, "The Historical and Political Contexts of Second Temple Judaism," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:21–89.

outside of Paul in an attempt to create a historically precise lens for reading the Tenth Commandment in Paul.

Beyond, however, the reception history of the Tenth Commandment, other historical data is relevant for understanding the Tenth Commandment in Pauline ethics, specifically, information about Paul as a historical individual and the context in which he lived. Zimmermann, however, expresses pessimism about knowing anything with certainty about the historical Paul and advocates for the study of ethics which "is based on the text and only concerns itself with the ethics that can be discovered in the text."[33] He further promotes an approach to ethics which "takes its orientation here primarily from the writings themselves and less from the postulated authors of the works."[34] On the one hand, Zimmermann's point is well taken—the text itself should be the primary focus of study. On the other hand, however, Zimmermann does not recognize the importance of clear and readily available historical evidence which sheds light on Paul's thought.

Paul was a Second Temple Jew, and there is significant evidence that the Decalogue played an important role in early Jewish thought. Volker Rabens identifies the Decalogue as a prominent influence on ethics in the literature of the Second Temple period, and several examples readily demonstrate the accuracy of his generalization.[35] Philo, for example, identified the Ten Words as "the heads of the laws" (κεφάλαια νόμων; *Decalogue* 154) and devoted a treatise, *On the Decalogue*, to expositing them. He also organized his treatment of the remainder of the Mosaic Law around the Decalogue in *On the Special Laws*. Additionally, Josephus references "the Ten Words" (τῶν δέκα λόγων)

---

[33] Zimmermann, "The 'Implicit Ethics'," 7. Zimmermann does not deny the importance of historical sensitivity when reading ancient texts, however, he applies that principle simply to the text itself and deemphasizes the author. Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 48.

[34] Zimmermann, "The 'Implicit Ethics'," 403.

[35] Volker Rabens, "Ethics," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 2:252–54.

and paraphrases each of them (*Ant.* 3.91–92).[36] When he does, he singles out the Ten Words from the remainder of Torah by stating, "These words it is not permitted us to state explicitly, to the letter, but we will indicate their purport" (*Ant.* 3.90 [LCL, Thackeray]).[37] Early Christian writings suggest a similar prominence for the Decalogue in Second Temple Judaism. In Mark 10:19, for example, Jesus quotes the Decalogue in a way that suggests that it was well-known to his audience (cf. Matt 5:21, 27; 19:18–19; Luke 18:20).[38]

Also, as David Lincicum observes, the Ten Words likely had a place in Jewish liturgy during the Second Temple period.[39] Lincicum observes the widespread prevalence of the Decalogue among the *tefillin*[40] and *mezuzot*[41] from Qumran.[42] Additionally, during

---

[36] Pseudo-Philo paraphrases the Decalogue twice, and, as Murphy observes, "Showcases the Ten Commandments . . . as the epitome of God's covenantal commands to Israel." Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 175.

[37] While the origin and meaning of Josephus' statement is unclear, it suggests the Decalogue has a special significance in his mind. For a discussion of the possible meaning of this statement, see J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 123–28; Josephus, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, ed. and trans. Louis H. Feldman, FJTC 3 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 235n190; Reinhard Weber, *Das "Gesetz" bei Philon von Alexandrien und Flavius Josephus: Studien zum Verständnis und zur Funktion der Thora bei den beiden Hauptzeugen des hellenistischen Judentums* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001), 296–97. Josephus make a similar statement about the divine name, writing, περὶ ἧς οὔ μοι θεμιτὸν εἰπεῖν (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.76). Concerning the Decalogue, Josephus writes, οὓς οὐ θεμιτόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν λέγειν φανερῶς πρὸς λέξιν Josephus, *Ant.* 3.90.

[38] France writes, "Jesus assumes that this total stranger is familiar with the decalogue—a significant pointer to its place in Jewish society at that time." Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 402.

[39] David Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*, WUNT 2 284 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 28–58. For other sources which cite evidence showing that the Decalogue was used in Jewish liturgy during the Second Temple period, see Moshe Weinfeld, "The Uniqueness of the Decalogue and Its Place in Jewish Tradition," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, trans. Gershon Levi (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 29–30; Richard A. Freund, "Decalogue," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 2:196–97; Aharon Oppenheimer, "Removing the Decalogue from the Shema and Phylacteries: The Historical Implications," in *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, LHBOTS 509 (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 97–98.

[40] "Small leather capsules containing certain passages of Scripture that were bound on the upper forehead and on one's left arm." Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 40.

[41] "A small scroll rolled up and affixed to the doorposts of one's house, bearing the passages that prescribe such an action." Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 40.

[42] Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 42–43.

the Second Temple period, there is evidence that the Decalogue was read along with the Shema prayer in Jewish liturgy in at least some contexts. In the Nash Papyrus, for example, the Decalogue is placed with the Shema prayer. Since the Nash Papyrus was designed for liturgical use, it suggests the Ten Words was included in the liturgy by the community which produced the Nash Papyrus.[43] Also, m. Tamid 5:1 describes how priests serving in the Temple "read the Ten Commandments" along with the Shema prayer during their morning blessing.[44] In view of this evidence, many Jews during the Second Temple period would have likely been familiar with the Decalogue in liturgical contexts and probably would have regarded it as a significant text.[45]

Would Paul have shared this view of the Ten Words? Paul gives reasons in his writings for readers to assume that he would have been very familiar with texts like the

---

[43] Lincicum helpfully summarizes the significance of the Nash Papyrus: "The small size and harmonizing tendency of the papyrus together with its excerpting of significance passages suggest that it was used for liturgical purposes; its geographical separation from Qumran suggests that it provides an independent and roughly contemporaneous witness to the inclusion of the Decalogue in the liturgy of the time." Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 43.

[44] For a discussion of later rabbinic analysis of this passage, see Roger Brooks, *The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 34–36. Weinfeld makes the further argument that the Decalogue would have been incorporated into an annual covenant renewal ceremony, and he suggests it would have taken place at Pentecost. Weinfeld, "Uniqueness of the Decalogue," 34–44. Langer, however, critiques Weinfeld, suggesting that his evidence does not bear the weight of his claim. Ruth Langer, "The Decalogue in Jewish Liturgy," in *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*, ed. Dominik Markl, Hebrew Bible Monographs 58 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 85–88. Langer critiques the idea that the Decalogue had a widespread role in Jewish liturgy during the Second Temple period. However, she grants the significant evidence of the Nash Papyrus and m. Tamid 5:1. She concludes, "However, these witnesses are insufficient to establish that Jews everywhere were participating in a liturgical recitation of the Decalogue at this time or that it had any place in their synagogues which were, as yet, primarily a place for the reading and teaching of Scripture rather than of prayer." Langer, "The Decalogue in Jewish Liturgy," 85–87. Langer rightly cautions against drawing more ambitious conclusions than the evidence warrants. Yet, the balance of evidence clearly weighs in the direction that the Ten Words were a widespread and well-known text in Jewish society at the time and likely played a role in Jewish liturgy. On the question of liturgical use, Greenspoon argues that there are traces of evidence in the Decalogue itself, specifically in Exod 20 LXX, that it was used in liturgical contexts. Leonard J. Greenspoon, "Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014), 347.

[45] At some point after the destruction of the temple, the Ten Commandments ceased to be a part of Jewish liturgy, an event which has fascinated scholars. For discussions see Langer, "The Decalogue in Jewish Liturgy," 87–101; Oppenheimer, "Removing Decalogue from Shema and Phylacteries," 98–105. Brooks helpfully traces later rabbinic attitudes toward the Ten Words. Brooks, *Spirit of the Ten Commandments*, 32–51.

Decalogue. Paul testifies about himself that he was committed to the law as a member of the party of the Pharisees before his change in allegiance to Jesus (2 Cor 11:22; Gal 1:13–14; Phil 3:5–6), and Luke gives a portrait of Paul which is consistent with the biographical information preserved in the Pauline corpus (Acts 22:3, 23:6, 26:4–5). In addition to Luke recording that Paul identified himself as a Pharisee (Acts 23:6, 26:5), he records Paul testifying that he received a Pharisaical education under the influence of Gamaliel (Acts 22:3). Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee (*Life* 7–12), describes the Pharisees in a way that illuminates the significance of this information for understanding Paul's thought. Josephus claims that the Pharisees "have the reputation of being unrivalled experts in their country's laws" (*Life* 191–92) and he suggests the Pharisees "are considered the most accurate interpreters of the laws" (*J. W.* 2.162; cf. *J. W.* 1.110–11).[46] With this information in mind, Paul almost certainly received a thoroughly Jewish education rooted in the law.[47] Lincicum goes further, arguing that "Paul probably encountered a Septuagintal form of Deuteronomy in a Greek-speaking synagogue during his days of study in Jerusalem, and may have committed it to memory there."[48]

With this evidence in mind, Paul's citations of the Decalogue (Rom 2:21–22; Rom 7:7; Rom 13:9; Eph 6:2–3) take on a new light. Most likely, Paul was familiar with the Decalogue as a particularly prominent text from his education and its use in Jewish liturgy. Of course, these general observations do not yield precise conclusions regarding the influence of the Tenth Commandment on Paul. However, they do suggest that the reader of Paul should not be surprised to see traces of the Tenth Commandment in Paul's

---

[46] As a Pharisee, Josephus is not an unbiased observer of course (e.g., *J. W.* 2.166). On the question of whether there may be a semi-ironic tone to some of these statements, see Josephus, *Judean War 2*, ed. and trans. Steve Mason, FJTC, IB (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 131–32n1003.

[47] Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 49–55.

[48] Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 48–49. Additionally, according to Josephus, education in the law was encouraged for all Jews (*Ag. Ap.* 2.204).

ethical instruction, even when it is not directly cited. So, data regarding the historical Paul is relevant for this study and provides an important historical backdrop.

However, to say that Paul is influenced by his historical context is not to say that there is nothing distinctive about his thought.[49] Therefore, while this is not primarily a comparative study, I reflect at points on ways Paul uses the Tenth Commandment in a manner distinctly different from his early Jewish contemporaries.

Canonical

This study is canonical[50] in the sense that it attempts to adopt the reading presuppositions of a Second Temple Jewish reader by focusing on the final form of the Hebrew Bible.[51] Since the primary purpose of this study is to make a claim regarding Pauline ethics, the best approach is reading the Hebrew Bible in the way Paul would have read it. So, for example, I engage heavily with the question of the meaning of the Tenth Commandment in its original context, which is an important introductory question. I will not, however, engage with critical issues such as the composition history of the Ten Words, a question which has little to no relevance for how the Tenth Commandment would or would not have impacted Paul.[52]

---

[49] While Paul read the same texts as his contemporaries, their conclusions were often markedly different. Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 1–5.

[50] While the term *canonical* can be used in different ways, I am referring to a reading focused on the final form of the Hebrew Bible without giving exhaustive attention to historical-critical questions. While the use of the term *canonical* is most associated with the work of Childs, I am not necessarily adopting his methodology in totality. For a summary of Childs' thought and critical interaction with it, see Iain W. Provan, *The Reformation and the Right Reading of Scripture* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017), 609–20.

[51] In his similar project, Williamson articulates the following methodological claim: "To read the Scriptures as first century Jews such as Paul read them, we must adopt a pre-critical mentality and read a canonical, final text, Scripture." Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 8. Also, de Vos articulates a similar approach to the Hebrew Bible as the one adopted in this study in his investigation of the reception of the Decalogue. de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*.

[52] Additionally, modern critical study of the Decalogue has been subjected to penetrating critique. Childs, for example, writes, "Certainly, the modern critical period has brought a new dimension of philological and historical precision to bear. Yet to the extent to which the scholar now finds himself increasingly estranged from the very substance which he studies, one wonders how far the lack of content which he discovers stems from a condition in the text or in himself." Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of*

By adopting a canonical approach, there is an inevitable collision with the question of what should be considered the canon. However, while granting that there are ongoing debates and complexities regarding what constituted the canon in Second Temple Judaism, it is common scholarly practice to identify the Hebrew Bible as the Scriptures for Paul.[53] Additionally, some argue that there is good evidence that Paul's canon was identical to the Pharisaical canon which is preserved in the Hebrew Bible today.[54] Therefore, while acknowledging the complexity regarding the question of the canon of the Hebrew Bible at the time of Paul, this study proceeds with the assumption that Scripture for Paul contains the books which are considered a part of the Hebrew Bible today. However, for those who disagree, I address a variety of texts from early Judaism throughout this project, including the LXX. So, for the purposes of this project, the primary difference will simply be terminological.

Additionally, I examine the Pauline corpus as a whole in this study, including the books which are often identified as "Deutero-Pauline" or "pseudonymous."[55] In this

---

Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 437. Or, as Barker writes regarding Deuteronomy, critical study "often sidelines theological concern and undervalues the book's rich nuances and subtleties." Paul A. Barker, "Contemporary Theological Interpretation of Deuteronomy," in *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, ed. David G. Firth and Philip Johnston (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 90.

[53] For a survey of recent developments in the study of the Old and New Testament canons, see James H. Charlesworth, "Reflections on the Canon, Its Origins, and New Testament Interpretation," in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*, ed. Andrew Brian McGowan and Kent Harold Richards, RBS 67 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 505–30. While Charlesworth raises more questions than he answers, his project helpfully surveys the diverse witnesses to what could be considered canonical in Second Temple Judaism.

[54] Timothy H. Lim, "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSNT* 38, no. 1 (September 2015): 71–72. For a classic treatment, see Roger T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986).

[55] In scholarship, many refer to Colossians, Ephesians, and 2 Thessalonians as "the Deutero-Pauline letters," and 1–2 Timothy and Titus are often referred to as "the pseudonymous letters." For a collection of essays dealing with issues in this area of scholarship, see Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*, Pauline Studies 8 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2013). For those who hold the Pauline authorship of these texts, this decision will seem perfectly natural. For those who deny the Pauline authorship of one, or more, of these texts, I do not think that should fundamentally undermine my conclusions. At the very least, there is value in considering texts together. As many have observed, if the author of Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timothy or Titus is not Paul, it is without doubt someone deeply influenced by him. Furthermore, these writings would preserve aspects of his ethical

project, I do not intend to directly enter the debate regarding the authorship of these texts.[56] Instead, I intend to treat them as a corpus for the purposes of this investigation. However, it is worth noting that while the majority scholarly opinion in North America and Europe has been against the Pauline authorship of these texts, this position is far from unanimous and significant critiques have been brought against the traditional arguments for ruling out Pauline authorship.[57]

As a final comment, some will perhaps see a contradiction between adopting both a historical and canonical approach in this project, as the two are often juxtaposed.[58] However, the two can be adopted harmoniously in this project. By reading the Hebrew Bible canonically, I am undertaking the most historically sensitive reading, because, as argued above, Paul would have read the Hebrew Bible in the same way. Also, to avoid confusion, while treating the Pauline corpus as a whole is consistent with a canonical approach, it is also a perfectly legitimate historical position. Additionally, it is a simple fact that every historical question cannot be resolved and the lack of consensus regarding authorship requires committing to a working position. Thus, historical and canonical

---

instruction and be his earliest interpreters. It seems, therefore, reasonable to consider the Pauline corpus as a whole in this project without attempting to make a definitive statement regarding Pauline authorship.

[56] For a treatment of the authorship of Colossians, see Scot McKnight, *The Letter to the Colossians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 5–18; Maria Pascuzzi, "Reconsidering the Authorship of Colossians," *BBR* 23, no. 2 (2013): 223–45. For a treatment of the authorship of Ephesians, see Thomas M. Winger, *Ephesians*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2015), 21–77. For a treatment of the authorship of 2 Thessalonians, see Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 46–54. For a treatment of the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, see Robert W. Yarbrough, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 69–90.

[57] For example, van Nes challenges the use of lexical evidence to argue against Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. Jermo van Nes, *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the Corpus Paulinum*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 16 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2018). Also, Köstenberger shows how the mission motif in the Pastoral Epistles functions as an argument for their authenticity. Andreas J. Köstenberger, "An Investigation of the Mission Motif in the Letters to Timothy and Titus with Implications for the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," *BBR* 29, no. 1 (2019): 49–64.

[58] For a discussion of this issue, see Seitz, who critiques Watson. Christopher R. Seitz, *The Character of Christian Scripture: The Significance of a Two-Testament Bible*, STI (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 61–62, 152–54. Watson summarizes Seitz's critique of his work and replies: Watson, introduction to 2nd ed. of *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, lvi–lxi.

approaches can be fruitfully employed in the same project, provided that terms and boundaries are clearly defined.

Summary

By adopting each of these three lenses—exegetical, historical, and canonical—I investigate whether or not the Tenth Commandment, as a moral norm, influences Paul.[59] By using the term *norm*, I am calling attention to the fact that the Tenth Commandment is a principle which establishes a standard of right and wrong. As Zimmermann writes, "A 'norm' is a pronouncement within an ethical statement or discourse that justifies the claim to an 'ought' or sets forth an attribution of value in terms of the conduct of an individual for a group."[60]

Historical Summary of Research

To my knowledge, there is no focused research on the influence of the Tenth

---

[59] Eckhard J. Schnabel, "How Paul Developed His Ethics: Motivations, Norms, and Criteria of Pauline Ethics," in *Jesus, Paul, and the Early Church: Missionary Realities in Historical Contexts; Collected Essays*, WUNT 406 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 193–222. See also the earlier publication of the same article: Eckhard J. Schnabel, "How Paul Developed His Ethics: Motivations, Norms and Criteria of Pauline Ethics," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*, ed. Brian S. Rosner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 267–97. However, I will not be focusing on going beyond this claim to reflecting on how Christians should receive Paul's ethical instruction today, which is an important clarification because much of the conversation related to methodology in New Testament ethics focuses on approaches to how Christians should understand the Bible to impact their lives today. For examples, see, Stephen E. Fowl, "Methodology: New Testament," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Ethics*, ed. Robert L. Brawley, Oxford Encyclopedias of the Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 2:39–45; Fowl, "The New Testament, Theology, and Ethics," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 397–413; Bruce C. Birch, "Scripture in Ethics: Methodological Issues," in *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, ed. Joel B. Green et al. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 27–34; Richard B. Hays, "Scripture-Shaped Community: The Problem of Method in New Testament Ethics," *Interpretation* 44, no. 1 (January 1990): 42–55. For a volume in which many of the essays engage with the question of bringing biblical ethics into contemporary relevance, see Ruben Zimmermann and Stephan Joubert, *Biblical Ethics and Application: Purview, Validity, and Relevance of Biblical Texts in Ethical Discourse*, WUNT 384 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

[60] Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 43. To give an additional aspect of Zimmermann's methodology which I adopt, he rightly observes that norms rarely exist in isolation, and a "constellation of norms" is observable in Paul (59). When Paul, for example, states that the Tenth Commandment is fulfilled by the command of Lev 19:18 (Rom 13:9), he is placing the Decalogue in conversation with other norms. Furthermore, Paul may be influenced by the teaching of Jesus (see Matt 19:19; 22:9), which would also function as a norm for him.

Commandment on Paul's ethical instruction. For this reason, this summary of research focuses on selected works that will function as important conversation partners, although they are not directly answering the research question of this project.

William Andrew Williamson dealt with a closely related question in his 2007 dissertation, "The Influence of You Shall Not Murder on Paul's Ethics in Romans and 1 Corinthians." In that project, he argued, "The influence of 'You shall not murder' on Paul's ethics in Romans and 1 Corinthians is evident in Paul's frequent use of the biblical and Jewish murder theme in his ethics and his expansion of that theme in his christology."[61] To make his case, Williamson begins by extensively dealing with the question of the meaning of the murder command in its original context.[62] Then, he turns to the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, distilling multiple features of a murder theme found in these writings.[63] He goes on to make the argument that the murder command is a significant influence on Paul's ethics in Romans[64] and 1 Corinthians.[65] Finally, he briefly reflects on a Pauline theology of the Decalogue and charts the various levels of influence of the murder command on Paul's ethics.[66] Since Williamson takes up a specific command from the Decalogue and investigates its influence on Pauline ethics, his project bears significant similarities to the one that I am proposing. However, since I am taking up a different command, my project is substantially different than his

---

[61] Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 355.

[62] In contrast to those who argue that the murder command is a multi-sense prohibition against killing, he argues that it is best understood as a single-sense prohibition against murder with a broad application. Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 105–6.

[63] Williamson identifies seven themes: murder as a problem for God and the godly, murder addressed by three overlapping sets of laws, laws of moral impurity, anti-social sin and murder, anti-social vice and murder, murder in ethical lists, and the fulfillment of the murder commandment. Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 103, 116, 119, 129, 148, 157, 184.

[64] Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 204–96.

[65] Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 297–350.

[66] Williamson identifies the six levels of influence as theological, semantic, conceptual, formal, rhetorical, and christological. Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder," 355–62.

dissertation and will be a separate piece of research.

A small body of research focuses on the Decalogue in Paul.[67] Gottfried Nebe, for example, contributed to this discussion in his 2011 essay "The Decalogue in Paul, Especially in His Letter to the Romans."[68] In his piece, Nebe surveys each explicit citation of the Ten Words in Romans. Nebe is representative of the majority of scholarship on the Decalogue in Paul in that he focuses on explicit references to the Ten Commandments without paying attention to more subtle references or focusing in on a specific commandment. In contrast, I am proposing a more focused study which has margin to take into consideration more subtle patterns of influence.[69]

Eric L. Henry produced one of the few focused pieces of research on the Tenth Commandment with his dissertation, "The Tenth Commandment: A Study in the History of Interpretation." Henry traces the reception of the Tenth Word through the Hebrew Bible, to ancient versions, to the church fathers, and into modern times. In this survey, however, he dedicates limited attention to Paul.[70]

---

[67] In addition, some literature examines the use of the Decalogue in the New Testament. Evans, "Decalogue in the New Testament"; Reginald H. Fuller, "The Decalogue in the New Testament," in *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*, ed. William P. Brown (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 33–44. While these studies are helpful, they are too broad to deal with the questions of this project in any depth. Grant surveys the use of the Decalogue in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Robert M. Grant, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity," *HTR* 40, no. 1 (1947): 1–17. Again, his treatment is too broad to delve deeply into the questions of my project. Lidija Novakovic, "The Decalogue in the New Testament," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 35, no. 4 (Winter 2008): 373–86; F. E. Vokes, "The Ten Commandments in the New Testament and in First Century Judaism," in *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 5, *Papers Presented at the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965*, pt. 2, *The New Testament Message*, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), 146–54. Flusser surveys the Ten Commandments in the New Testament but gives only the slightest attention to Paul. David Flusser, "The Ten Commandments and the New Testament," in Segal and Levi, *Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, 224. Steyn examines the occurrences of citations from the Decalogue in the New Testament with the goal of tracing which source they relied upon for their ordering. Gert. J. Steyn, "Pretexts of the Second Table of the Decalogue and Early Christian Intertexts," *Neotestamentica* 30, no. 2 (1996): 451–64.

[68] Gottfried Nebe, "The Decalogue in Paul, Especially in His Letter to the Romans," in Reventlow and Hoffman, *Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, 50–87.

[69] Also, Burton made a significant contribution to this short conversation in his monograph on Rom 7:1–6. He heavily engages with Paul's use of the Decalogue in Romans; however, he overstates his case by arguing that νόμος is essentially synonymous with the Decalogue in Romans. Keith A. Burton, *Rhetoric, Law, and the Mystery of Salvation in Romans 7:1–6* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001).

[70] Eric Leopold Henry, "The Tenth Commandment: A Study in the History of Interpretation"

Diane Louise Hakala gives focused attention to the way the Decalogue functions as a summary of the law in both Jewish and Christian literature in her work "The Decalogue as a Summary of the Law: Jewish and New Testament Approaches."[71] Hakala gives focused attention to the Decalogue in Romans, interacting with Romans 7:7 and 13:9, which are important texts for this study. However, she focuses on how the Decalogue as a whole functions as a summary of the law rather than the Tenth Commandment specifically.[72]

In his 2016 work on the Decalogue, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr.*, J. Cornelis de Vos traces the reception history of the Ten Words throughout the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, and into early Christian texts, including the Apostolic Fathers. However, he devotes relatively little attention to Paul. When he does, he exclusively focuses his discussion on explicit citations.[73]

Furthermore, some scholars have drawn attention to the influence of the Ten Commandments in Paul, although their works primarily focus on questions other than the ones I am asking. For example, in his 2010 work *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy* Lincicum dedicates a few pages to the Decalogue as an influence on the ethics of Paul in the larger context of his study of the influence of Deuteronomy on Paul.[74] Or, John Frederick argues in his 2019 work *The Ethics of the Enactment and Reception of Cruciform Love* that the ethics of Colossians was primarily derived from

---

(PhD diss., University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1997), 109–16.

[71] Diane L. Hakala, "The Decalogue as a Summary of the Law: Jewish and New Testament Approaches" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2014).

[72] Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 129–34.

[73] For de Vos, "An zwei Stellen zitiert Paulus aus dem Dekalog: Röm 7,7 und 13,8–10." de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 216. Since Paul includes the Tenth Commandment in both of those citations, de Vos' comments, although limited, will be relevant for my project.

[74] Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 123–27.

Jewish traditions. While Frederick emphasizes the role of the Decalogue in Colossians, he puts more focus on the teachings of Jesus and the Jewish Two Ways tradition.[75]

In his 2007 work *Greed as Idolatry* Brian Rosner provides a detailed study focused on Colossians 3:5[76] and Ephesians 5:5.[77] Over the course of his work, Rosner examines the ways Christians have understood greed as idolatry in the history of interpretation, examines possible sources for Paul's statements in Colossians 3:5 and Ephesians 5:5, and argues that the statements are metaphorical, communicating that greed violates God's claim to exclusive worship. Furthermore, he locates greed in the context of the early church sharing their possessions and showing hospitality.[78] Rosner, however, does not emphasize the role of the Tenth Commandment, which leaves room to build on his conclusions related to Colossians 3:5 and Ephesians 5:5.[79]

Also, Walter Brueggemann has produced a significant piece of research for this project with his 2016 work *Money and Possessions*. Brueggemann traces the theme of covetousness throughout the Old and New Testaments.[80] In chapters on Paul and the Pastoral Epistles, he explores Pauline thought related to economics, possessions, and

---

[75] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*. Also, Hartman argues that the household code in Col 3:6–4:1 is influenced by the Decalogue. Lars Hartman, "Code and Context: A Few Reflections on the Parenesis of Col 3:6–4:1," in Rosner, *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 177–91.

[76] "Covetousness (τὴν πλεονεξίαν), which is idolatry (εἰδωλολατρία)."

[77] "A covetous person (πλεονέκτης), who is an idolater (εἰδωλολάτρης)."

[78] Rosner concludes, "The greedy are those with a strong desire to acquire and keep for themselves more and more money and possessions, because they love, trust, and obey wealth rather than God." Brian S. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 129.

[79] Rosner emphasizes the foundational nature of many texts from the Jewish Scriptures, including the prohibition against the worship of other gods and idolatry from the Decalogue. However, he does not identify the Tenth Commandment as having a significant role in the interpretation of Eph 5:5 and Col 3:5. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 52–59, 69–79. Also see Rosner, *Paul and the Law*, 191–92. However, Rosner does note that "in Jewish thought both greed and idolatry involved evil desire," and references the Tenth Word, so it does not go unmentioned in his work. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 150.

[80] Brueggemann suggests that "Sabbath is the alternative to coveting" in the narrative of the Hebrew Bible. Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 23.

covetousness, and he dedicates limited attention to Ephesians 5:3–5 and Colossians 3:5, suggesting they are connected to the Tenth Commandment.[81] However, Brueggemann focuses on the positive elements of Paul's instruction (e.g., generosity and contentment) and the application of Pauline thought to contemporary issues of economic justice, which is a different focus than the question I am seeking to answer. Thus, despite his attention to the Tenth Commandment throughout his work, Brueggemann interacts with the question of how the Decalogue may or may not be influencing Paul's teaching only in passing.

In his work on the Ten Commandments, Patrick D. Miller surveys the meaning of the Tenth Commandment in its original context and explores how it is developed in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. Miller's work is helpful, and I draw on it repeatedly, especially in my treatment of the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible. However, since it is a survey work, he is unable to dedicate more than two pages to his treatment of Paul.[82]

In addition, research on the language of desire in Paul is significant for my project. Andrew Bowden, for example, in his 2016 article "A Semantic Investigation of Desire in 4 Maccabees and Its Bearing on Romans 7:7" explores Paul's quotation of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7:7 alongside a similar quotation by the author of 4 Maccabees. Bowden argues, "Both authors discuss ἐπιθυμία under the schemata of mastery and both link ἐπιθυμία with similar lexemes."[83] While Bowden is primarily investigating issues related to desire in Paul more broadly, his work on the Tenth

---

[81] Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, 228–31.

[82] Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 387–414.

[83] Andrew Bowden, "A Semantic Investigation of Desire in 4 Maccabees and Its Bearing on Romans 7:7," in *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Munich, 2013*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Meiser (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016). In another article, Bowden argues "dass das zehnte Gebot in Röm 7,7 wegen des breiteren Kontexts von Freiheit und Sklaverei in Röm 5-8 zitiert wurde." Andrew Bowden, "Sklaverei, Gesetz, und Erkenntenis der Sünde. Die Rolle der Begierde in Röm 7,7–8," in *Perspektiven auf Römer 7*, ed. Stefan Krauter (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Theologie, 2016), 45.

Commandment is relevant for my project. Bowden also traces the reception of Numbers 11 in the LXX and early Jewish and Christian literature. However, he does not emphasize the role of the Tenth Word, with the exception of his discussion of Philo.[84]

Significance

Since no focused study exists on the Tenth Commandment in Paul, this project makes a scholarly contribution by filling a gap in current research. Also, the Decalogue in Paul is understudied in general, with a few notable exceptions.[85] While this study would not be a broad or exhaustive treatment of the Ten Words in Paul, the findings of it will have relevance for this neglected field of study, because closely examining one command from the Decalogue is a way at getting at the influence of the Decalogue as a whole on Paul's thought.[86] In view of this, the study of the Tenth Commandment in Paul is worthwhile, because it opens a significant window into Paul's ethical thought. As I will argue, for Paul, the Tenth Commandment draws defining boundaries for sinful behavior, bleeds into the remainder of the Decalogue, and functions in other capacities as well.

Second, the argument of this dissertation intersects with current trends in New Testament studies such as the study of Torah ethics in Paul, which focuses on the way the Hebrew Bible informs and influences Paul's moral instruction.[87] Since Torah ethics in

---

[84] Andrew Bowden, "'And the Mixed among Them Desired a Desire': The Reception of Desire in Numbers 11 LXX in Greek Texts, Ending with the Apostle Paul," in *Testing and Temptation in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, ed. Daniel L. Smith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, WUNT 2 519 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 93–115. Also see Bowden, "'A Delight to the Eyes and Desirous to Make One Wise': The Hellenistic Reception of Desire in Genesis 3" (paper presented at the 21st International Congress of the International Organization for the Old Testament, Munich, Germany, August 25, 2013). Unfortunately, I was unable to interact with Bowden's monograph, forthcoming at the time of the completion of this project, which will undoubtedly make a significant contribution to the conversation around desire in Paul: Andrew Bowden, *Desire in Paul's Undisputed Epistles: Semantic Observations on the Use of epithymeō, ho epithymētēs, and epithymía in Roman Imperial Texts*, WUNT 2 539 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

[85] See "History of Research" section above.

[86] Since Williamson has undertaken a detailed study of the murder command, this proposed project can add to the work done by Williamson and contribute to further detailing Paul's use of the Decalogue in his ethics. Williamson, "Influence of You Shall Not Murder."

[87] Unlike many areas in Pauline studies, Torah ethics in Paul is somewhat understudied. As

Paul is a subfield of New Testament ethics, I also intend to make a modest contribution to that broader field.[88] Also, this proposed study connects to perennial fields of study in New Testament scholarship such as Paul and the law,[89] and the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.[90] While each of these fields has its own body of research, and this project is not an attempt to engage with the breadth of scholarship on those questions, it has the potential to make a contribution to them.

Therefore, my project garners its significance from addressing an understudied area and intersecting with contemporary trends in scholarship. Furthermore, for those interested in New Testament ethics, the fundamental task is descriptive. As Hays observes, the descriptive exegetical task must precede other essential steps when attempting to state how communities of faith should live today.[91] Therefore, this study

---

Meiser asserts, "While great attention has been paid to Paul's theoretical statements concerning the relationship between the Law and Christ, the Law and faith, and the Law and justification, the topic of 'the Torah and Pauline ethics' has remained somewhat neglected." Martin Meiser, introduction to *The Torah in the Ethics of Paul*, LNTS 473 (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 1. Recognizing this void, some work has directly engaged with this question in recent years. Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller, eds., *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016); Rosner, *Paul and the Law*; Meiser, *Torah in Ethics of Paul*; Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*. Also, Victor Paul Furnish gives some direct attention to the question in his classic work. Victor Paul Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 28–43. Rosner's focused study of 1 Cor 5–7 stands out as a particularly rigorous treatment on the subject. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics*.

[88] Gupta, "New Testament Ethics"; Brian S. Rosner, "Paul's Ethics," in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 212–23. In New Testament ethics, a perennial question is to what extent Scripture played a role in Christian ethics for Paul. Von Harnack, for example, writes, "Paul did not give the Old Testament to the young churches as the book of Christian sources for edification. Rather, he based his mission and teaching wholly and completely on the gospel and expects edification to come exclusively from it and from the Spirit accompanying the gospel." Adolf von Harnack, "The Old Testament in the Pauline Letters/Churches," in Rosner, *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 44. In contrast, Holtz writes, "For Paul the Torah represents the only norm of life and its order represents the order of the wholesome life." Traugott Holtz, "The Question of the Content of Paul's Instructions," in Rosner, *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 69. Of course, New Testament ethics deals with many more issues than the one under consideration in this project. See, for example, Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*, 2nd ed., WUNT 2 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 253–306.

[89] Rosner, *Paul and the Law*; Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*.

[90] Matthew W. Bates, "The Old Testament in the New Testament," in McKnight and Gupta, *State of New Testament Studies*, 83–102.

[91] Hays suggests that the descriptive task is followed by the synthetic and hermeneutical tasks which are also essential. Hays, "Scripture-Shaped Community," 42–46.

attempts to engage in a descriptive task, and others may be able to build on it in doing further work in New Testament ethics.[92]

Argument

To make my argument, in chapter 2, I examine the form and interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature outside of Paul. I briefly survey the place of the Decalogue in the Pentateuch, and, while I do not engage with introductory questions such as the dating and composition history of the Decalogue, I do briefly address the different forms of the Tenth Commandment in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 and how it should be numbered. I also address the question of the meaning of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible. According to some, the Tenth Commandment is a prohibition against both desire and action—specifically, desiring the property of another and taking it. In contrast, I argue that the Tenth Commandment is a prohibition of desire, and I adopt the following as a working definition of covetousness: desiring something forbidden in a way in which to take it. By examining this issue in detail, I intend to set a foundation for the rest of the work by answering the unavoidable question, what does the Tenth Commandment mean? To conclude this chapter, I address the translations of the Tenth Commandment in the Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX and briefly survey quotations and paraphrases of the Tenth Commandment in early Jewish literature.

Then, in chapter 3, I argue that Paul uses the Tenth Commandment to describe and define sin. In the Hebrew Bible, Adam and Eve's primal sin forms an important background for the Tenth Commandment (Gen 2:9; 3:6; Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) and Second Temple Jewish literature further establishes that connection (GLAE 11.1; 19.3; 3

[92] Of course, there are other approaches to New Testament ethics, which Hays helpfully charts. Richard B. Hays, "Mapping the Field: Approaches to New Testament Ethics," in *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt and François S. Malan, BZNW 141 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 3–19.

Bar. 4.8; *Ant.* 1.41–42; *QG* 1.31, 47–48; Wis 2:24). Also, Numbers 11 informs the Tenth Commandment (Num 11:4, 34; Deut 5:21), a connection which Philo highlights (Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.126–131). Paul also connects the Tenth Commandment to Adam and Eve's sin (Rom 7:7) and Numbers 11 (1 Cor 10:6). By doing so, Paul upholds the Tenth Commandment as an ethical norm and presents the Tenth Commandment as describing something fundamental to sin itself: it can be traced back to evil desire.

In chapter 4, I claim that Paul connects the violation of the Tenth Commandment to idolatry. In the Hebrew Bible, covetousness is directly connected to idolatry (Deut 7:25; Isa 1:29; 44:9), a link which is sustained in early Jewish literature (e.g., *T. Jud.* 19.1). Paul follows a similar pattern by connecting covetousness to idolatry (1 Cor 10:6–7; Eph 5:5; Col 3:5). When it comes to 1 Corinthians 10, I build on argumentation from the previous chapter by arguing that when Paul connects evil desire (1 Cor 10:6) and idolatry (1 Cor 10:7), the Tenth Commandment is forming his ethics. Also, while Paul does not explicitly cite the Tenth Commandment in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5, I argue that he is influenced by it in identifying covetous desire with idolatry.

In chapter 5, I assert that Paul connects covetousness to violating other commands from the second table of the Decalogue. In the Hebrew Bible, covetousness is connected to murder, adultery, theft, and false witness (Josh 7:21; 2 Sam 11; 1 Kgs 21) and early Jewish literature develops this connection (e.g., Philo, *Spec.* 4:84; Sus 8–14, 19–21, 43, 53, 61). Paul cites the majority of the second table alongside the Tenth Commandment (Rom 13:9), and he links covetousness to sexual immorality (1 Cor 10:6–8; 1 Thess 4:3–8), indicating that he connects breaking the Tenth Word to other prohibitions of the Decalogue.

In chapter 6, I demonstrate that Paul uses the Tenth Commandment as a test of faithful leadership. In the Hebrew Bible, the violation of the Tenth Commandment by the economic, political, and religious elite is given particular attention (2 Sam 11; 1 Kgs 21;

Mic 2:1–2), and Second Temple literature shows the same pattern (e.g., Sus 8–14). Paul frequently presents his ministry as free from covetousness (2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–10). Furthermore, Paul regularly critiques his opponents for being motivated by financial or personal gain (2 Cor 2:17; Phil 1:15–17; Titus 1:11). When doing so, Paul establishes himself as an exemplar. Also, Paul instructs that leaders in Christian communities must not be motivated by greed (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:9–10; Titus 1:8). In a concluding chapter, I summarize my argument, draw conclusions, and reflect on the significance of Paul's use of the Tenth Word.

CHAPTER 2

THE FORM AND INTERPRETATION OF THE TENTH COMMANDMENT IN THE HEBREW BIBLE AND EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE

To study Paul's use of the Tenth Commandment, preliminary questions must be answered: What is the Tenth Commandment? What does it mean? And how would Paul most likely have encountered it? In this chapter, therefore, I establish a baseline regarding the form and interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature.[1]

The Form and Interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible

In this section, I focus on the form and interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible. But Paul, of course, wrote in Greek. And when he quotes the Tenth Word (Rom 7:7; 13:9), the wording of his quotation agrees with Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX.[2] So, while the form and interpretation of the

---

[1] Of course, early Christian writings are also relevant for reading Paul, but there are not any direct citations of the Tenth Word in the New Testament outside of Paul. Mark 10:19 is a possible exception where Jesus may reference the Tenth Commandment directly with the words, "Do not defraud" (Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς); however, this is a disputed point. France, for example, suggests that Jesus' words are "an attempt to draw out in more behavioural terms the implications of the tenth commandment: appropriating someone else's possessions is likely to be a practical result of coveting." Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 402. Yet, Peppard argues that Jesus intentionally inserted a command that was not from the Decalogue to prophetically indict his listener. Michael Peppard, "Torah for the Man Who Has Everything: 'Do Not Defraud' in Mark 10:19," *JBL* 134, no. 3 (2015): 595–604. Since I am limiting myself to clear translations, citations, or paraphrases of the Tenth Commandment, I do not deal with Mark 10:19 in this survey. Also, while there are clear references to the Tenth Commandment in the Apostolic Fathers (Barn. 19.6; Did. 2.2), these texts postdate Paul; therefore, delimiting this chapter to the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature fits the available evidence.

[2] To be more specific, Paul's citations of the Tenth Word agree with the unified tradition of the LXX and the Hebrew Bible, which is regularly the case. Lim takes this as evidence that Paul did not exclusively rely on the LXX. He writes, "It is commonly asserted on the basis of a casual comparison between his biblical citations and the LXX that 'Paul's Bible' is the Septuagint. Yet, when one analyses the textual character of his verbatim citations, it is evident that the text that he most often quotes is the uniform

Tenth Commandment in the LXX is clearly important for its usage in Paul, it may not be immediately clear why the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible also deserves attention. However, it is important to distinguish between the question of the textual origin of Paul's quotations and the question of which texts influenced his thought.[3] Thus, although Paul likely drew from the LXX when citing the Tenth Commandment, it does not follow that the LXX *alone* is relevant for Paul's understanding and use of the Tenth Word.

In fact, there is good reason for thinking that the Hebrew Bible would have informed, directly or indirectly, Paul's use of the Tenth Word. At the most basic level, the LXX is a translation of the Hebrew Bible, which means that the Hebrew Bible provides an important background for understanding the LXX. Additionally, Paul likely knew Hebrew, as suggested by his self-designation Ἑβραῖος (Phil 3:5; 2 Cor 11:22), so there is

---

text of the MT and LXX. His quotations agree with both the MT and LXX 41 times out of 92 cases (45 percent). Paul cites the LXX, when it differs from the MT, only on 17 occasions (18 percent). Paul did use the Septuagint, and the language of the Greek translation shaped the expressions in his own writings, but the textual classification of his verbatim quotations shows that it is the uniform tradition of the MT and LXX that he most commonly cites. Paul cited his Scriptures in Greek, because that was the language of his letters, but it does not necessarily follow that the biblical citations are, then, to be textually classified as the septuagintal text-type." Timothy H. Lim, "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSNT* 38, no. 1 (September 2015): 71. Also see Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 140–41. Kujanpää cautions against concluding that Paul was directly familiar with the Hebrew Bible. In fact, she concludes in her study of Pauline quotations in Romans that there is no evidence of Paul "directly engaging with a Hebrew text." Katja Kujanpää, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*, NovTSup 172 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2019), 335. Of course, to quote a maxim, the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, and Kujanpää does admit that "the possibility that Paul occasionally translates from the Hebrew, it cannot be excluded." Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 335. Kujanpää relies on the work of Koch (Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* [Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986]); and Stanley (Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992]), in addition to her own research, and suggests that Paul most often directly cites the LXX and any instances of Paul seeming to cite the Hebrew Bible, as opposed to the LXX, can be explained by the tendency, roughly contemporaneous to Paul, to revise portions of the LXX to the Hebrew Bible. Typically, this is referred to as the *kaige* revision. Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*; David Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*, WUNT 2 284 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 53. Silva catalogues explicit citations of Scripture in Paul and notes that in instances where the LXX and MT disagree, Paul often agrees with the LXX, but he does occasionally agree with the MT. Moisés Silva, "Old Testament in Paul," in *DPL*, 630–34. While this evidence could be taken as evidence that Paul occasionally translated his quotations directly from the Hebrew Bible, it could also be explained by Paul using a LXX text which had been corrected to the Hebrew Bible already.

[3] For a helpful summary of scholarship on the origin of Paul's quotations, see Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 4–8.

no reason to exclude the possibility that he interacted with the Hebrew Bible, whether or not it was the source of his quotations.[4] Furthermore, a vital part of this project is tracing the way certain themes related to the Tenth Word are developed in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to undertake this study without examining the form and interpretation of the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible. In light of these reasons, primary attention will be given in this chapter to the Hebrew Bible as a foundational document, but the Tenth Commandment in the LXX, as well as other early Jewish literature will also be surveyed.

While the purpose of this section is to examine the form and interpretation of the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible, I do not engage with the full gamut of critical issues regarding the Ten Words. As articulated in the previous chapter, I am undertaking a final form reading in this project; consequently, I focus on the canonical form of the Hebrew Bible.[5] So, for example, I do not engage with the questions of the dating, composition history, or addressees of the Decalogue.[6] Also, I do not interact in detail with the

---

[4] If Paul knew Hebrew in addition to Greek, it would also fit well-documented historical data. As Lincicum observes, "The phenomenon of bi- or even tri-lingualism among Jews and other ancient peoples under imperial dominion was widespread and well-known." Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 53.

[5] See methodology section in chap. 1 for an explanation and justification of this approach.

[6] As Osumi summarizes, "The research on the Decalogue in the 20th Century, especially from 1930s to 1970s, focused on the tradition history of these two texts. Scholars tried to trace back the oral tradition of both texts to their common origin. This approach saw a decisive meaning not in the present canonical text but in the reconstructed original one." Yuichi Osumi, "One Decalogue in Different Texts," in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28-31, 2007*, ed. Akio Moriya and Gōhei Hata, JSJSup 158 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012), 23. Stamm summarizes a significant amount of critical scholarship up until 1965, and his survey illustrates the focus on tradition historical questions. J. J. Stamm and M. E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1967), 13–75. Also, Baker provides a summary of scholarship on the dating of the Ten Words. David L. Baker, "The Finger of God and the Forming of a Nation: The Origin and Purpose of the Decalogue," *TynBul* 56, no. 1 (2005): 5–9. While a comprehensive summary of historical critical work on the Decalogue is unnecessary, I have gathered some representative examples: Lang argues that the Decalogue developed in three stages, and the current form is best understood as a "dodecalogue" consisting of twelve commandments. Bernhard Lang, "Twelve Commandments—Three Stages: A New Theory on the Formation of the Decalogue," in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and H. G. M. Williamson (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003). In contrast, Blum argues that the Decalogue originally consisted of seven commandments. Erhard Blum, "The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, FAT 78 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019),

comparative study of the Tenth Commandment alongside Ancient Near Eastern law codes or other ancient texts.[7] While these questions are significant, they are outside of the purview of this study.

After delimiting this discussion, several crucial questions remain: Since the Tenth Commandment occurs twice in the Hebrew Bible, what are the implications of the different forms in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21? Should Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 be numbered as one or two commandments? What does the Tenth Commandment prohibit? How is the Tenth Commandment distinguished from the other

---

299–301. Schmidt argues that the Decalogue can be traced to an exilic redaction prior to the Book of the Covenant. Ludwig Schmidt, "Dekalog und Bundesbuch im Kontext von Exodus 19-24," *ZAW* 128, no. 4 (2016): 579–93. As another example, Johnstone examines the influence of the Decalogue on Exodus with the stated goal of determining whether the version of the Decalogue in Exodus or Deuteronomy is original. William Johnstone, "The Influence of the Decalogue on the Shape of Exodus," in *Torah and Tradition: Papers Read at the Sixteenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap, Edinburgh, 2015*, ed. Klaas Spronk (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2017), 150–75. Kennett studies the Decalogue from the perspective of Pentateuchal source criticism. R. H. Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920). Himbaza treats the critical variants of the Decalogue in detail and makes claims regarding its dating and composition history. Innocent Himbaza, *Le décalogue et l'histoire du texte: études des formes textuelles du decalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Academic Press, 2004). Similarly, Hossfeld compares the Exodus and Deuteronomy versions of the Decalogue with the intention of tracing the composition history of the Ten Words. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog: seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1982). Tian argues that the Decalogue in Deut 5 is earlier and the Decalogue in Exod 20 is a priestly revision of the earlier form. Haihua Tian, "Literary Context of the Decalogue and Its Different Versions in the Hebrew Bible," *Journal of Sino-Western Communications* 2, no. 1 (July 2010): 61–72. Also see He-Won Ro, "The Exodus Decalogue in Deuteronomistic Redaction," *Asia Journal of Theology* 16, no. 2 (October 2002): 315. Osumi, however, argues that there was no single original Decalogue from which the Exodus and Deuteronomy versions were derived. Osumi, "One Decalogue in Different Texts," 23. Needless to say, the conclusions reached by critical scholars have largely been conflicting. Baker writes, "So although it is possible that there was an earlier form of the Decalogue, simpler and shorter than either of the forms in the Bible, it cannot be proved with certainty nor is there is any way of establishing its exact wording. In any case, it is the texts of Exodus and Deuteronomy which have become canonical for Israel and the church, and it is in this form that the Decalogue has had an unparalleled influence in world history." Baker, "The Finger of God," 14.

[7] To give a few examples of this approach, Hogue argues that the Decalogue can be understood as an instance of the creation of a monument in the ANE. Timothy Hogue, "The Monumentality of the Sinaitic Decalogue: Reading Exodus 20 in Light of Northwest Semitic Monument-Making Practices," *JBL* 138, no. 1 (2019): 79–99. Also, Hood compares the Decalogue and the Egyptian Book of the Dead, noting that both are concerned with "matters of the heart." Jared C. Hood, "The Decalogue and the Egyptian Book of the Dead," *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (January 2009): 64. Baker briefly surveys some of the relevant legal and non-legal ANE texts for the study of the Tenth Commandment. David L. Baker, *The Decalogue: Living as the People of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017), 143–45. Lastly, Kaufman compares the ordering of the Decalogue to the ordering of other ANE legal compilations. Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Second Table of the Decalogue and the Implicit Categories of Ancient Near Eastern Law," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, ed. John H. Marks and Robert McClive Good (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987), 111–16.

commandments of the Decalogue, and how does it overlap with them? And, even prior to these questions, it must be asked, what is the significance of the context (i.e., the Decalogue) of the Tenth Commandment?

Context: The Decalogue

In the Hebrew Bible, the Tenth Commandment (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) is located in the Decalogue (Exod 20:2–17; Deut 5:6–21), which, as the initial statement of the Sinai covenant, possesses unique significance.[8] YHWH spoke only one part of the law to the people of Israel directly, and it was the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:22; Deut 5:22).[9] YHWH wrote the Decalogue with his own finger on two tablets of stone (Exod 24:12; 31:18; 34:28; Deut 4:13; 5:22; 9:10).[10] Moses placed the Ten Words in the Ark of the Covenant as an expression of their fundamental importance to the covenant between YHWH and Israel (Deut 10:5).[11] "While the Decalogue was not the only part of the Pentateuch associated with the covenant," Daniel I. Block writes, "it was recognized as the original and official covenant document, announced to the people by YHWH himself and written by his own hand."[12] The Tenth Word, therefore, as part of the Decalogue,

---

[8] See the similar discussions in Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 3; Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 397–98.

[9] Baker argues that the Pentateuch presents the Decalogue as spoken by God, in contrast with the remainder of the law. Baker, "The Finger of God," 1–5. Similarly, Nicholson writes, "The Decalogue, in contrast to other legislation in the Sinai narrative in Exodus, is presented as having been spoken directly by God to Israel rather than mediated through Moses." Ernest W. Nicholson, "Decalogue as the Direct Address of God," *VT* 27, no. 4 (October 1977): 422.

[10] De Vos contrasts the presentation of the Decalogue and the two stone tablets in Exodus and Deuteronomy, arguing that the Ten Words are not presented as written on the tablets in Exodus, but they are in Deuteronomy. J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 13–15. While de Vos rightly observes some ambiguity in the Exodus account, he exaggerates it. Exod 34:28 identifies the content of the remade tablets as the Ten Words. Also, the Deuteronomy account is compatible with the Exodus account and simply adds a greater level of specificity.

[11] Millard defends the view that the tablets in the Ark contained the Ten Commandments. Alan Millard, "The Tablets in the Ark," in *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*, ed. J. G. McConville and Karl Möller, LHBOTS 461 (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 254–66.

[12] Daniel I. Block, "The Decalogue in the Hebrew Scriptures," in *The Decalogue through the Centuries: From the Hebrew Scriptures to Benedict XVI*, ed. Jeffrey P. Greenman and Timothy Larsen

shares this unique significance.

Additionally, the Ten Commandments are not isolated or simple injunctions but are connected to the remainder of the Mosaic law and allow for broad application.[13] In fact, according to many interpreters of the Pentateuch, both ancient and modern, the Decalogue functions as the organizing rubric for the remainder of the Mosaic law.[14] According to Philo, "The Ten Words (οἱ δέκα λόγοι) are summaries (κεφάλαια) of the special laws which are recorded in the Sacred Books and run through the whole of the legislation" (*Decalogue*, 154). Similarly, John H. Walton argues, "The Decalogue is the primary organizing principle of DL."[15] Of course, it is debated to what extent each aspect of the Mosaic law fits under the headings of the Ten Words, and those questions must be handled on a case-by-case basis. However, there is clearly some connection between the Decalogue and the remainder of the Mosaic law. When Paul, therefore, cites the Tenth Word, he does not simply cite an isolated injunction. Instead, he opens a door into vast meaning and significance by citing a piece of the Decalogue, the initial statement of the

---

(Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 13. Block is not alone in this assessment. Childs, for example, writes, "The Decalogue is set apart from the other laws which follow. All of Israel's laws were from God, but the Decalogue had a special place." Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 397. Brooks argues, "The Sinaitic revelation of the Ten Commandments . . . stands out as the literary focal point" of the Exodus narrative. Roger Brooks, *The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 29. Craigie writes, "The Decalog is at the heart of the message of Deuteronomy." Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 149. Gentry and Wellum write, "The Ten Words form the heart of the covenant between God and Israel at Sinai." Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*, 2nd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 365. Weinfeld identifies the Decalogue as "the creed of ancient Israel." Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, AB, vol. 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 242. Durham writes, "This most influential of all law codes must be seen in Exodus as the center of the narrative that is at the very heart of the OT." John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 299.

[13] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 5–7.

[14] Gentry and Wellum, for example, suggest that the Judgments (Exod 20:22–23:33) are "an expansion on the Ten Words." Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 383.

[15] John H. Walton, "The Decalogue Structure of the Deuteronomic Law," in *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, ed. David G. Firth and Philip Johnston (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 117. See also Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 5–6; Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Structure of the Deuteronomic Law," *Maarav* 1 (1979): 105–58; Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 393, 399; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, AB, vol. 2A (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 305–6.

Sinai covenant.

Form: Is There One Tenth Commandment, or Are There Tenth Commandments?

The Pentateuch records the Decalogue in both Exodus and Deuteronomy, so Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 both preserve versions of the Tenth Commandment. However, these two texts are not identical,[16] which raises an important question for this project: is there really such a thing as *the* Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible, or is it more accurate to speak of Tenth Commandments?[17]

Table 1. Comparison of Exodus 20:17 MT and Deuteronomy 5:21 MT

Exodus 20:17	Deuteronomy 5:21[18]
לֹא תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא־תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ׃	וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְלֹא תִתְאַוֶּה בֵּית רֵעֶךָ שָׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ שׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ׃
Do not covet the house of your neighbor. Do not covet the wife of your neighbor, his slave, his maid, his ox, his donkey, anything which is to your neighbor.	Do not covet the wife of your neighbor, and do not covet the house of your neighbor, his field, his maid, his ox, his donkey, or anything which is to your neighbor.

[16] In this project, I use the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (*BHS*) as the basis for texts from the Hebrew Bible. For discussions of some of the textual witnesses to Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21, see Sidnie Ann White, "The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue," *JBL* 109, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 203–5; Himbaza, *Le décalogue et l'histoire du texte*.

[17] To clarify, when I raise the question of the different forms of the Tenth Commandment in Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21, I am not asking the question of the enumeration of the Decalogue, which will be addressed in the following section. Instead, I am raising the question as to whether or not Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 can be legitimately viewed as a unity, considering that they differ in form.

[18] I have omitted the sigla ס which is added by the editors of the *BHS*.

There are three primary differences between the Exodus and Deuteronomy forms of the Tenth Commandment[19]:

1. In Exodus 20:17, the verb חמד is used twice, but in Deuteronomy 5:21, חמד is used once and אוה is used once.

2. In Exodus 20:17, the object of the first verb is "the house of your neighbor" (רֵעֶךָ בֵּית), and the object of the second verb is "the wife of your neighbor (רֵעֶךָ אֵשֶׁת). In Deuteronomy 5:21, however, the objects are inverted: the object of the first verb is "the wife of your neighbor" (רֵעֶךָ אֵשֶׁת), and the object of the second verb is "the house of your neighbor" (רֵעֶךָ בֵּית).

3. Deuteronomy 5:21 includes an additional object of the second verb, "his field" (שָׂדֵהוּ), which is not present in Exodus 20:17.

In light of these differences, is it still possible to refer to Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as a unity, considering the differences between the two? And, what should be made of the differences between the two versions?[20] Through examining these three differences, it will become clear that the differences between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 open up new avenues of interpretation, but they are also complementary and do not indicate a significant disjunction between the two texts.

When it comes to the first difference between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21, חמד and אוה are similar terms, but they also have unique nuances so the inclusion of אוה in Deuteronomy 5:21 is noteworthy.[21] To summarize the difference between the

---

[19] Since I am adopting a final form reading and not directly engaging with the critical debate over whether the Exodus or Deuteronomy version of the Decalogue is chronologically earlier, I will refer to the Exodus version as if it is prior, since it precedes Deuteronomy in canonical order.

[20] Ancient interpreters wrestled with this distinction. Augustine notes it but essentially identifies the Decalogue in Deuteronomy as a faithful paraphrase of the Decalogue in Exodus. He writes, "Not quite the same words are read in Exodus, where the things that are now being repeated were first narrated. From this we should understand (which I have already mentioned several times) that it is not to be considered a lie if the same intention is expressed in different words. . . . For it was no great thing for Moses to examine what he had written in Exodus and to repeat it in exactly the same words, except that it was the concern of our holy teachers to impress this very thing on their students, that they should seek nothing else in speakers' words except the intention that the words were set down to express" (*Quaest. Hept.* 5.10.3). For the translation of *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, I have used Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, trans. Joseph T. Lienhard and Sean Doyle, *Writings on the Old Testament*, ed. Boniface Ramsey, *Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2016), 1:1–476.

[21] In the interest of addressing the differences in form between Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21, I am briefly addressing the meanings of חמד and אוה. However, since establishing the meanings of these terms is essential for interpreting the Tenth Commandment, I will return to this issue in greater detail later in this

two terms, while חמד and אוה are both used as general terms for desire, חמד often refers to an inclination toward an object which is inherently desirable (e.g., a precious metal), and אוה often refers to physical appetites (e.g., hunger). Deuteronomy 5:21, therefore, nuances the meaning of the Tenth Commandment by using the term אוה.

However, חמד and אוה also occupy a similar semantic domain and are used interchangeably at points in the Hebrew Bible.[22] Proverbs 6:25, for example, states, "Do not desire (אַל־תַּחְמֹד) her beauty" (יָפְיָהּ), and Psalm 45:11 states, "And the king will desire (וְיִתְאָו) your beauty" (יָפְיֵךְ). In these similar statements, יְפִי is the object of either חמד (Prov 6:25) or אוה (Ps 45:11), which shows how the terms can be used in place of one another. Similarly, Psalm 68:17 refers to "the mountain God desired (חָמַד) for his dwelling" (לְשִׁבְתּוֹ), and Psalm 132:12–13 states, in reference to Zion, that God "desired (אִוָּה) it for his dwelling" (לְמוֹשָׁב לוֹ) and "I desired it" (אִוִּתִיהָ). As in the previous example, חמד and אוה are used in comparable statements, which suggests the terms could be used interchangeably.[23] Therefore, although חמד and אוה each have distinct nuances, there is evidence that they could be used interchangeably in the Hebrew Bible.[24]

Therefore, returning to Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21, the use of two similar, yet distinct, verbal forms in Deuteronomy 5:21 clarifies what type of desire is

---

chapter, so this section is intended to be a preliminary discussion.

[22] For this reason, Driver identifies the change in verbal form in Deuteronomy "merely as a rhetorical variation." S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, 3rd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), 86; Günter Mayer, "אָוָה," in *TDOT*, 1:135–37.

[23] To give an additional example, in Gen 3:6 חמד occurs alongside a nominal form, תַּאֲוָה, from the root אוה. In light of Ps 68:17 and Ps 132:12–13, Gen 3:6 is an additional piece of evidence that חמד and אוה can function interchangeably in the Hebrew Bible, while retaining their nuances. David L. Baker, "Last but Not Least: The Tenth Commandment," *HBT* 27, no. 1 (June 2005): 12–13.

[24] Skralovnik argues that חמד and אוה in Ps 68:17 and Ps 132:12–13 do "not act as a synonyms with no discernible semantic distinctions." Samo Skralovnik, "God's Desire in the Psalms: A Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* and *'wh* Word Fields in Ps 68:17 and Ps 132:13-14," *Bogoslovska Smotra* 86, no. 1 (2016): 181–93. Skralovnik rightly clarifies that the two terms have nuances; however, this observation is not incompatible with the verbs being used interchangeably in some contexts. See the helpful discussion of overlapping sense relations in Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*, rev. and exp. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 121–25.

being prohibited. Also, the use of two distinct lexemes opens up new lines of interpretation, as will be explored in future chapters. However, חמד and אוה are occasionally used interchangeably in the Hebrew Bible, so they are most likely functional synonyms in Deuteronomy 5:21. Therefore, the use of אוה, as opposed to חמד, in Deuteronomy 5:21 is exegetically significant but does not create a substantial gap in meaning between the two forms.[25]

When it comes to the second difference, a wide variety of suggestions have been offered to explain the transposition of "the house of your neighbor" (בֵּית רֵעֶךָ) and "the wife of your neighbor" (אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ) in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21.[26] So, for example, some have suggested that Deuteronomy 5:21 moves the wife to the object of the first verb, because she would be a common object of sexual desire (cf. Prov 6:25).[27] Or, Hagith Sivan suggests that the change in order confirms that the wife was thought of as property by the author of Deuteronomy. "Deuteronomy's Tenth Commandment," she writes, "sets aside women from the rest of man's immediate environment to emphasize both the interchangeability of women with other items of property, and to highlight the

---

[25] Wittenberg, however, attributes the change in verb in Deut 5:21 to the work of a redactor and suggests that neither the Exod 20:17 nor Deut 5:21 forms are original. Instead, both are expansions of an original shorter commandment. He also suggests that the use of אוה in Deut 5:21 establishes a different trajectory from the original commandment which is picked up by Paul. He claims that the original meaning of the Tenth Commandment can still be seen in passages like Neh 5:1–13, Job 20:19, and Mark 12:40/Luke 20:47. Gunther H. Wittenberg, "The Tenth Commandment in the Old Testament," *JTSA* 22 (March 1978): 8–17. While Wittenberg operates from the perspective of redaction criticism, which I am not engaging with in this project, it is worth asking whether the distinction between חמד and אוה is significant enough to necessitate identifying the work of a redactor. In my view, the verbs are functionally synonymous, while maintaining unique nuances, and usage of both verbs in the Hebrew Bible bears out this claim. For that reason, a complex reconstruction like Wittenberg's is simply not necessary.

[26] In the history of interpretation, there have been many eloquent and creative interpretations proposed. Watson (1620–1686), for example, writes, "In Deuteronomy the wife is set down first, in respect of her value. . . . But in Exodus the house is put before the wife, because the house is first in order; the house is erected before the wife can live in it; the nest is built before the bird is in it; the wife is first esteemed, but the house must be first provided." Thomas Watson, *The Ten Commandments* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965), 181.

[27] Sivan writes, "Motivated by the horror of appropriation, the Deuteronomy Commandment elevates women as the most desirable objects of coveting. It also implies that covert coveting of other men's wives is more pervasive and complex than the rest of the listed inventory." Hagith Sivan, *Between Woman, Man, and God: A New Interpretation of the Ten Commandments*, LHBOTS 401 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 215.

close connection between them."[28] So, according to Sivan, the shift of "the wife of your neighbor" (אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ) to the first object in Deuteronomy 5:21 communicates the interchangeability of women with property and was intended to reinforce male dominance.

Block, however, responds to Sivan, arguing that the movement of "the wife of your neighbor" (אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ) to the first object in Deuteronomy 5:21 was intended to restrict Israelite men from abusing their power in society and taking advantage of women in their communities.[29] By interpreting the shift in word order in this way, Block shows that Deuteronomy 5:21 does not have to be interpreted in such a way that relegates women to property.[30]

While Sivan and Block propose radically different explanations of the rationale for the change in order of objects, they both attribute motive to redactional activity in Deuteronomy 5:21 and assume that the change in order gives warrant for proposing an explanation. William L. Moran, however, challenges the idea that the change in order of objects between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 requires an explanation. Instead, he argues that the lists of objects in both Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are

---

[28] Sivan, *Between Woman, Man, and God*, 220. Sivan attempts to bring together mainstream biblical scholarship and feminist methodologies in her study (16–21). Sivan also writes, "The Tenth Commandment espouses a law of marriage that distributes women, one by one, into masculine households. In its dream of a just community, women must stay in a fixed domain where they can bear sons who resemble their fathers. Such an ecology suppresses sexuality, conceiving one specific combination as essential for a sexual union. There is no reproduction outside a home where an ideal man is one who is a Yahwist, a truthful friend, a respected father and a complete master over his entire household. This is why the Hebrew Bible insists on an asymmetry of sexes, rather than on separation, and this is why asymmetry is etched into the Tenth Commandment. The Decalogue adapts itself to this disequilibrium to enable males to monopolize the status of 'men'" (220).

[29] Daniel I. Block, "'You Shall Not Covet Your Neighbor's Wife': A Study in Deuteronomic Domestic Ideology," *JETS* 53, no. 3 (2010): 460–63. DeRouchie follows Block. Jason S. DeRouchie, "Making the Ten Count: Reflections on the Lasting Message of the Decalogue," in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*, ed. Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 434–36. Also see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 317–18.

[30] Vasholz argues that the wife may be listed along with material goods because she could have been economically desirable due to her dowry. He primarily relies on data from the ANE to make his case. Robert Ivan Vasholz, "You Shall Not Covet Your Neighbor's Wife," *WTJ* 49, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 399–403. Baker follows Vasholz on this point. Baker, "Last but Not Least," 5.

consistent with other ancient lists and imply nothing about the status of the wife.[31]

Furthermore, Patrick D. Miller suggests that the position of the wife in either version of the Tenth Commandment—whether Exodus 20:17 or Deuteronomy 5:21—does not equate her with physical property. He notes, "One response to such a commandment is to see it as indicating a devaluing of women and wives. Another response is to hear in the commandment an understanding of possession that incorporates *personal relationships* as well as economic goods."[32] Miller rightly observes that the transposition of the objects in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 is not necessarily a statement of the value of the wife. Instead, as Christopher Wright states, "What the items have in common is not that they are pieces of property, but that they are typical of what may be the object of a neighbor's coveting."[33] Therefore, there is no reason for seeing Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as relegating the wife to property or communicating significantly different messages regarding the status of the wife due to the change in order of objects in the two texts.

Turning to the third, and final, difference between the two forms, the objects of the verbs listed in each version are nearly identical, except for the presence of "his field"

---

[31] William L. Moran, "Conclusion of the Decalogue, Ex 20:17–Dt 5:21," *CBQ* 29, no. 4 (October 1967): 548–53; Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 427–28.

[32] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 394. Christina Rossetti (1830–1894), the great English poet, also identifies the potential for understanding the Tenth Commandment as listing the wife as an object of her husband's property. She, however, argues that the house refers to more than just the physical property, but the household or all of someone's existence, so the wife is not being listed as merely physical property. Christina Georgina Rossetti, *Letter and Spirit: Notes on the Commandments* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1883), 190–94. For discussion of Rossetti's interpretation of the Tenth Commandment, see Timothy Larsen, "Christina Rossetti, the Decalogue, and Biblical Interpretation," *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte* 16, no. 1 (2009): 27–28.

[33] Christopher J. H. Wright, *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 197. Wright goes on to argue, "There are obviously various motives for covetous desire; oxen and asses represent property which is coveted for its economic value, but it can scarcely ever have been the case that a man coveted his neighbor's wife merely with a view to adding her to his possessions. It is surely her sexuality which is his desire and which was in the legislator's mind when he included her in the list appended to the commandment. So while the commandment forbids the coveting of anything or anyone belonging to a neighbor, the nature of the belonging and the coveting is clearly not uniform. The commandment is concerned with a man's relationship with his neighbor and tells us nothing about the nature of the neighbor's relationship with his own wife" (197).

(שָׂדֵהוּ) in Deuteronomy 5:21, which is absent in Exodus 20:17. David Noel Freedman argues that the addition of שָׂדֵהוּ should be attributed to a redactor who wished to account for the sin of Ahab (1 Kgs 21). While Freedman's solution is creative, it presupposes redactional activity by an individual with knowledge of the events described in 1 Kings 21, which raises the question of whether or not a simpler solution is possible.[34]

To propose another explanation, Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 both conclude with the statement, "anything which is to your neighbor" (וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ), which extends the prohibition to a variety of potential objects of coveting which are not listed. Therefore, when Deuteronomy 5:21 includes שָׂדֵהוּ, the addition can be interpreted as a decision to make an additional object, which is implicit in the statement "anything which is to your neighbor" (וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ), explicit. Thus, the inclusion of an additional object in Deuteronomy 5:21 is best understood as an interpretive expansion of a trajectory established by Exodus 20:17.

Stepping back from the specific differences between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21, Susan Docherty argues that citations of biblical material by later authors are often altered, which is consistent with citation practices in the ANE.[35] As she writes, the "tendency to avoid verbatim reproduction probably reflects contemporary literary practices and cultural expectations."[36] With this observation in mind, interpreters

---

[34] David Noel Freedman, Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, and Michael M. Homan, *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering a Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Astrid B. Beck (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 153–58. Freedman is correct, however, to connect 1 Kgs 21 to the Tenth Commandment, and I will return to that connection in chap. 5.

[35] Susan Docherty, "Crossing Testamentary Borders: Methodological Insights for OT/NT Study from Contemporary Hebrew Bible Scholarship," in *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, ed. David Allen and Steve Smith, LNTS 597 (New York: T & T Clark, 2020), 17–20.

[36] Docherty, "Crossing Testamentary Borders," 19. Also, Schultz writes of quotations in ANE literature in general, "A large degree of verbal divergence can be tolerated as long as the quotation is still recognizable." Richard L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*, JSOTSup (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 143. Since Deut 5:21 is surely recognizable as a quotation of Exod 20:17, it certainly raises the question of whether any special significance can be assigned to the differences between the two. Tooman also observes that one way of signaling that an older text is being used is through inverting the wording of the older text. William A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*, FAT 2 52 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck,

should be cautious in drawing bold conclusions from the slight differences between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21. Rather, the most reasonable conclusion is that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are intended to be read as witnesses to the same words, although each is slightly nuanced in a way consistent with typical citation practices in the ANE.

Summary. While the differences between Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are noteworthy and open additional avenues of interpretation, they do not signify a substantial gap in meaning between the two prohibitions; therefore, from the perspective of a final form reading, it is legitimate to refer to them together as a unity—that is, *the* Tenth Commandment. In the remainder of this project, therefore, I refer to Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as a single unit and only distinguish between the two when it is significant.

Enumeration: The Tenth Commandment or the Ninth and Tenth Commandants?

While the Pentateuch specifies that God gave Ten Words to the people of Israel (Exod 34:28; Deut 4:13; 10:4), it does not enumerate them. The Decalogue, therefore, has been numbered in a variety of ways in the history of interpretation, and the Tenth Commandment is some of the most contested terrain in this conversation. Up to this point, I have referred to the contents of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Commandment, but they are often numbered as the Ninth and Tenth Commandments. In this section, therefore, I take a brief look at this conversation.

To complicate the matter, however, the enumeration debate involves more than Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21. In fact, interpreters differ as to whether or not

---

2011), 27–31. Perhaps, therefore, inversion of wording is being intentionally used to signal the use of an earlier text in Deut 5:21.

Exodus 20:2 and Deuteronomy 5:6 should be identified as a preamble or the First Word. And still another question is whether Exodus 20:3–6 and Deuteronomy 5:7–10 should be numbered as one or two commandments.[37] Of course, neither nine nor eleven words is a viable option, so whatever decisions are made when it comes to these debated sections of the Decalogue have a bearing on the enumeration of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21.[38] A comprehensive discussion, therefore, would have to examine the enumeration of the entirety of the Decalogue. However, to set a baseline for the present study, the best approach is to briefly survey the debate regarding Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 without attempting a comprehensive discussion of the enumeration of the Decalogue as a whole.

In early Jewish sources, Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are presented as a single prohibition (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92; 4 Macc 2:5–6; Philo, *Spec*. 4.78; LAB 11.13). Additionally, some early Jewish writers explicitly identify Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word. Josephus, for example, identifies Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as "the Tenth" (ὁ δέκατος; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92). Similarly, Philo identifies Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as "the last (τὸ τελευταῖον) of the Ten Words" (τῶν δέκα λογίων; *Spec. Laws* 4.78).[39]

In early Christian tradition, Origen advocated for numbering Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word.[40] Augustine, however, is credited with first making

---

[37] For treatments of the numbering of the Decalogue overall, see Jason S. DeRouchie, "Counting the Ten: An Investigation into the Numbering of the Decalogue," in DeRouchie, Gile, and Turner, *For Our Good Always*, 93–125; Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 5–13.

[38] For charts summarizing the numbering of the Decalogue in various traditions, see DeRouchie, "Making the Ten Count," 96; Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 6–7.

[39] Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 were also viewed as a single prohibition in the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). However, the SP adds an additional commandment. For a discussion, see Gershon Hepner, "The Samaritan Version of the Tenth Commandment," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 20, no. 1 (2006): 147–52.

[40] Origen does not discuss the Tenth Commandment specifically, but his numbering of the first two commandments would necessitate him taking Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 as a single prohibition. Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, trans. Ronald E. Heine, FC (Washington, DC: Catholic

the argument that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are two distinct commandments.[41] According to Augustine, there is a conceptual distinction "between coveting another man's wife and coveting another man's house" (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.2). Additionally, he observes that there is only one object after the first verb but an extended list of objects after the second verb, which suggests two distinct commands. Therefore, according to Augustine, Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are best conceived of as two different commands (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.2). Today, Augustine's view on the Tenth Commandment is represented in Catholic[42] and Lutheran[43] traditions. However, in Reformed and Orthodox traditions, Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are numbered as a single prohibition, and the majority of Jewish tradition also holds this view.[44]

In contemporary scholarship, the numbering of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 continues to be contested.[45] Jason DeRouchie, for example, asserts that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 should be understood as two distinct commands, grounding his argument in discourse analysis.[46] In particular, he argues that

---

University of America Press, 1982), 318.

[41] Augustine shows an awareness of alternate positions on the numbering of the Decalogue (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.1–2).

[42] Smith observes that medieval Christian writers exclusively follow Augustine's numbering. Lesley Smith, *The Ten Commandments: Interpreting the Bible in the Medieval World*, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 175 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014), 146–47.

[43] Martin Luther, *Larger Catechism*, in *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, trans. Charles Arand et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 9–10.

[44] DeRouchie observes that the paragraph divisions of the MT (*parashiyyot*) divides Deut 5:21 into two distinct commands, which would mean Jewish tradition is not unanimous on the question. The sigla ס which is added by the editors of the *BHS* can be seen separating the two commands in Deut 5:21. DeRouchie, "Making the Ten Count," 99–100. Nonetheless, while allowing for a dissenting voice, the majority of Jewish tradition regards Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 as a single prohibition.

[45] For a survey of contemporary research engaging with the enumeration of the Ten Words, see DeRouchie, "Counting the Ten," 94n3.

[46] DeRouchie, "Counting the Ten," 103–10; Jason Shane DeRouchie, "A Call to Covenant Love: Text Grammar and Literary Structure in Deuteronomy 5–11" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005). Block also argues for this position. Block, "'You Shall Not Covet Your Neighbor's Wife'," 472–74; Daniel I. Block, *The Gospel According to Moses: Theological and Ethical*

the repetition of לֹא תַחְמֹד in Exodus suggests that Exodus 20:17 is meant to be read as two independent clauses and, therefore, two different commandments.[47] While DeRouchie admits that the enumeration of Exodus 20:17 is somewhat ambiguous, he claims the presence of two different verbs in Deuteronomy 5:21, חמד and אוה, clearly communicates that reading two different injunctions is necessary.[48]

In response to DeRouchie, however, reading Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as a single prohibition is supported by the majority, if not all, of the most ancient sources.[49] Furthermore, the repetition of the verb in Exodus 20:17 can easily be explained as creating a tight link between the two sets of objects in such a way that the second clause is simply an explanation of the first. While DeRouchie argues that Deuteronomy 5:21 confirms that Exodus 20:17 should be read as two commandments, the opposite could also be argued. Perhaps, Deuteronomy 5:21 should be read in light of the reading already established by Exodus 20:17, where the repetition of the same verb makes it less likely that there are two commands in view.[50] Lastly, as noted above, while חמד and אוה are distinct verbal roots, they are functionally synonymous in Deuteronomy 5:21, which raises the question of whether or not two different verbal forms necessitate reading two

---

Reflections on the Book of Deuteronomy (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012), 169–73.

[47] DeRouchie, "Counting the Ten," 106. DeRouchie, however, also helpfully summarizes the arguments for seeing Exod 20:17 as a single prohibition: "The repetition of the verb חמד 'covet' clearly identifies a topical parallel between the two prohibitions. Furthermore, if בית in 20:17a is understood as 'household', the independent clause that follows in 20:17b is easily read as an expansion or clarification of this household's makeup, which would include the neighbor's wife, servants, livestock, and material goods" (103).

[48] DeRouchie, "Counting the Ten," 106–10. Or, Hutton argues that Exod 20:17 contains one commandment, but Deut 5:21 contains two distinct commandments. Rodney R. Hutton, "'Sovereignty' and 'Holiness' in the Decalogue Tradition," in *Raising up a Faithful Exegete: Essays in Honor of Richard D. Nelson*, ed. K. L. Noll and Brooks Schramm (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 212–13. Hutton argues, from the perspective of redaction criticism, that the Decalogue in Exod 20 is the product of Priestly theology while the Decalogue in Deut 5 is the product of Deuteronomistic theology. He claims each has different theological emphases, which partially explains the complicated debates regarding numbering today. Hutton, "'Sovereignty' and 'Holiness'," 223.

[49] Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 11.

[50] For a critique of DeRouchie, see Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 11.

separate injunctions since the two lexemes are very similar in meaning. Although the arguments for seeing Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as two distinct commands do carry weight, the case for reading these passages as one prohibition is stronger.

When it comes to reading Paul, it seems that the issue becomes even clearer, because the early Jewish evidence tilts decidedly in favor of treating Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as one injunction (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92; 4 Macc 2:5–6; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.78; LAB 11.13). Since writers roughly contemporaneous to Paul write in such a way that suggests that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 were read as the Tenth Commandment, Paul likely conceived of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word.

Also, when Paul quotes Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21, he cites it as, "Do not covet" (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις; Rom 7:7, 13:9), not listing objects and only citing one of the verbs. While Paul does not explicitly number Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word, there are no explicit markers in Romans 7:7 or 13:9 to suggest that he is making a distinction between two commandments in his citation. Therefore, when the early Jewish evidence is weighed alongside the Pauline evidence, there is little warrant for distinguishing between the Ninth and Tenth Commandments in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 for the purposes of studying Paul.

Summary. While there are weighty arguments for viewing Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as two distinct commands, there is no clear evidence that Paul made such a distinction. In fact, Paul's abbreviated citation of Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX implies either that Paul viewed these texts as containing one command or thought of the prohibition(s) against coveting as unified in some way. Moving forward, therefore, I refer to the prohibition(s) of Exodus 20:17 and

Deuteronomy 5:21 as a unity using the terms *Tenth Commandment* and *Tenth Word*.[51]

Meaning: What Does the Tenth Commandment Mean?

Having discussed the form and enumeration of the Tenth Commandment, an unavoidable question presents itself: what does the Tenth Commandment mean? On this question, there are two primary positions: those who claim that the Tenth Commandment forbids a desire, and those who emphasize that the Tenth Commandment is forbidding an action. Of course, many interpreters strike a mediating position by suggesting that the Tenth Word is prohibiting some combination of desire and action. So, the positions can be conceived of as a spectrum from desire to deed or cognition to action.[52]

In early Jewish literature, the Tenth Word was often interpreted as a prohibition against dangerous passions (e.g., 4 Macc 2:5–6; Philo, *Decalogue* 142–53; *Spec. Laws* 4.78b–131). Also, in Christian tradition, Augustine argued the Tenth Commandment forbids lust and greed,[53] and Calvin suggested the Tenth Commandment functions to prohibit any sinful desire that may enter the mind, even before it reaches the level of

---

[51] Also, I will not consistently note when a writer holds to a different enumeration of the Decalogue. Smith's comment regarding medieval Christian readers of the Ten Commandments is instructive: "It is ironic that, having decided to follow Augustine's division of the Decalogue and treat coveting or 'concupiscence' (*concupiscentia*) as falling under two separate precepts, commentators almost without fail discuss these last two commandments together rather than separately." Smith, *The Ten Commandments*, 146. While Smith's findings are drawn from sources which are much later in the history of interpretation than Paul, they highlight the simple fact that it is difficult to meaningfully distinguish between two commands in Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 and maintain that distinction in interpretation. Similarly, while Luther numbers Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 as the Ninth and Tenth Commandments, he discusses them together. Luther, LC 292–310. As a contemporary example, White, who holds to a distinction between the Ninth and Tenth Commandments, treats the two together in his commentary. Thomas Joseph White, *Exodus*, Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2016), 188–91.

[52] Botica gives a particularly helpful and detailed survey of recent interpretation of the Tenth Word. Aurelian Botica, "The Tenth Commandment and the Concept of 'Inward Liability,'" in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*, ed. Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, and John H. Walton (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 53–63. Also see Aurelian Botica, *The Concept of Intention in the Old Testament, Philo of Alexandria and the Early Rabbinic Literature: A Study in Human Intentionality in the Area of Criminal, Cultic and Religious and Ethical Law*, PHSC 9 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2011), 453–56.

[53] Augustine, of course, held to a distinction between the Ninth and Tenth Commandments in Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.1–3). Also see Luther, *Larger Catechism*, 292–310.

intent.[54]

However, many rabbinic Jewish commentators interpreted the Tenth Commandment to forbid acting on a desire to possess someone else's possessions.[55] So, for example, *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael* states, "Perhaps the Commandment forbids coveting in words? Not so; for the Torah states (Deut. 7.25) 'You shall not covet the silver and gold on them and *take* it for yourself.' Just as in that case one is culpable only on committing an act, so too in the present instance."[56] Thus, the Tenth Word was only violated when someone acted on the desire to take a forbidden object.

Today, a significant stream of scholarship makes the case that the Tenth Commandment prohibits both desire and action—specifically, desiring the property of another and taking it.[57] Walter Brueggemann represents this position when he writes, "The term 'covet' in truth concerns not only an attitude of wanting but also an action of taking."[58] Similarly, J. J. Stamm writes, "It does not only aim at the will, but

---

[54] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, vol. 1 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1961), 2.8.49–50. While Luther emphasizes that the Tenth Commandment prohibits desire, he also emphasizes that it rules out any schemes to taking what belongs to someone else, even if those schemes are legal. Luther, LC 296.

[55] Alexander Rofé, "The Tenth Commandment in the Light of Four Deuteronomic Laws," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, trans. Gershon Levi (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 45–48; Samo Skralovnik, "The Meaning and Interpretation of Desire in the Tenth Commandment (Exod 20,17): The Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* Word Field," *BN* 171 (2016): 17–18; Skralovnik, "The Dynamism of Desire: The Root *ḥmd* in Relation to the Root *'wh*," *VT* 67, no. 2 (2017): 280–83.

[56] Quoted in Rofé, "Tenth Commandment in Light of Laws," 45.

[57] Gordon interprets the Tenth Commandment through the lens of ANE data, arguing that the Tenth Commandment is best explained in light of an ancient Ugaritic inscription referring to Baal coveting and acquiring a house. Cyrus Herzl Gordon, "Note on the Tenth Commandment," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 31, no. 3 (July 1963): 208–9. Buchanan, on the other hand, interprets the Tenth Commandment through the lens of contemporary Middle Eastern culture, claiming that desire would have been linked to a social obligation to offer an object to the one who desires it. George Wesley Buchanan, "Spiritual Commandment," *JAAR* 36, no. 2 (June 1968): 126–27.

[58] Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 16–17. Wittenberg also argues that the verb prohibits the combination of desire and action. Wittenberg, "Tenth Commandment in Old Testament," 9–10. Rofé argues that the original meaning of the Tenth Commandment was to prohibit a desire and an action and that meaning can still be seen in Deuteronomic law. Since he does not take a canonical view, his work is highly colored by assumptions regarding various redactions by authors with a variety of interpretations and motivations. He concludes, "It may be said, then, that these four 'neighbors' statutes come from the same source. A single author who stood under the influence of Wisdom literature, composed them. He meant them to be interpretations of the

simultaneously at the violent intrigues which a person uses in order to attain the property of his neighbor."[59] Typically, those who hold this view assert that the verb חמד (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) denotes action and not merely desire. G. Wallis, for example, argues that desire and action are unified in the term חמד.[60]

However, other contemporary scholars make the case that the Tenth Word specifically prohibits a desire. Bernard S. Jackson argues that the Tenth Commandment prohibits the intention to have what belongs to someone else, whether or not there is an ensuing action.[61] He concludes, "There is no adequate reason to doubt the traditional meaning of the 10th Commandment."[62] Similarly, Peter C. Craigie writes, "This tenth and final commandment should be interpreted simply as a prohibition of desire or coveting, without there being any suggestion of an act."[63]

Lastly, some argue for a mediating position—that the Tenth Commandment forbids desire, but the type of desire prohibited is the kind which often leads to action. Miller, for example, argues that the verb refers to desire but "what is in view is a combination of feeling and action in pursuit of what one is greedy for but may not have."[64] Or, Brevard Childs writes, "The original command was directed to that desire

---

Tenth Commandment. As he understood it, 'You shall not covet your neighbor's house' forbids all trespass into the realm of the other than may cause damage to his property, or to his ownership rights." Rofé, "Tenth Commandment in Light of Laws," 65.

[59] Stamm and Andrew, *Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, 103.

[60] G. Wallis, "חָמַד," in *TDOT* 4:452–61.

[61] Bernard S. Jackson, "Liability for Mere Intention in Early Jewish Law," *HUCA* 42 (1971): 202–11.

[62] Jackson, "Liability for Mere Intention," 211. In light of Jackson's arguments, Weinfeld retracts earlier argumentation in favor of the view that the Tenth Word prohibited action. Moshe Weinfeld, "The Uniqueness of the Decalogue and Its Place in Jewish Tradition," in Segal and Levi, *Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, 9n27.

[63] Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, 163. Also see Moran, "Conclusion of the Decalogue"; Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus*, NAC 2 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 466–67; Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, rev. ed., WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 125, 128; Durham, *Exodus*, 297–99; Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 180; Duane A. Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus*, Kregel Exegetical Library (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2014), 482–83.

[64] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 391. According to Miller, when Deuteronomy uses אוה, it

which included, of course, those intrigues which led to acquiring the coveted object."[65]

As this brief survey demonstrates, there is hardly a consensus around the meaning of the Tenth Word. However, to effectively study the use of the Tenth Commandment in Paul, clarity on the interpretation of the Tenth Commandment is essential. Therefore, since the debate hinges on the meaning of חמד (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) and אוה (Deut 5:21), it needs to be adjudicated through analysis of these lexemes.

Typically, חמד is used to refer to the desire for material objects which are inherently desirable, such as sources of food (e.g., Gen 2:9, 3:6) or precious metals (e.g., Deut 7:25; Josh 7:21).[66] Isaiah 53:2 states, "He had no appearance that we would desire him" (וְנֶחְמְדֵֽהוּ), which illustrates that חמד refers to a predictable attraction toward inherently attractive objects. In the case of Isaiah 53:2, the absence of attractiveness in the subject is emphasized; therefore, there is an absence of attraction. חמד, therefore, typically refers to an attraction to an inherently desirable object, which immediately seems to fit its usage in the Tenth Word where the various objects could be judged as desirable.[67]

To further clarify, while חמד does not necessarily connotate negative desire, it often has negative undertones in the Hebrew Bible (Exod 20:17; 34:24; Deut 5:21; 7:25; Josh 7:21; Ps 39:11; Job 20:20; Prov 1:22; 6:25; 12:12; Isa 1:29; 44:9; 53:2; Mic 2:2).[68]

---

further clarifies that the desire itself is wrong, even if it is not acted upon. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 389–92; Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 84.

[65] Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 427. For additional examples, see Baker, "Last but Not Least," 13–20; Rainer Kessler, "Debt and the Decalogue: The Tenth Commandment," *VT* 65, no. 1 (2015): 53–61; Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire"; Skralovnik, "The Dynamism of Desire"; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 316.

[66] David Talley writes, "This vb. is very 'material,' for it refers primarily to persons or things visible to the eye." David Talley, "חמד," *NIDOTTE* 2:167. For helpful lexical work on חמד, see Baker, "Last but Not Least," 7–11; Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire"; Skralovnik, "The Dynamism of Desire"; Talley, *NIDOTTE* 2:167–69; Wallis, *TDOT* 4:452–61.

[67] Also, the term occurs four times as a *niphal* participle (Gen 2:9; 3:6; Prov 21:20; Ps 19:11), where it is used to describe the desirability of an object.

[68] While חמד most often has a negative connotation, it has an unmistakably positive connotation in Ps 19:11, Ps 68:17, and Prov 21:20. Also, Gen 2:9 and Song 2:3 could be interpreted as

Observing this pattern, Samo Skralovnik concludes: "A desire expressed by the verb form of the lexical root *ḥmd* indicates something diametrically opposite to longing for God, i.e. it denotes the objectification of God."[69] However, Skralovnik exaggerates, because there are also clear examples where חמד is used with a positive connotation (e.g., Ps 19:11, 68:17; Prov 21:20).[70] Therefore, the positivity or negativity of the term is primarily determined by context and is not lexicalized, although the pattern of its usage trends negative.[71]

Also, since חמד refers to desiring an object which is inherently desirable, it understandably implies action in some cases (e.g., Exod 34:24), which has led some to conclude that חמד communicates action and not desire specifically.[72] Furthermore, since חמד is often linked with לקח (Gen 3:6; Deut 7:25; Josh 7:21) or גזל (Mic 2:2), some have concluded that the action of taking or seizing is implied in the verb.[73]

However, while חמד is sometimes used in a way that implies action, it is also used in contexts where there is a clear distinction between internal desire and external action (e.g., Prov 6:25; Mic 2:1–2), which suggests that חמד does not *necessarily* denote action. Instead, it implies it in some cases.[74] Also, the fact that חמד is often linked with לקח or גזל raises a question: why would an author who employed חמד also need to use

---

positive uses of the term. Baker, "Last but Not Least," 9–10.

[69] Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire," 17.

[70] Skralovnik, "The Dynamism of Desire," 279.

[71] Stuart heavily emphasizes the neutrality of the term to the point where he seems to miss the negative trend of the term, even classifying Isa 1:29 as neutral use of the term when it clearly refers to idolatrous desire. Stuart, *Exodus*, 466.

[72] Rofé, "Tenth Commandment in Light of Laws," 47–48.

[73] Rofé, "Tenth Commandment in Light of Laws," 47–48.

[74] Moran cites several examples from the ANE which suggest that verbs of desire in general often implied action, even though the verb itself did not denote action. Moran, "Conclusion of the Decalogue," 546–48.

לקח or גזל if חמד already implied those actions?[75] In fact, it could be argued that the usage of לקח or גזל alongside חמד shows that there is a clear distinction between the desire and the ensuing action, because an additional verb is necessary to communicate external action.[76]

To take one example, Micah 2:2 uses the term חמד alongside גזל, which has led some to conclude that חמד implies or denotes the action of seizing. However, Micah 2:1 describes the process of planning by those coveting and suggests that they act on their desires the following day. So, the context suggests a distinction between intent and action. Additionally, why would the author need to make גזל explicit if it was already denoted by חמד?[77]

Therefore, חמד refers to desiring an object which is inherently desirable, and it may imply action to appropriate that object in some cases. Turning back to the Tenth Word, this conclusion fits the usage of חמד of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21, where the objects of חמד are items which would be perceived as having inherent value and worth. In light of this, the typical meaning of חמד fits the context of the Tenth Commandment. Therefore, by using חמד, the Tenth Commandment is forbidding desire to appropriate what rightfully belongs to another in response to the desirability of that object.[78]

---

[75] Moran, "Conclusion of the Decalogue," 544; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 316.

[76] Gen 3:6 shows that desiring and taking are viewed as related, but distinct, steps in a progression. In Gen 3:6 a *niphal* participle (וְנֶחְמָד) of חמד is used to describe the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Gen 3:6 is clarifying, however, because it describes Eve's assessment of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in detail by recounting that she "saw" (וַתֵּרֶא) three things: First, "the tree was good for food" (טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמַאֲכָל); second, "it was a desirable thing" (תַּאֲוָה־הוּא); third, "it was desirable for making one wise" (וְנֶחְמָד הָעֵץ לְהַשְׂכִּיל). After describing Eve's assessment in this way, Gen 3:6 records that Eve took from the tree, using לקח, which would seem to imply the action of taking was the possible consequence of the desire but distinct from it.

[77] See discussion in Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah*, AB, vol. 24E (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 270–72; Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1976), 288n15.

[78] In his extensive analysis of חמד, Skralovnik concludes, "What the Tenth Commandment prohibits is not merely the existence of desire in the imagination nor the (specific) acts themselves. It prohibits the dynamics of desire which take place on the inner spiritual level but have external social-

Turning to the second term in question, אוה (Deut 5:21) is used to refer to a wide range of desires, such as hunger and thirst (Num 11:4, 34; Deut 12:20; 2 Sam 2:16; 23:15; 1 Chron 11:17; Ps 106:14; Prov 23:3, 6; Mic 7:1), the desire to possess or control objects or territory (Deut 14:26; Eccl 6:2; 1 Kgs 11:37; 2 Sam 3:21; Ps 132:13–14), or the desire of one person for another (Ps 45:12; Isa 26:9). Also, אוה can refer to internal physical desires or yearnings, and it often refers to strong desires. Additionally, אוה can be used to refer to positive (e.g., Ps 132:13–14), negative (e.g., Prov 21:20), or neutral (e.g., Deut 14:26) desires in the Hebrew Bible, and the connotation of the term is only discernable from the context.[79]

This meaning of אוה fits the context of Deuteronomy 5:21 where the objects of desire are household assets. Deuteronomy 5:21, therefore, forbids the desire to have or control what belongs to another person. In metaphorical terms, Deuteronomy 5:21 prohibits "hungering for" or "craving" the possessions of another.

Having examined the meanings of both חמד and אוה, it is possible to conclude that they are similar terms, but each has unique nuances. In general, חמד carries the specific nuance of a desire which arises in response to the attractiveness of an object, while אוה often refers to internal physical desires which may or may not arise in response to an external stimulus.[80] In other words, חמד refers to the reaction of a subject to the desirability of an object, while אוה refers to the internal desire for an object. Sralovnik concludes, "The verb from of the lexical root *ḥmd* is used to express the desire for appropriation, while the verb form of the lexical root *'wh* applies in cases in which the

---

economic effects (consequences)." Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire," 21. Skralovnik helpfully emphasizes that חמד does not refer to mere thoughts or casual attractions, but it seems to denote a strong desire for an object which is perceived as valuable. Miller also rightly emphasizes that the use of חמד emphasizes the strength of the desire. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 391.

[79] For lexical work on אוה, see Mayer, *TDOT* 1:134–37; William C. Williams, "אָוָה," *NIDOTTE* 1:304–6.

[80] Williams helpfully suggests that חמד is more objective in meaning while אוה is more subjective. Williams, *NIDOTTE* 1:305.

desire is an expression of basic physical needs or other instinctive tendencies."[81] Also, חמד tends to be used in a negative way, although there are instances of it being used with a positive connotation, while אוה trends toward more neutral usage. Significantly, חמד and אוה both refer to strong desires and may imply the intention to appropriate or control that which is desired.

In light of this analysis, the verbs חמד and אוה refer to desire specifically and not an act of appropriation which may or may not follow. Yet, the action of taking is closely related to coveting and often presented as a natural outgrowth of it.[82] In contemporary English, it is common to ask whether or not someone is "willing and able" to do something, which illustrates the intuitive connection, yet distinction, between desire and action in human experience. On the one hand, someone may be willing to do something but not able. If so, he or she lacks the ability to follow through on the desire. Also, someone may be able to do an action but not willing. If so, one lacks the desire to do what he or she is capable of accomplishing. If, however, someone is both willing and able to do something, the action will take place. Perhaps, this example from English has some explanatory power for the usages of חמד and אוה in the Hebrew Bible. While the terms designate desire specifically, action seems to attach itself to these terms because desire and action are closely connected in human experience. However, despite the close connection between desire and action in human experience, they are distinct ideas in contemporary English, and, much more importantly, analysis of חמד and אוה suggests they were distinct ideas in the Hebrew Bible also.

---

[81] Skralovnik, "The Dynamism of Desire," 284.

[82] Also, as noted previously, the change in verb between Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 has led some to conclude that the two are different commands. However, as the treatment above confirms that the two verbs occupy a similar semantic domain and can be interchangeable. As Childs writes, "The Deuteronomic substitution of the verb *hit'awweh* did not mark a qualitative difference of approach which had the effect of internalizing a previously action oriented commandment. . . . Rather, the Deuteronomic recension simply made more explicit the subjective side of the prohibition which was already contained in the original command." Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 427.

As noted, חמד and אוה are terms which denote strong desire and may imply action, which clarifies the meaning of the Tenth Word. While the Tenth Word prohibits desire specifically, it prohibits a specific kind of desire: a desire for something forbidden which would lead to action if the opportunity presented itself. Therefore, based on lexical analysis of the usages of חמד and אוה in the Hebrew Bible, the Tenth Commandment prohibits an Israelite from desiring anything which belongs to his or her neighbor in a way in which to take it for oneself. Now, this desire may arise because of the inherent desirability of the object or it may arise as a result of a felt need within the desirer. Either way, when something which belongs to another is desired in a way in which to take it, the Tenth Commandment has been violated. While an Israelite may have desired something which belonged to his neighbor in a way in which to take it, he may not have acted in response to that urge. He, for example, may have desired his neighbor's wife and wanted to take her for himself, but he might have feared the consequences of acting on that desire. However, even if the desire was not acted on, the Tenth Commandment would have been violated.

Summary. While many have argued that the Tenth Commandment prohibits the combination of an action and desire, or even an action only, I have argued that the Tenth Commandment prohibits a desire. In particular, the Tenth Commandment prohibits desiring specific objects in a specific way. It bars Israelites from desiring what belongs to their neighbor in a way in which they would take it if they had the opportunity.

Differentiation: How Is the Tenth Commandment Different from the Other Prohibitions of the Decalogue?

If the Tenth Word forbids desiring to possess what belongs to a neighbor, an additional question arises: how is the Tenth Commandment different from the other prohibitions of the Decalogue, and how does it overlap with them?

In particular, the Tenth Commandment seems to overlap with the Seventh Commandment (adultery) and the Eighth Commandment (stealing), because the objects of coveting in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 list both the wife and the material goods of a neighbor. So, if someone was to take someone else's wife, that action, depending on the circumstances, would likely be described as adultery, and, if someone was to appropriate someone else's house, field, ox, donkey, maid, or anything else which belonged to one's neighbor, that action would most likely be described as stealing.[83]

Due to this conceptual overlap, interpreters have wrestled with the question of differentiating between the commandments throughout the history of interpretation. Calvin provides one option for distinguishing the Tenth Commandment from the remainder of the Decalogue by describing the uniqueness of the Tenth Commandment as forbidding "coveting" as opposed to "intent." Calvin subsumes the intent to commit adultery or stealing (i.e., lust or greed) under the Seventh and Eighth Commandments and argues that coveting, as forbidden by the Tenth Commandment is something more subtle. He writes, "Intent, as we spoke of it under the preceding commandments, is deliberate consent of will where lust subjects the heart. But covetousness can exist without such deliberation or consent when the mind is only pricked or tickled by empty and perverse objects."[84] According to Calvin, therefore, the Tenth Commandment can be violated prior to any intent to act on the desire for a forbidden object. Calvin, therefore, represents a tradition which distinguishes the Tenth Commandment by suggesting that it focuses on desires even before the level of intent.

---

[83] Augustine helpfully summarizes the dilemma in regard to the Eighth Word, "Indeed, not everyone who covets his neighbor's property steals; but if everyone who steals his neighbor's property covets, it could be that in that general statement . . . that pertains to theft is also contained (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.3).

[84] Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.8.49. One of the reasons Calvin interprets the Tenth Commandment in this way is because he intends to distinguish it from the interpretation of the Seventh Commandment given by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount.

Luther argues that the Tenth Commandment is differentiated from the remainder of the Decalogue by prohibiting a desire, not necessarily an external act. Also, he emphasizes that the Tenth Commandment, by extension, prohibits all schemes or actions to take what rightfully belongs to another, even if those actions are technically legal.[85] Similarly, Christoph Dohmen argues that the Tenth Commandment can be distinguished from the Seventh and Eighth Commandments, because it focuses on attitude and intention: "The prohibition against coveting . . . is about an attitude within the sphere of interpersonal relationships. Therefore the prohibition clearly distinguishes itself from that surrounding theft or adultery, in the sense that it seeks to understand the intentions behind a wide range of deeds."[86] According to Dohmen, therefore, the Tenth Word can be distinguished from the remainder of the prohibitions of the Decalogue by its expansive nature, as opposed to the more specific Seventh and Eighth Commandments. Dohmen also emphasizes, similar to Luther, that the Tenth Commandment prohibits, by extension, a variety of acts of appropriation which may be technically legal. He summarizes the Tenth Word as follows: "Fellow human beings may not and should not be robbed of their livelihood through legal means or by schemes that the law does not cover."[87] Luther, and the similar approach of Dohmen, provide a helpful way forward by distinguishing the Tenth Word both by its internal orientation and emphasizing how a broad application of it extends to a variety of practices which are not covered by other injunctions from the Decalogue.

Skralovnik, however, distinguishes between the Eighth and Tenth

---

[85] Luther suggests that those who defraud others in trade or take advantage of others through the court system are guilty of breaking the Tenth Commandment. Luther, *Larger Catechism*, 296. Weinfeld makes a similar argument. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 316.

[86] Christoph Dohmen, "Decalogue," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014), 202.

[87] Dohmen, "Decalogue," 203.

Commandments by suggesting that the Tenth Commandment prohibits the ability of the rich to seize the livelihood of another person, as opposed to the Eighth Commandment which restricts simple theft.[88] Skralovnik rightly observes that some of the objects of the Tenth Commandment are things which could not be stolen by a thief (e.g., a house), which suggests that the Tenth Commandment may prohibit, by extension, schemes beyond simple theft to appropriate what belongs to someone else. However, he unhelpfully restricts the scope of the Tenth Commandment by limiting it to the schemes of the wealthy.[89] In contrast, the Tenth Commandment is a sweeping prohibition against desiring anything which belongs to a neighbor, and it prohibits all from doing so, regardless of their wealth. Skralovnik rightly points out that the Tenth Commandment is often violated by those with economic means (e.g., Mic 2:1–2); however, he incorrectly makes this phenomenon a defining characteristic of the prohibition.[90]

In fact, the better explanation for the violation of the Tenth Commandment by the rich is that if the Tenth Commandment prohibits desiring something in a way in which to take it, only those with the power to take the object of their desire will be able to act on their desires. Since those who are rich and powerful have the means to act on their desires, it makes sense that their violations of the Tenth Commandment would be given

---

[88] Skralovnik writes, "Thieves thereby do not significantly endanger livelihoods while mighty men, rulers in positions of power, 'steal' houses and fields, something which has disastrous economic and theological consequences." Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire," 21.

[89] In support of his view, Skralovnik observes that the verb of the Eighth Commandment, גנב (Exod 20:15; Deut 5:19), is never used with a house as its object. Skralovnik, "Meaning and Interpretation of Desire," 21. However, the term is also used with animals (e.g., Gen 30:33, 31:39; Exod 21:37) and persons (e.g., Gen 40:15; Exod 21:16) as the object. Since animals and persons are also listed as objects of the Tenth Commandment, Skralovnik's argument is not compelling.

[90] Lang argues that Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 protect the property of those who have to be away from their homes for extended periods of time. Lang supports his case with comparative evidence from ANE law codes and suggests that Exod 34:24 supports this interpretation. Bernhard Lang, "'Du sollst nicht nach der Frau eines anderen verlangen': Eine neue Deutung des 9. und 10. Gebots," *ZAW* 93, no. 2 (1981): 216–24. While Lang rightly identifies one of the implications of the Tenth Word, his interpretation does not exhaust the meaning of it. Also, Lang interprets the essence of the Tenth Word as appropriation, as opposed to desire.

attention, because they would be able to act on their covetous desire.[91]

With the help of these interpreters, it seems that the clearest way of distinguishing between the Tenth Commandment and the other commandments of the Decalogue is the simple distinction between external action and internal desire. Since the Tenth Commandment forbids a desire specifically, by extension, it also forbids the actions that someone may take motivated by that desire, which results in the overlap between it and the other prohibitions. In fact, violating the Tenth Commandment may lead to the violation of the Sixth (murder), Seventh, Eighth, or Ninth (false witness) Commandments.[92] However, despite this overlap, there is still a clear distinction between the commands: while covetous desire may never bloom into adultery or stealing, it is forbidden.[93]

The Form and Interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in Early Jewish Literature

Up to this point, I have focused on the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible, because it is the foundational document for understanding the Tenth Commandment in Paul. Now, it is possible to turn to the form and interpretation of the Tenth Commandment in early Jewish Literature. Paul was a Second Temple Jew who was familiar with the LXX, and it exerted a significant influence on him. Also, the writings of other Second Temple Jews shed light on the way Paul may have received and interpreted the Tenth Word. Therefore, I will survey the form and interpretation of the Tenth

---

[91] Similarly, Augustine suggests the Seventh and Tenth Words "differ to such an extent that sometimes a man who does not covet his neighbor's wife commits adultery and has relations with her for some other reason, while sometimes he may covet her and, fearful of punishment, not have relations with her. And perhaps the law wished to show this, that both are sins" (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.3).

[92] I will explore this relationship in detail in chap. 5.

[93] In distinguishing between the commands in this way, it indirectly establishes another argument for seeing the Tenth Commandment as prohibiting covetous desire specifically. If the Tenth Commandment prohibited an action, it would be very difficult to distinguish it from the preceding words, and the Decalogue would be redundant. Augustine makes a similar observation (*Quaest. Hept.* 2.71.3).

Commandment in early Jewish literature in this section, beginning with the LXX and moving to other early Jewish writers. To delimit this discussion, I only engage with clear examples of translation, quotation, or paraphrase of the Tenth Commandment.[94]

The LXX

Turning to the LXX, the translators of both Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX and Exodus 20:17 LXX render the Tenth Commandment this way[95]:

Table 2. Comparison of Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX

Exodus 20:17 LXX[96]	Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX[97]
Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου οὔτε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ βοὸς αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ ὑποζυγίου αὐτοῦ οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν.	Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου οὔτε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ βοὸς αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ ὑποζυγίου αὐτοῦ οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν.
Do not covet the wife of your neighbor, and do not covet the house of your neighbor, his field, his maid, his ox, his donkey, or anything which is to your neighbor.	Do not covet the wife of your neighbor, and do not covet the house of your neighbor, his field, his maid, his ox, his donkey, or anything which is to your neighbor.

[94] So, for example, I do not deal with Pseudo-Phocylides 6 in this section.

[95] For a discussion of the history of the LXX text of the Decalogue, see Himbaza, *Le décalogue et l'histoire du texte*. Also, for a summary of textual variants in the LXX history of the Decalogue, see de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 18–36.

[96] For the text of Exodus LXX, I have used John William Wevers, ed., *Exodus*, vol. 2, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

[97] For the text of Deuteronomy LXX, I have used John William Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomy*, vol. 3, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

While there are notable differences between Exodus 20:17 MT and Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX are identical, which suggests harmonization. Also, when the LXX translators depart from Exodus 20:17 MT or Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, they generally agree with Deuteronomy 5:21 MT.[98] Most notably, the order of the objects of the verbs in Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX follows the order of Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, with the wife as the first object, as opposed to Exodus 20:17 MT, where the house is the first object.[99] Also, the LXX translators include the field as an object, which occurs in Deuteronomy 5:21 MT but not Exodus 20:17 MT. Therefore, the evidence suggests the LXX translations of the Tenth Word follow Deuteronomy 5:21 MT and are harmonized. Perhaps, the translator of Deuteronomy LXX worked off of Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, then the translator of Exodus LX intentionally harmonized to that preexisting translation.[100]

If there is an exception to this pattern, it is that both Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX repeat the verb ἐπιθυμέω, which agrees with the pattern of Exodus 20:17 MT, where חמד is used twice, but not Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, where חמד is

---

[98] Wevers summarizes, "The Greek texts are on the whole much closer to the Hebrew of Deuteronomy than to that of Exodus." John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 314.

[99] According to de Vos, the adoption of the Deuteronomy order of objects by the LXX translator of Exodus may have been motivated by the focus on sexual sin in the Hellenistic period. de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 35–36. Similarly, Loader argues that the movement of the wife to the first object gives more prominence to this particular manifestation of sin. William R. G. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), 9. Freund, however, argues that the LXX translators are motivated by distinguishing the wife from the property of the husband. Richard A. Freund, "Decalogue," in *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (London: T & T Clark, 2020), 139–40. However, since the translator of Exodus LXX demonstrates a broad pattern of harmonizing to Deut 5:21 LXX, it is difficult to see warrant for such explanations, because it fits a broader tendency.

[100] Greenspoon adopts conflicting views on the matter, suggesting that the translator of Exodus LXX was working off of a Hebrew *vorlage* of Exodus which had the same order of objects as Deut 5:21. Leonard J. Greenspoon, "Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus," in Dozeman, Evans, and Lohr, *The Book of Exodus*, 332–33. Greenspoon, however, also suggests that the translator of Exodus LXX "adopted the order and contents of Deut 5, even though I am quite sure he had before him a Hebrew like that of MT Exod 20" (346).

used once and אוה is used once.[101] While this could be interpreted as an instance of the LXX translators agreeing with Exodus 20:17 MT, as opposed to Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, it could also be explained by the similar semantic range of חמד and אוה.[102] Due to this ready explanation, the conclusion holds that the source text of Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX is Deuteronomy 5:21 MT.[103]

Also, the LXX translators include the phrase "or any of his animals" (οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ), which is not found in Exodus 20:17 MT or Deuteronomy 5:21 MT. In fact, as Innocent Himbaza observes, not only is this reading not found in the MT, it is not found in any manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible.[104] While the LXX translators including this phrase could be attributed to different factors, Himbaza proposes the simple and reasonable explanation that the addition is an interpretive expansion of the Tenth Word which further clarifies objects which should not be coveted.[105] Since Exodus 20:17 MT and Deuteronomy 5:21 MT both conclude with the statement, "anything which is to your neighbor" (וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ), the LXX translators may have identified license in

---

[101] Hakala observes that it is commonly asserted that the LXX forms of the Decalogue were harmonized to Deuteronomy LXX, and she suggests several pieces of counter evidence. While the question of the harmonization of the Decalogue as a whole is outside the purview of this study, one piece of evidence she offers is the use of ἐπιθυμέω twice in Exod 20:17 LXX and Deut 5:21 LXX. Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 18. However, it seems the evidence suggests that the repetition of ἐπιθυμέω in Exod 20:17 LXX and Deut 5:21 LXX can be better explained by the similar semantic range of חמד and אוה than identifying the repetition as an instance of agreement with Exod 20:17 MT. Therefore, whether or not the Decalogue as a whole is harmonized to Deuteronomy LXX, the Tenth Word seems to fit that pattern.

[102] As Wevers simply observes, "These are synonyms." John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 104.

[103] Innocent Himbaza, "The Reception History of the Decalogue through Early Translations: The Case of the Septuagint, Peshitta, and Targums," in *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*, ed. Dominik Markl, Hebrew Bible Monographs 58 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 30. According to de Vos, the harmonization of the two versions of the Decalogue shows the importance placed on the Decalogue by some early Jews. de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 36.

[104] Himbaza, "Reception History of Decalogue," 30.

[105] Himbaza also suggests that an assimilation to Deut 5:14 MT is a possible explanation for the addition of the phrase. Himbaza, "Reception History of Decalogue," 30. Greenspoon, relying on the work of Perkins and Wevers, points out that the tendency of the LXX translator of Exodus is to expand rather than contract in translation, which may also contribute to explaining the addition of the phrase. Greenspoon, "Textual and Translation Issues," 326–27.

their source text to expand the prohibition by adding an additional object.[106]

To briefly summarize, the evidence suggests that the translators of Exodus LXX and Deuteronomy LXX generally followed Deuteronomy 5:21 MT when rendering the Tenth Word. Also, the fact that Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX contain an identical interpretive expansion, which is absent in the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, suggests that the translations are harmonized to one another.[107]

In view of this, a few observations can be made about the understanding of the Tenth Word by the LXX translators: First, they intentionally harmonized Exodus 20:17 MT and Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, which communicates that they interpreted the two texts as witnesses to the same prohibition. Also, while there are no explicit markers in Exodus 20:17 LXX or Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX regarding enumeration, the LXX translators use ἐπιθυμέω twice, which contrasts with the presence of two different verbs in Deuteronomy 5:21 MT.[108] As will be seen, early Jewish writers exclusively present Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word. Perhaps, the repetition of ἐπιθυμέω by the LXX

---

[106] While I have focused on the substantive departures that the LXX translators take from the MT, Wevers notes a few minor differences: the LXX translators do not render the initial conjunction in Deuteronomy, the conjunction before the second verb, and include οὔτε before the second object of the second verb, although there is not an equivalent conjunction in the MT. Wevers, *Notes on Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 104. Greenspoon claims that the LXX translators do not render the expression וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ, which is found in both Exod 20:17 MT and Deut 5:21 MT. Greenspoon, "Textual and Translation Issues," 330. However, the rendering οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν in both Exod 20:17 LXX and Deut 5:21 LXX seems to be an equivalent expression, so it is not clear to me that this is a notable difference.

[107] As de Vos suggests, there are three possible explanations for the changes in Exod 20:17 LXX and Deut 5:21 LXX from the MT: First, the changes which produced the LXX versions may have been made subconsciously. Second, there may have been a different *vorlage* available to the translators of the LXX. Third, the changes were made consciously. de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 34. In view of the data listed, the first two possibilities are excluded, and the third is the most reasonable.

[108] According to some, the LXX translators generalize the Tenth Commandment by translating חמד and אוה using ἐπιθυμέω. Josephus, *Against Apion*, ed. and trans. John M. G. Barclay, FJTC 10 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 304–5n947; Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 331–32. However, Hakala argues that this is not the case when it comes to the Tenth Commandment or the translation of the Decalogue as a whole. Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 14–17. Also, Loader suggests that this translation "could lend itself also to the possible interpretation that not only the lustful response is outlawed, but also the sexual passion itself. It need not do so, but it provides a link to value systems which portray passions negatively." Loader, *Septuagint, Sexuality, and New Testament*, 11. Loader correctly observes that the LXX translation creates new interpretive options, but it does not necessitate them.

translators is part of the explanation for this unanimity.

Second, the LXX translators added an additional object, "or any of his animals" (οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ), which most likely represents an interpretative decision to unpack additional possible objects of covetousness. Most likely, therefore, the LXX translators viewed the prohibition as extending beyond the objects explicitly listed. As will be seen, some early Jewish writers follow this pattern of extending the objects of the Tenth Word.

4 Maccabees 2:5–6

The author of 4 Maccabees[109] quotes the Tenth Commandment in 4 Maccabees 2:5: "Therefore, the law (ὁ νόμος) says, 'Do not covet (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's wife (τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου), nor anything that is your neighbor's" (οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν).[110] In this citation, he reproduces the wording of Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX exactly, with the exception of switching οὐδὲ for οὔτε. Interestingly, he seems to intentionally quote the first and last objects included in Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX. Almost certainly, he explicitly mentioned the wife because of his contextual reference to Joseph resisting the temptation of illicit sex (4 Macc 2:1–4).[111] After citing the most relevant object, he may have simply included the

[109] DeSilva writes that 4 Maccabees is "an anonymous work by a well-educated, rhetorically skilled Diaspora Jew, writing in an urban environment in the region of Asia or Syria most probably during the first half of the first century CE." David Arthur deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 33. As van Henten writes, "There is a consensus that 4 Maccabees originated in the diaspora." J. W. van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*, JSJsup 57 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 78. As scholars have observed, when the author uses participles in agreement with first person finite verbs they are masculine grammatically. Therefore, I refer to the author using masculine pronouns in this study. Stephen Westerholm, *Law and Ethics in Early Judaism and the New Testament*, WUNT 383 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 86n2. Tabb observes that "most modern scholars agree that 4 Maccabees was composed in the approximate period 20–120 CE." Brian J. Tabb, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview: Luke, Seneca and 4 Maccabees in Dialogue*, LNTS 569 (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 72. For surveys of the debate around dating, see Tabb, *Suffering in Ancient Worldview*, 72–74; deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield Academic), 12–18; van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours*, 73–78.

[110] For the text of the LXX, unless otherwise specified, I have used Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta*, rev. ed. (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

[111] David Arthur deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in*

final phrase as a way to summarize the remainder of the Tenth Word.[112] Thus, while the citation is shortened, it seems that the author of 4 Maccabees intended to evoke the entirety of the Tenth Word in the mind of his audience. By doing so, the citation of the Tenth Commandment may serve the argumentative purpose of broadening the focus of Torah from sexual lust in particular (4 Macc 2:1–4) to wrongful desire for anything which belongs to another.[113]

When the author of 4 Maccabees refers back to his quotation of the Tenth Commandment in 2:6, he writes, "The Law (ὁ νόμος) has told us, 'Do not covet'" (μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν). With this two-word reference to the Tenth Commandment, he places the focus on desire itself. DeSilva comments, "In 2:6, the author provides an even more abbreviated paraphrase of this commandment, saying that the Law has ordered Jews 'not to desire,' which could here be read as a prohibition of (excess) desire *tout court* and so marks the completion of the broadening process begun in 2:5."[114] Adopting deSilva's reading, even though the focus of 4 Maccabees is undoubtedly on desire itself, the author still references specific objects of desire in his initial quotation (τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου, οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν; 4 Macc 2:5). By doing so, he acknowledges, through his quotation, that the Tenth Commandment specifically forbids desire for certain objects. However, with his abbreviated citation in 2:6, μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν, he broadens the prohibition of the Tenth Word, placing the focus on illicit desire itself.

When 4 Maccabees 2:5–6 is read in light of the work as a whole, this reading fits, because it is clear that the author, influenced by Hellenistic philosophy, chose to

---

Codex Sinaiticus (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2006), 95.

[112] DeSilva observes that the author omitted the other objects "perhaps for the sake of brevity, since these are subsumed under the concluding phrase which is recited, 'whatever belongs to your neighbor.'" deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Brill), 95.

[113] deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Brill), 95.

[114] deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Brill), 95.

quote the Tenth Commandment because of its focus on desire.[115] While scholars generally agree that the author employed a blend of philosophies, Stoicism is particularly prominent in his thinking, which partly explains his emphasis on desire.[116] Thus, the Tenth Word makes an appearance in service of proving the main thesis of his work: "Reason is the complete master over the emotions" (αὐτοκράτωρ ἐστὶν τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμός; 4 Macc 1:7).

Notably, the author of 4 Maccabees treats the Tenth Commandment as a single prohibition. He quotes the first verb (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) and its object (τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου) and then quotes one of the objects of the second verb (οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν). By quoting the commandment in this way, the author suggests he views it as a unified prohibition. Additionally, since the author references Joseph resisting the temptation of sexual desire (4 Macc 2:1–4), if the author viewed the commandments as two prohibitions—one against desiring a neighbor's wife and one against desiring a neighbor's goods—it would be expected that only the first prohibition would be quoted, because it would directly apply to the situation. However, by including an additional object, the author seems to communicate that all of Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 is relevant for his purposes. Finally, when the author refers back to the Tenth Word in 2:6, μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν, the shortened citation further suggests that he viewed Exodus 20:17 and

---

[115] DeSilva rightly observes that the citation of the Tenth Word communicates something about its significance: "For the author of 4 Maccabees, then, the last commandment of the Decalogue is no mere appendix, but a rule that promises to prevent the growth of vice from the very roots of the inner person." deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Brill), 95–96.

[116] According to Aune, "Stoicism is the most important philosophical background for the ethical theory of . . . the author of 4 Macc." David C. Aune, "Mastery of the Passions: Philo, 4 Maccabees and the Earliest Christianity," in *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Wendy E. Helleman (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 125. In contrast, Collins suggests that one philosophical background cannot be given prominence. John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 205–6. However, while the question of philosophical background is undeniably complex, and potentially irresolvable, some recent scholarship emphasizes the influence of Stoicism on the author. For example, Mosicke argues that, when it comes to a definition of evil, the author "has absorbed a Stoic understanding." Hans Moscicke, "The Concept of Evil in 4 Maccabees: Stoic Absorption and Adaption," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 25, no. 2 (2017): 125.

Deuteronomy 5:21 as a single commandment.

Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92

In the context of a summary of the entire Decalogue (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.91–92), Josephus paraphrases the Tenth Commandment with these words: "The Tenth (δέκατος) to covet nothing that belongs to another." (ὁ μηδενὸς ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιθυμίαν λαμβάνειν; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92 [LCL, Thackeray]). Prior to rehearsing the Ten Words, Josephus writes "These words it is not permitted us to state explicitly, to the letter, but we will indicate their purport" (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.90 [LCL, Thackeray]).[117] In light of this statement, he is self-consciously paraphrasing, so it is not surprising that he does not quote the Tenth Word verbatim. Also, when he cites the Tenth Commandment, he does not do it in a context where the Tenth Commandment itself is the primary focus. Instead, he is citing the entirety of the Decalogue, so he does not give additional explanation regarding the meaning of the Tenth Word.[118]

However, it is still possible to make a few observations from Josephus' paraphrase. First, he explicitly numbers the command contained in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as "the Tenth" (ὁ δέκατος). Second, he abbreviates the Tenth Commandment by not including specific objects, which makes sense in the context of a paraphrase. Third, he emphasizes that the desire is for specific objects with the words "nothing that belongs to another" (μηδενὸς ἀλλοτρίου; [LCL, Thackeray]). In this way, his expression evokes the concluding object: οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν (Exod 20:17 LXX; Deut 5:21 LXX) and places the focus on desire for specific things. Fourth, while

---

[117] For a discussion of the meaning and significance of this phrase, see de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 123–28; Reinhard Weber, *Das "Gesetz" bei Philon von Alexandrien und Flavius Josephus: Studien zum Verständnis und zur Funktion der Thora bei den beiden Hauptzeugen des hellenistischen Judentums* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001), 296–97.

[118] As de Vos writes, "Kurz und prägnant beschreibt er, worum es seiner Meinung nach in jedem der Gebote geht." de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 118.

the wording of Josephus' paraphrase does not directly match Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX, he does use the term ἐπιθυμία, which is related to ἐπιθυμέω and suggests the importance of this lexeme in referencing the Tenth Word.[119]

Philo

Philo stands alone among ancient sources in giving a focused exposition of the Tenth Commandment (*Decalogue* 142–53; *Spec. Laws* 4.78b–131).[120] According to Philo, "The Ten Words (οἱ δέκα λόγοι) are summaries (κεφάλαια) of the special laws which are recorded in the Sacred Books and run through the whole of the legislation" (*Decalogue* 154). Therefore, when Philo discusses the Tenth Word, he explains in detail how he believes it fits with the remainder of the Mosaic law. By doing so, he makes a unique contribution to the data regarding the Tenth Commandment in early Judaism through the sheer size of his exposition.[121]

In *Special Laws* 4.78 Philo gives a two-word citation of the Tenth Commandment: οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. By abbreviating the Tenth Word with only the first two words, Philo is consistent with a tendency evidenced in 4 Maccabees 2:5–6. However,

---

[119] Josephus, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, ed. and trans. Louis H. Feldman, FJTC 3 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 253n199. De Vos suggests that the use of ἐπιθυμία further emphasizes that the Tenth Commandment was interpreted as focused on desire itself in the Hellenistic period. de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 121.

[120] Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 14–17. I will be focusing exclusively on Philo's use of the Tenth Commandment. For a survey of his view of the Decalogue as a whole, see Paul Grimley Kuntz and Thomas D'Evelyn, *The Ten Commandments in History: Mosaic Paradigms for a Well-Ordered Society* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), 11–26; Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*, trans. Robyn Fréchet (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012), 145–49.

[121] Hans Svebakken, *Philo of Alexandria's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment*, Studia Philonica Monographs 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 184–86; Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947), 2:225–37; Kathy L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 193–99; Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "Philo and Paul on Alien Religion: A Comparison (2005)," in *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, WUNT 290 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 133–60; Sandelin, "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria (1991)," in *Attraction and Danger*, 27–76.

Philo separates himself by not referencing any objects of desire.[122] While Philo does not explain his choice to abbreviate the Tenth Commandment, Hans Svebakken observes that "it makes good sense in light of his overall treatment of the Ten Commandments, especially his view of the last five as a pentad of basic prohibitions governing human affairs."[123] Thus, by abbreviating the Tenth Word in this way, Philo can rightly be said to abstract the Tenth Word. Also, he identifies these two words as "the last (τὸ τελευταῖον) of the Ten Words" (τῶν δέκα λογίων; *Spec. Laws* 4.78).[124] In doing so, Philo clearly regards Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as one prohibition—the Tenth Word.[125]

Philo wrote extensively on the subject of the Tenth Word, so there are several significant features of his interpretation. However, to isolate one, as Svebakken traces, Philo interpreted the Tenth Commandment to be a prohibition of all passionate desire, as opposed to simply desiring the possessions of another.[126] Also, he believed the Tenth Commandment was kept through self-control, and one of the important purposes of the dietary laws in Mosaic legislation was to give an opportunity for the cultivation of this self-control in order to keep the Tenth Commandment.[127]

---

[122] When the citation by Philo, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, is compared to the citation of the author of 4 Maccabees, μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν, they are practically identical. Most likely, the infinitival form is used by the author of 4 Maccabees because it is indirect speech, and usage of μὴ is expected when negating a non-indicative verbal form. However, the author of 4 Maccabees only cites the Tenth Word in a two-word form after already referring to the entirety of it, so Philo is unique in exclusively using the two-word abbreviation.

[123] Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 8.

[124] For a survey of the form of the Tenth Commandment in Philo, see Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 1–2n4.

[125] Since Philo only cites the first two words of the Tenth Commandment, his citation agrees with the unified tradition of the MT and the LXX; however, Philo used the LXX in his writings. Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 1n3.

[126] Svebakken notes that Philo understands the Tenth Commandment through a Middle-Platonist framework. Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 33–80. In contrast to Svebakken, it is commonly asserted that Philo was Stoic in his view of desire. Paul Grimley Kuntz, for example, writes, "Philo offers a completely Stoic analysis of desire." Kuntz and D'Evelyn, *Ten Commandments in History*, 20. Mireille Hadas-Lebel traces how Philo is indebted to a number of philosophical schools. Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 161–75.

[127] Rhodes writes, "According to Philo, Moses introduced laws pertaining to food and drink precisely to bridle the passion incited by desire." James N. Rhodes, "Diet and Desire: The Logic of the

LAB 11.13; 44.6

Pseudo-Philo 11.6–13 records the Decalogue ,[128] including the Tenth Commandment.[129] Pseudo-Philo 11.13 states, "Thou shall not covet your neighbor's house nor whatever he possesses, lest others should covet your land."[130] Pseudo-Philo is an example of what is often referred to as "rewritten Bible,"[131] so it is unsurprising that the Tenth Word is paraphrased in a way that is unmistakable but also expanded and interpreted.[132] Pseudo-Philo 44.6 also preserves a rewriting of the Tenth Word in the context of another summary of the Decalogue: "And not to covet each one his fellow's wife or house or anything that belonged to him."[133]

While Pseudo-Philo was most likely composed in Hebrew, it is only extant in Latin manuscripts, so direct lexical comparison to the Hebrew Bible or the LXX is not possible.[134] However, it is possible to make several observations regarding the usage of

---

Dietary Laws According to Philo," *ETL* 79, no. 1 (April 2003): 123.

[128] For an introduction to Pseudo-Philo, see Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 1, AGJU 31 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1996), 195–280. Also see the more concise introduction in Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 3–7.

[129] For a discussion of the Decalogue as a whole in Pseudo-Philo, see de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 134–53.

[130] "Non concupisces domum proximi tui nec ea que habet, ne et alii concupiscent terram tuam." Text and translation of Pseudo-Philo are taken from the critical edition in Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 1996.

[131] Bohlinger writes, "Pseudo-Philo is one of the foremost examples of so-called "rewritten Bible" from ancient Judaism, akin to Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon and Josephus' Antiquities." Tavis Asaph Bohlinger, "The Akeda in Pseudo-Philo: A Paradigm of Divine-Human Reciprocity," *JSP* 25, no. 3 (March 2016): 15. For discussions of the use of the term "rewritten Bible," see Bohlinger, "The Akeda in Pseudo-Philo," 15n1; Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Achronism?," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 285–306. For further discussion of the genre of Pseudo-Philo, see Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 4–5.

[132] Murphy observes that LAB 11.6–13 alters "the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17) without fully rewriting them." Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 66.

[133] "Et ne concupiscerent unusquisque uxorem proximi sui, neque domum nec omnia que eius sunt."

[134] Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 3–4.

the Tenth Word in Pseudo-Philo. First, while Pseudo-Philo does not explicitly number Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 as the Tenth Word, the command is recounted in such a way that suggests it was viewed as a single injunction. Two reasons suggest this interpretation: First, although the objects are different in each paraphrase, only one verb is stated. Second, the paraphrases of the Tenth Word are in the context of summaries of the Decalogue (11.6–13; 44.6), which allows for comparison to the other prohibitions of the Decalogue, and the Tenth Word is stated as a simple and singular prohibition alongside the other prohibitions.[135]

Second, Pseudo-Philo abbreviates and paraphrases the Tenth Commandment but retains the references to specific objects of covetousness. In this way, the author does not follow the pattern of Philo in abstracting the Tenth Word. However, the author lists different objects in different contexts. In 11:13, the only object explicitly named, other than the summary statement, is the house, which could be read to align with Exodus 20:17 MT, but in 44:6, the wife is first, which matches Deuteronomy 5:21 MT, Exodus 20:17 LXX, and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX.[136] Therefore, it is unclear if the author is working off of a specific text or simply drawing freely from the objects for different purposes in different contexts.

Third, Pseudo-Philo exhibits several interesting interpretive expansions. Pseudo-Philo 11.13 includes a motivation clause, warning that Israel will have their land coveted if they covet the land of others.[137] Similarly, 44.10 states, "If a man will covet the property of his neighbor, I will command death and it will deny him the fruit of his

---

[135] Interestingly, Pseudo-Philo only explicitly mentions nine prohibitions. Murphy suggests that Pseudo-Philo combines the First and Second Word. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 66.

[136] On the order of the objects in 11.13, see de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 146–47; Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2:1011.

[137] "The introduction of the 'golden rule' into the Decalogue is unique to Pseudo-Philo." Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 67.

belly."[138] Most likely, this is reference back to the Tenth Word, and another motivational clause is included. As Howard Jacobson observes, "The sinner desires the property of his neighbor and therefore loses his most valued property, namely his children."[139] In both 11.13 and 44.10 the violation of the Tenth Commandment is presented in a conditional statement with a motivating warning. In a way, Pseudo-Philo applies *lex talionis* to the Tenth Word.[140]

Pseudo-Philo 44.6–7 connects idolatry to the violation of the other commandments of the Decalogue, and the corresponding vice for the Tenth Word is "and they lusted for foreign women" (LAB 44.7).[141] In the preceding context, Pseudo-Philo explains how each of the commands of the Decalogue were idolatrously violated, which means that desiring foreign women is an expression of idolatrous violation of the Tenth Word.[142] While Frederick J. Murphy suggests that Pseudo-Philo identifies the violation of each prohibition of the Decalogue as idolatry,[143] Jacobson rightly questions this conclusion and suggests that some of the sins lead to idolatry.[144] Thus, Pseudo-Philo interprets the Tenth Word as forbidding a wide range of activities, whether it be coveting

---

[138] "Et si voluerit unusquisque concupiscere uxorem proximi sui, mandabo morti et abnegabit eis fructum ventris eorum."

[139] Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,* 2:1025.

[140] Jacobson notes that Pseudo-Philo gives a rationale for obeying the Decalogue, "and the explanations mostly follow a single principle, that of (so to speak) measure for measure." Howard Jacobson, "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 193. Also see Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 176–77.

[141] "Et concupierunt mulieres alienas."

[142] Hakala, "Decalogue as Summary of Law," 60. As Murphy explains, "The connection between lust for foreign women and idolatry is implicit here but explicit throughout Pseudo-Philo." Frederick J. Murphy, "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo," *JBL* 107, no. 2 (June 1988): 279.

[143] Murphy summarizes, "To commit idolatry is to commit every other possible sin at the same time." Murphy, "Retelling the Bible," 279–80.

[144] Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2:1015. While this is a subtle distinction, it better explains the evidence.

the land or wife of a fellow Israelite or lusting after foreign women.[145]

Summary

With this brief summary of early Jewish references to the Tenth Commandment, a few conclusions can be drawn. First, although the LXX translators expand the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17 LXX; Deut 5:21 LXX), there is an observable tendency in other early Jewish sources (4 Macc 2:5–6; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.92; *Spec*. 4.78; LAB 11.13; 44.6) to abbreviate it. Pseudo-Philo, however, while abbreviating the prohibition itself by omitting the second verb and several of the objects, interpretively expands the Tenth Word (LAB 11.13; 44.10). Second, early Jewish writers consistently refer to Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 without making a distinction between the two texts. Also, Josephus (*Ant.* 3.92) and Philo (*Spec. Laws* 4.78) explicitly number these texts as the Tenth Word. Third, the LXX translators do not significantly depart from the MT, with the exception of adding one expression, and this expression is not represented in other early Jewish sources. So, it can be said that early Jewish writers, when citing the Tenth Commandment, appealed to the unified tradition of the Hebrew Bible and the LXX, although it is also clear that some early Jewish writers directly relied on the wording of the LXX (4 Macc 2:5–6; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.78).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have covered the form and interpretation of the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature. Throughout this survey, I have drawn conclusions which are relevant for the study of the Tenth Word in Paul. In particular, I have attempted to answer the vital questions, what is the Tenth Commandment, and how would Paul have encountered it?

---

[145] Jacobson, however, does not believe this is a reference to idolatry, contrasting it with the previous statements: "For all the previous commandments LAB elaborated or reinterpreted the biblical text. Here we have merely a straightforward statement." Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2:1018.

As the primary evidence shows, the Tenth Commandment forbids unrestrained desire for what belongs to someone else, and, by extension, it prohibits any ensuing actions or schemes to wrongfully appropriate an object of desire. Also, the Tenth Word was a significant text for early Jewish writers who appeal to and interpret it in diverse ways. With this foundation in place, it is possible to turn to the way the Tenth Word influenced the moral instruction of Paul.

CHAPTER 3

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT DEFINING SIN

Paul's use of the Tenth Commandment suggests that he views the violation of it as fundamental to sin. In other words, the influence of the Tenth Commandment on Paul's ethical instruction can be seen in that it defines and describes sin. To make this argument, I focus on two Pauline texts: Romans 7 and 1 Corinthians 10. I also explore Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11, because these texts are connected to the Tenth Commandment, and Paul integrates them into Romans 7 and 1 Corinthians 10. I argue that, for Paul, the Tenth Commandment is linked to the history of Israel in that it describes and prohibits the desire which motivated Adam and Eve in their primal sin, and the wilderness generation in their rebellion. In turn, Paul uses these narratives, informed by the Tenth Commandment, to instruct his congregations, and thus, shows the influence of the Tenth Word on his moral instruction.

Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11

When Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11 are read alongside the Tenth Word, parallels become evident. In the following sections, I explore the ways these two narratives are connected to the Tenth Commandment within the Hebrew Bible itself.

Genesis 2–3

When Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Commandment are read together,[1] the lexical

[1] In this discussion, I do not attempt to address the wide variety of interpretive issues related to Gen 2–3. Instead, my goal is to identify parallels between this complex text and the Tenth Word. So, my discussion is limited to the portions of it relevant to this task.

connections are particularly striking.[2] For one, חמד occurs in Genesis 2:9 (נֶחְמָד) and 3:6 (וְנֶחְמָד), and it also occurs in Exodus 20:17 (תַּחְמֹד 2x) and Deuteronomy 5:21 (תַּחְמֹד).[3] Although חמד occurs 21 times in the Hebrew Bible, the first and second occurrences are in Genesis 2:9 and 3:6 and the third and fourth are in Exodus 20:17. Then, חמד occurs for the fifth time in Exodus 34:24, before the sixth occurrence in Deuteronomy 5:21. Therefore, five of the first six occurrences of חמד in the Hebrew Bible are found in either Genesis 2–3 or the Tenth Commandment. To look at this evidence in a different way, חמד occurs 21 times in the Hebrew Bible, but it occurs seven times in the Pentateuch (Gen 2:9; 3:6; Exod 20:17 2x; 34:24; Deut 5:21; 7:25). Of those seven, five are located in Genesis 2–3 or the Tenth Commandment. On its own, this evidence is suggestive that there may be a connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word, but other parallels between the two texts are also present.

Genesis 3:6 also contains the noun תַּאֲוָה, which is derived from אוה, which occurs in Deuteronomy 5:21. While this noun occurring in Genesis 2–3 is notable, it is even more significant when its occurrence is considered alongside the use of חמד in the same text, because Deuteronomy 5:21 uses both חמד and אוה.[4] Regarding Genesis 2–3, Miller observes, "Only here are words from the two roots for desire in Deuteronomy 5:21

---

[2] The following scholars observe a connection between Gen 2–3 and the Tenth Word: Jared C. Hood, "The Decalogue of Genesis 1–3," *Reformed Theological Review* 75, no. 1 (April 2016): 45–46; Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 18; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, AB, vol. 2A (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 180; Hagith Sivan, *Between Woman, Man, and God: A New Interpretation of the Ten Commandments*, LHBOTS 401 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 213–15; Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis*, NAC, vol. 1A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 238; Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 75; Calum M. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 342.

[3] Gen 2:9 and 3:6 contain *niphal* participles functioning adjectivally, but Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 contain *qal* imperfects functioning in a prohibition. However, the verbs being conjugated differently and performing distinct grammatical functions does not discount the connections between the two passages. Furthermore, as will be demonstrated, the connections between the texts go beyond lexical parallels.

[4] As noted in the previous chapter, the different forms of the Tenth Word in Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 open additional avenues for interpretation, and this is one of those instances.

also found together."[5] Or, as Jared C. Hood writes, "The use of both words . . . seems to move beyond coincidence: the tenth Word emerges from the creation narrative."[6] At the least, these lexical connections suggest that Genesis 2–3 has a role in explicating Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21. However, to go further, it is also possible, based on these lexical connections, that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are designed to be read against the background of Genesis 2–3.

In addition to lexical parallels, there are conceptual parallels between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word, which heighten the possibility that these texts should be read together. First, both texts share the theme of desire. As noted above, both texts use similar terms for desire (חמד, אוה, תַּאֲוָה), which suggests they have a similar type of desire in view. Specifically, both passages focus on the desire for forbidden objects. In Genesis 2–3, the desire is for a particular tree which God forbade, and in Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 the desire is for things which belong to a neighbor. In both cases, therefore, a specific kind of desire is in view: illicit desire for forbidden objects.

While it is easy enough to see the centrality of evil desire to the Tenth Word, because it is a prohibition forbidding evil desire, Genesis 2–3 also evidences the centrality of desire. After Eve's conversation with the snake, Genesis 3:6 recounts that she "saw" (וַתֵּרֶא) three things: first, "the tree was good for food" (טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמַאֲכָל); second, "it was a desirable thing" (תַּאֲוָה־הוּא); third, "it was desirable for making one wise" (וְנֶחְמָד הָעֵץ לְהַשְׂכִּיל). Genesis 3:6, therefore, records that Eve perceived the desirability of the fruit of the tree in a multifaceted way.[7] Also, Genesis 3:6 describes Eve

---

[5] Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 400.

[6] Hood, "Decalogue of Genesis 1–3," 45–46.

[7] Victor Hamilton describes the tree as being "physically appealing," "aesthetically pleasing," and "sapientially transforming." Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*, vol. 1, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 190.

acting on her desire using a form of לקח, which is consistent with the usage of חמד in the Hebrew Bible and shows that desire motivated her action.[8] So, desire is not a tangential element in Genesis 2–3, but a driving force in the narrative.[9] Therefore, although the texts in question are different—Genesis 2–3 is narrative and Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 contain a single prohibition—the theme of evil desire plays a central role in both.

To note an additional conceptual similarity, the theme of divine command is prominent in both passages. God gives a command to Adam in Genesis 2:16–17, and the serpent and Eve discuss it in Genesis 3:1–3. While God's command did not specifically forbid desire—God forbade Adam and Eve from eating (לֹא תֹאכַל) from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—the ensuing narrative clarifies that desire was the specific factor leading to violation of the command. Similarly, Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are divine commands. Therefore, in addition to the lexical connections between the two texts, they share similar concepts of illicit desire and divine command.[10]

While the lexical and conceptual connections between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Commandment suggest a connection between the two texts, an objection could be raised: Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Commandment are texts with different characters,

---

[8] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 401.

[9] Tushima thoughtfully explores the dynamics of desire in Gen 3 and suggests the narrative has a paradigmatic role in reading other narratives related to desire in the Hebrew Bible. Cephas T. A. Tushima, "The Paradigmatic Role of Genesis 3 for Reading Biblical Narratives about Desire," *Unio Cum Christo* 5, no. 1 (April 2019): 87–102.

[10] In addition to the conceptual similarities I have focused on, Carmichael and Sivan both emphasize the role that gender plays in Gen 2–3 and the Tenth Commandment. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in Bible*, 334–42; Sivan, *Between Woman, Man, and God*, 213–15. According to Carmichael, in fact, Deut 5:21 presents the wife first, because the Deuteronomist intends to heighten the connection to the creation story, where the relationship between men and women is highlighted. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in Bible*, 336–37. Of course, gender is important for both texts; however, on a straightforward reading, it would seem gender functions very differently in them. In Gen 2–3 gender primarily makes an appearance in the relational dynamics between Adam and Eve and the presence of masculine and feminine characters. In the Tenth Commandment, however, gender only makes an appearance, because the wife of a neighbor is one of the possible objects of coveting. Therefore, what the narratives have in common is not the objects of desire, but evil desire itself. Additionally, the primary weakness of such constructions is that they rely on hypotheses concerning redactional activity.

settings, and many different themes. Furthermore, the two texts are in different books in the Hebrew Bible. In view of these differences, someone might argue, the texts should not be read together.

In response, to offer a final reason for seeing a connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word, there is warrant for seeing a broader connection between the Decalogue and the creation narrative. In particular, the Fourth Word (Sabbath) is rooted in Genesis 2:1–3.[11] Hood notes the connections between Genesis 2:1–3 and the Exodus version of the Fourth Word (Exod 20:8–11).[12] First, Genesis 2:1 reads, "And the heavens (הַשָּׁמַיִם) and the earth (וְהָאָרֶץ) and all their host were completed," and Exodus 20:11 states, "For the Lord made the heavens (אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם) and the earth (וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ) and the sea and all that was in them in six days." While Exodus 20:11 is not a verbatim quotation of Genesis 2:1, it seems to be a reference to it and even uses some of the same vocabulary. Second, Genesis 2:2 states, "And he rested (וַיִּשְׁבֹּת) on the seventh day (בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי)," and Exodus 20:11 states, "And he rested (וַיָּנַח) on the seventh day (בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי)." While the verbiage is not identical in these two texts, it is similar, and it would seem that Exodus 20:11 is a reference to Genesis 2:2. Third, Genesis 2:3 states, "And God blessed (וַיְבָרֶךְ) the seventh day (אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי) and sanctified it" (וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ), and Exodus 20:11 states, "Therefore, the Lord blessed (בֵּרַךְ) the sabbath day (אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת) and sanctified it" (וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ). Again, while the two phrases are not identical, there are clear verbal

[11] Carmichael argues that the Decalogue as a whole can be traced back to various pieces of biblical narrative and puts particular emphasis on the paradise narrative, Cain and Abel, and the golden calf. Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in the Bible*, 315–37. Hood, however, critiques Carmichael. Hood, "The Decalogue of Genesis 1–3," 35–39. Instead, Hood argues that Gen 1–3 form a background for the entire Decalogue. Hood, 39–59. If Carmichael and Hood substantiate their claims, then there is warrant for seeing a connection to multiple commands from the Decalogue in Gen 1–3. If that is the case, it further contributes to seeing the Tenth Commandment in Gen 2–3; however, acceptance of their broader theses is not necessary for the argument being made here, which is that the Fourth Word can be seen in Gen 1–3.

[12] As with the Tenth Word, Exod 20:8–11 and Deut 5:12–14 preserve different versions of the Fourth Word. Unlike Exod 20:8–11, Deut 5:1–14 does not reference the creation narrative. Instead, Deut 5:12–14 points back to the experience of the Israelites in slavery. For a discussion of the Exodus and Deuteronomy forms of the Fourth Word and the interpretation of each, see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 117–30.

resonances between them.[13]

In view of this evidence, the Fourth Word, specifically Exodus 20:11, seems to reference Genesis 2:1–3.[14] Thus, if the Fourth Word is grounded in and explained by a passage from Genesis 2–3, why would it be unreasonable to see a connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word also?[15] In fact, if the Fourth Word draws from the pattern of creation, it raises the likelihood that the Tenth Word draws from the primal sin of Adam and Eve.[16] Therefore, when the broader connection between the Decalogue and Genesis 2–3 is combined with the lexical and conceptual evidence for a specific connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word, it becomes likely that the Tenth Word should be read against the background of Genesis 2–3, which raises a question: In light of these parallels, what is the significance of the connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word?

Genesis 2–3 recounts Adam and Eve's primal sin brought about by their evil desire, and the Tenth Commandment forbids evil desire in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, the Tenth Word is best understood as prohibiting the same type of desire which Adam and Eve manifested in the Garden of Eden for the forbidden fruit, but for a

---

[13] Also, Gentry and Wellum suggest that the Ten Words connect to the ten utterances of God in the creation narrative. Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*, 2nd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 365–66.

[14] Hood summarizes, "The structure of thought between Genesis and Exodus is the same, proceeding from the completion of creation, to God's rest, to the blessing. In phraseology and semantics, the Exodus statements are sufficiently similar to give the impression that the earlier text is being paraphrased." Hood, "Decalogue of Genesis 1–3," 44.

[15] Perhaps, someone could draw the conclusion from the parallel between Exod 20:11 and Gen 2:1–3 that Exod 20:17 is drawn from Gen 2–3 but not Deut 5:21. However, as catalogued above, the Deuteronomy version of the Tenth Word actually provides an additional verbal resonance with Gen 2:1–3 that makes this conclusion unlikely.

[16] Hood also argues that the connections to the Decalogue in Gen 1–3 cohere together. He writes, "The high point of the creation story is that God rested and rejoiced in his work, and blessed the seventh day. The low point is that humanity did not enter into God's rest, but through covetousness, was cursed. The final Word of the Vertical' (God-focused) section of the Decalogue thus coincides with the high point of Gen 1:1–2:3, and the final Word of the 'horizontal' (socially-focused) section of the Decalogue coincides with the low point of the Edenic narrative." Hood, "Decalogue of Genesis 1–3," 46.

different object: the possessions of a neighbor.[17] Therefore, with the Tenth Word God instructs Israel not to act toward one another as Adam and Eve acted toward him in the Garden of Eden.[18]

Furthermore, although the Tenth Commandment prohibits a specific kind of desire for specific objects, reading it against the background of Genesis 2–3 clarifies that the Tenth Commandment is prohibiting a manifestation of a broader problem. As Miller writes, "In the biblical story *the human predicament begins with desire let loose* and uncontrolled."[19] When Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word are read together, it becomes clear that God forbids coveting the fruit of a tree, what belongs to another Israelite, and, by extension, anything which God has forbidden, which demonstrates that unbounded human desire for things which God has forbidden is a fundamental offense against God. Thus, while the Tenth Commandment primarily focuses on desire for what belongs to another, it is best understood as a particularly bold point on a trajectory which further defines and restricts a sin first committed by Adam and Eve. When the Tenth Word is read against the background of Genesis 2–3, it has the important role of defining and describing sin.

Numbers 11

Numbers 11:4–35 narrates how a group of people travelling with Israel, referred to as וְהָאסַּפְסֻף (Num 11:4),[20] complained about the quality of the food which

---

[17] Wenham writes, "The woman's covetousness is described in terminology that foreshadows the tenth commandment." Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 75.

[18] Speaking of Adam and Eve, Carmichael writes, "This frustration of their desire to attain unending life prompts a prohibition against coveting a neighbor's possessions." Carmichael, *Law and Narrative in Bible*, 342.

[19] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 400. Also, Hamilton comments on Gen 3:6, "Here is the essence of covetousness. It is the attitude that says I need something I do not now have in order to be happy." Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 1:190.

[20] Perhaps, Num 11:4 is referring to the group of non-Israelites who had attached themselves to the community of Israelites. Exod 12:38 records, "Also a great mixed group (עֵרֶב) went up with them," and Lev 24:10 references the presence of non-Israelites among the community. Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of*

YHWH had provided.[21] Specifically, they "craved a craving" (הִתְאַוּוּ תַּאֲוָה), and "the sons of Israel" (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) joined in and began weeping, expressing a longing for the food of Egypt (Num 11:4–6).[22] YHWH responded by providing quail for them to eat (Num 11:31–32), but he judged them with a plague while they ate it (Num 11:33).[23] Numbers 11:4–35 is significant for this study because, like Genesis 2–3, it connects to the Tenth Word.[24] However, I am not aware of a treatment which emphasizes the connections between Numbers 11:4–35 and the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible, so I intend to make

---

Numbers, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1993), 207–8; Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 83; Martin Noth, *Numbers*, trans. James D. Martin, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 85; R. Dennis Cole, *Numbers*, NAC, vol. 3B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 184. Philip J. Budd, however, expresses skepticism regarding interpreting the term as a reference to non-Israelites. Philip J. Budd, *Numbers*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 127.

[21] Num 11:4–35 contains multiple storylines, so Sommer breaks Num 11:4–35 into two narratives: one consisting of 11:4–15, 18–24a, and 31–35, and the other consisting of 11:16–17 and 24b–30. Benjamin D. Sommer, "Reflecting on Moses: The Redaction of Numbers 11," *JBL* 118, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 604. Due to these distinct elements, discussion related to Num 11:4–35 in historical critical scholarship typically relates to alleged redactional activity in bringing together two unrelated stories. Sommer, for example, argues that Num 11:4–35 contains two distinct narratives, and Moses is portrayed as good in one and bad in the other. Sommer, "Reflecting on Moses." Reis, however, responds to Sommer, suggesting that Num 11:4–35 presents a coherent picture of Moses. Pamela Tamarkin Reis, "Numbers XI: Seeing Moses Plain," *VT* 55, no. 2 (2005): 207–31. Also, Levine rejects the idea that the distinct stories cannot be harmonized, noting that the two storylines are united in the "connection between food-supply problems and political leadership." Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, AB, vol. 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 327. As Ashley rightly observes, "The unitive factor in the narrative is the person of Moses himself. As the text stands the themes are related, and the primary task of the exegete is to explain the text, not its putative ancestor." Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, 207.

[22] Since "the sons of Israel" (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) joined in on the complaining, they are implicated in the sin, even if the original responsibility fell on וְהָאסַפְסֻף. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, 207–8; Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, 321. Milgrom, however, argues that the punishment primarily fell on the non-Israelites travelling with Israel. In response, the narrative seems to maintain focus on the whole congregation of Israel, so the most natural reading is that the judgment fell on those who sinned, regardless of whether they were a part of the initial group which instigated the rebellion. Milgrom, *Numbers*, 92–93.

[23] As Noth notes, "The unashamed 'craving' of the people is punished by means of a surfeit of the gift." Noth, *Numbers*, 91. Or, Cole writes, "Talionic justice, justice fitting the offense, was the portion of those who protested against the Lord." Cole, *Numbers*, 198.

[24] Num 11 has also been interpreted from a Pentecostal perspective. David Hymes, "Numbers 11: A Pentecostal Perspective," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 13, no. 2 (July 2010): 257–81. However, the primary portion of the narrative in focus for these interpreters are not the ones which I am focusing on in this project. For a comparison of Num 11:4–35 with other narratives of judgment in Numbers, see Robert C. Culley, "Five Tales of Punishment in the Book of Numbers," in *Text and Tradition: The Hebrew Bible and Folklore*, ed. Susan Niditch (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 25–34; Dan Ben-Amos, "Five Tales of Punishment in the Book of Numbers," in Niditch, *Text and Tradition*, 35–45. On the structure of Num 11–12, see Milgrom, *Numbers*, 376–80; David Jobling, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 39 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1986), 31–65.

a case for a connection between these texts.

In establishing this connection, the most significant evidence is lexical. The term אוה occurs in Numbers 11:4, Numbers 11:34, and Deuteronomy 5:21.[25] While אוה occurs 28 times in the Hebrew Bible, these three occurrences are the first.[26] From the perspective of a canonical reading, the consolidation of the early usage of אוה in Numbers 11:4–35 and Deuteronomy 5:21 is suggestive of a connection between the texts. Furthermore, while אוה can be used to refer to positive (e.g., Ps 132:13–14), negative (e.g., Prov 21:20), and neutral (e.g., Deut 14:26) desires in the Hebrew Bible, Numbers 11:4–35 and Deuteronomy 5:21 clearly use the term to denote a negative desire. Therefore, the two texts use the same term in the same way.

Also, within the Hebrew Bible, אוה is used to refer back to the events recorded in Numbers 11:4–35 by Psalm 106, which suggests that אוה may have been associated with Numbers 11:4–35 by later authors. Psalm 106:14 recounts, "They craved a craving (וַיִּתְאַוּוּ תַּאֲוָה) in the wilderness, and they tested God in a desert."[27] Psalm 106:14 is important evidence indicating that the term אוה was associated with Numbers 11:4–35 by later writers. When Deuteronomy 5:21 employs the term, therefore, it uses a term which is likely associated with Numbers 11:4–35.

While the lexical connections between Numbers 11 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are suggestive, the conceptual parallels between the two passages show that the connection

---

[25] Num 11:4–34 resonates particularly with the version of the Tenth Word recorded in Deut 5:21 due to the usage of אוה. Typically, commentators do not identify a connection to the Tenth Word; however, some do point to Deut 5:21 for comparative lexical information. For example, Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, 321; Budd, *Numbers*, 127.

[26] In Num 34:10, the form וְהִתְאַוִּיתֶם occurs, and the root may be אוה. BDB, however, classifies it as a different verb, although a homonym. In contrast, Mayer treats it as the same verb but with a significantly different meaning. Günter Mayer, "אָוָה," *TDOT* 1:135. Budd, however, suggests the form in Exod 34:10 is from תאה. Budd, *Numbers*, 366. While it is difficult to say with certainty whether or not the form in Exod 34:10 is from אוה, early usage of אוה in the Hebrew Bible is clearly concentrated in Num 11:4–35 and Deut 5:21.

[27] On the connection between this passage and Num 11, see John Goldingay, *Psalms 90–150*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 229.

fits.[28] To point out the clearest parallel, Numbers 11:4–35 focuses on illicit desire of the type prohibited by the Tenth Word. Numbers 11:4 states that "they craved a craving" (הִתְאַוּוּ תַּאֲוָה), and Numbers 11:34 concludes the narrative section by stating that the place received the name "Tombs of Desire" (קִבְרוֹת הַתַּאֲוָה). When the rationale for the name is given, it is "because there they buried the people who craved" (אֶת־הָעָם הַמִּתְאַוִּים).[29] So, illicit desire, described with the terms אוה and תַּאֲוָה, factors prominently in the narrative. To further illustrate this, as is generally recognized, Numbers 11:4–35 forms a distinct literary unit, so the uses of אוה and תַּאֲוָה are located at both the introduction (Num 11:4) and the conclusion (Num 11:34) of the narrative, forming an *inclusio* for the narrative as a whole.[30]

In addition to these lexical and conceptual connections, Numbers 11:4–35 and Deuteronomy 5:21 would readily have been associated by later authors as particularly prominent texts in the Hebrew Bible. In addition to Psalm 106:14–15, Psalm 78:17–31 also references the events recorded in Numbers 11:4–35. Additionally, within the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy 9:22 refers back to the location of the events of Numbers 11 in a string of other locations.[31]

In view of this data, does a connection between Numbers 11 and the Tenth Word make sense? It does, because the events described in Numbers 11 resonate with the Tenth Word, and therefore, it is plausible that the two texts inform one another. In

---

[28] While commentators typically do not directly connect Num 11 to the Tenth Word, they often make comments which show the conceptual affinities between the passages. Noth, for example, writes, "The greedy and unrestrained eating of the 'covetous' people has brought about death." Noth, *Numbers*, 91.

[29] As Cole states, "Now the graves of the ravenous would become a didactic memorial to the results of rebellion." Cole, *Numbers*, 198.

[30] In Num 11:4–35, the response of God to the complaints illustrates further that illicit desire is in view in the narrative. Num 11:10 states, "The Lord was very angry." God announces his plan to overwhelm the complainers with meat (Num 11:18–20). As Num 11:31–33 described, the meat they craved became the means of death for those who rebelled against God and Moses. So, the story reinforces throughout that the primary issue at play is evil desire.

[31] On the prominence of the Decalogue in the Hebrew Bible, see the previous chapter.

Numbers 11, the people of Israel rebel against YHWH, motivated by wrongful desire, and the Tenth Word forbids precisely that type of desire for what rightfully belongs to others. If an uncontrolled desire, like the one demonstrated by Israel in the wilderness, takes root in the community for the possessions of a neighbor, only injustice can follow. When the Pentateuch is read in its final form, it makes sense that later readers would have drawn connections between the Tenth Commandment and Numbers 11, due to the lexical and conceptual connections between the two passages and the prominence of these two texts in the Hebrew Bible. As will be seen, that is precisely what happened.

Several conclusions could be drawn from this data. Perhaps, the use of אוה in Numbers 11 forms part of the explanation for the use of the same verb in Deuteronomy 5:21, as opposed to repeating חמד like Exodus 20:17. In the canonical narrative of the Hebrew Bible, Numbers 11:4–35 is sandwiched between the two occurrences of the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21). Therefore, it may have been interpreted as a concrete example of the type of desire forbidden by Exodus 20:17, which could be why אוה was chosen as a term in Deuteronomy 5:21 to further nuance and clarify the Tenth Word. While authorial intention cannot be demonstrated in this case, it seems reasonable. At the most basic level, Numbers 11 forms an important background to the Deuteronomy version of the Tenth Word, because its use of the term אוה helps establish its meaning. When Deuteronomy 5:21 uses the term אוה, the reader knows that the type of desire described in Numbers 11, an unrestrained craving for something that God has not provided, is forbidden.

In this way, Numbers 11, like Genesis 2–3, helpfully nuances and develops the interpretation of the Tenth Word. When God forbids desire for what belongs to a neighbor, he is forbidding out-of-control desire which is inevitably self-destructive. While God provided the wilderness generation with food, they were not content and hungered for something which God had not provided, resulting in their own destruction. Numbers 11, therefore, functions as an additional bold point on a trajectory in the

Hebrew Bible which illustrates the way unrestrained desire for what God has not given leads to destruction.

Summary

Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11 provide important backgrounds for interpreting the Tenth Commandment. As I have argued, both narratives are connected to the Tenth Word by their use of key lexemes and concepts. While the Tenth Word forbids a specific type of desire for a specific set of objects, Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11 reveal the fact that the type of desire forbidden by the Tenth Commandment is prohibited when it is directed at things forbidden by God, whether or not those things belong to a neighbor. Additionally, Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11 are particularly prominent narratives in the Hebrew Bible which describe and define human sin against God.

Finally, it is worth reflecting on Genesis 2–3, Exodus 20:17, Numbers 11:4–35, and Deuteronomy 5:21—four texts on one trajectory.[32] Genesis 2–3 describes Adam and Eve's primal sin, attributing it to desire. Exodus 20:17 forbids unrestrained desire for what belongs to other humans, using language from Genesis 2–3. Numbers 11:4–35 recounts gluttonous desire for what God has not provided, using language from Genesis 2–3. Deuteronomy 5:21 uses language from both Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11:4–35 to reemphasize and restate the prohibition against desiring what belongs to a neighbor.[33] In my view, there is significant reason for reading these texts from the Hebrew Bible together.

---

[32] Gen 2–3 and Num 11:4–35 share a direct verbal connection which they do not share with the Tenth Word: תַּאֲוָה, which occurs 21 times in the Hebrew Bible. Of those 21 times, the first and third are Gen 3:6 and Num 11:4. Additionally, three more uses of תַּאֲוָה in the Hebrew Bible refer back to Num 11:4–35 (Ps 78:29–30; 106:14). When this evidence is considered, it also seems likely that these texts are meant to inform one another.

[33] Mayer notes the shared lexemes (אָוָה) between Gen 2–3 and Num 11 and suggests that אָוָה "is an expression of man's self-assertiveness. It manifests itself as guilty rebellion against God, which must be punished." Mayer, *TDOT* 1:137.

Early Jewish Literature

Before turning to Paul, there are several relevant passages from early Jewish literature to consider, because these texts shed light on whether or not it is historically plausible that Paul might have read Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11 together with the Tenth Word. Also, the interpretations put forward by these texts provide important points of comparison to illustrate how Paul did and did not interpret Genesis 2–3, Numbers 11, and the Tenth Word.

Genesis 2–3

According to some early Jewish sources, Genesis 2–3 was a narrative about evil desire. Greek Life of Adam and Eve 11.1–3,[34] for example, recounts a dramatic instance where an animal rebukes Eve:

> Then the beast cried out, saying, "O Eve, neither your greed (ἡ πλεονεξία σου) nor your weeping are due to us, but to you, since the rule of the beasts has happened because of you. How is it that your mouth was opened to eat from the tree concerning which God commanded you not to eat from it? Through this also our nature was changed. Therefore now you would not bear it if I begin to reprove you."[35]

According to the animal, the tragic events of Genesis 3 resulted from Eve's greedy desire,

---

[34] For a succinct introduction to Greek Life of Adam and Eve, see John R. Levison, "Greek Life of Adam and Eve," in *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (London: T & T Clark, 2020). For a helpful history of the text and summary of some research, see Wanda Zemler-Cizewski, "The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve: Recent Scholarly Work," *Anglican Theological Review* 86, no. 4 (Fall 2004): 671–77. De Jonge argues for a Christian origin for the text, which would call into question its usefulness as witness to early Jewish thought. Marinus de Jonge, "The Christian Origin of the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," in *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*, ed. Gary A. Anderson, Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 347–63; Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, SVTP 18 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003). However, Dochhorn has made a strong case for its Jewish origin. Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 112–24, 152–72. Therefore, while the debate continues, it continues to be a mainstream view that Greek Life of Adam and Eve provides insight into early Judaism. For a recent work which takes this view, see John R. Levison, "1 John 3.12, Early Judaism and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," *JSNT* 42, no. 4 (June 2020): 460.

[35] For the text of Greek Life of Adam and Eve, I have used Johannes Tromp, ed., *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 6 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005).

denoted with the term πλεονεξία.[36] As John Levison notes, the beast "traces the dominion of animals to Eve's greed."[37] Most likely, the meaning of the accusation is that Eve greedily desired the fruit of the tree which God had forbidden, leading her to sin with the ensuing consequence of animals becoming aggressive and dangerous.[38]

In Greek Life of Adam and Eve 19.3, Eve directly connects desire to her sin by stating that Satan "sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit which he gave me to eat which is covetousness (τῆς ἐπιθυμίας). For covetousness (ἐπιθυμία) is of every sin" (πάσης ἁμαρτίας).[39] Eve describes a different perspective on the events in the Garden of Eden than the beast (GLAE 11.1–3), suggesting that her deception by Satan should be attributed to "his covetousness" (τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτοῦ; GLAE 19.3). Although Eve attributes blame to Satan, and this explanation contrasts with the blaming of her greed in Greek Life of Adam and Eve 11.1–3, she goes on to eat the fruit (GLAE 19.3), so Satan's desire becomes hers.[40] Although Greek Life of Adam and Eve 11.1–3 and 19.3 blame

---

[36] Dochhorn argues that πλεονεξία cannot be translated as greedy desire in this context. Instead, he argues that it should be understood as denoting an aggressive lust for power or position. Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*, 266. However, if πλεονεξία typically denotes the desire to accumulate more, it fits well with the context. While Dochhorn is right to note that Eve is not being accused of greedy desire for monetary gain, her desire could reasonably be understood as greedy for a different object, like elevating her position. Lanzillotta, for example, suggests that Eve could be presented as motivated by desiring to elevate her status to divinity. Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta, "The Envy of God in the Paradise Story According to the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 544.

[37] Levison, "Greek Life of Adam and Eve," 97.

[38] For a broader treatment of this passage, see Gary A. Anderson, "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," in Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 33–40; Rivka Nir, "The Struggle between the 'Image of God' and Satan in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 61, no. 3 (2008): 327–39.

[39] Tromp explains the text and grammar of this phrase, suggesting that it could be translated, "for every sin involves desire." Tromp, *Life of Adam and Eve in Greek*, 56–57. Also, however, Tromp conjectures that this phrase may have been an interpretive gloss added late, but he includes the reading in his edition (109). Dochhorn, however, opts for a different text: "sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit which he gave me to eat which is his covetousness (τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτοῦ). For covetousness (ἐπιθυμία) is the origin of every sin" (κεφαλὴ πάσης ἁμαρτίας). Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*, 325.

[40] In general, Apocalypse of Moses presents a somewhat complex portrait of who is to blame for the sin in the Garden of Eden. Levison argues that Apocalypse of Moses 15–30 was originally a separate literary composition which exonerates Eve from blame. John R. Levison, "The Exoneration of Eve in the Apocalypse of Moses 15-30," *JSJ* 20, no. 2 (December 1989): 135–50. Levison, however, returns to his own thesis in a later essay and expresses some skepticism regarding his own initial conclusions. John R.

different characters, both identify evil desire as fundamental to the events of Genesis 3. Additionally, Greek Life of Adam and Eve 16:1–17:4 describes how the devil convinced the serpent to act on his behalf and implies that envy motivated both.[41] Apparently, the author of Greek Life of Adam and Eve interpreted the events of Genesis 3 as symbolic of a broader problem, concluding that evil desire is fundamental to sin itself. Or, as Eve puts it in Greek Life of Adam and Eve 19.3, "For covetousness (ἐπιθυμία) is of every sin" (πάσης ἁμαρτίας). While the author of Greek Life of Adam and Eve does not directly reference the Tenth Word, the emphasis placed on desire parallels it.[42]

Turning to another passage, 3 Baruch 4:8 states,[43]

> And I said, "I pray you, show me which is the tree that led Adam astray." And the angel said, "It is the vine, which the angel Sammael (ὁ ἄγγελος Σαμαὴλ) planted, for which the Lord God became angry, and cursed him and his plant. That is why he did not permit Adam to touch it, and that is why the devil being envious (φθονήσας ὁ διάβολος) deceived him through his vine."[44]

In this passage, Adam's sin is attributed to the deception of the devil,[45] which in turn was

---

Levison, "The Exoneration and Denigration of Eve in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve," in Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 251–75. Díaz Araujo builds on Levison's argument, paying particular attention to Apocalypse of Moses 17:1–2. Magdalena Díaz Araujo, "The Satan's Disguise: The Exoneration of Eve in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve 17:1–2," *Judaïsme Ancien* 5 (2017): 159–82.

[41] Lanzillotta argues that envy is an important factor in the wider narrative of Greek Life of Adam and Eve. Lanzillotta, "Envy of God in Paradise Story." Also see von Nordheim-Diehl on the place of envy in early Jewish interpretation of Gen 3. Miriam von Nordheim-Diehl, "Der Neid Gottes, des Teufels und der Menschen - eine motivgeschichtliche Skizze," in *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 442–46.

[42] Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*, 346.

[43] For an introduction to 3 Baruch, see Alexander Kulik, *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*, CEJL (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 7–15. Himmelfarb identifies 3 Baruch as a Christian composition and questions its value for insights regarding early Judaism. Martha Himmelfarb, "3 Baruch Revisited: Jewish or Christian Composition, and Why It Matters," *Zeitschrift Für Antikes Christentum* 20, no. 1 (2016): 41–62. Kulik, however, suggests it is Jewish in origin, although preserved in Christian tradition. Kulik, *3 Baruch*, 13–15. Also see Harlow, who concludes "that 3 Baruch was originally a Jewish work." Daniel C. Harlow, *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, SVTP (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1996), 108.

[44] For the Greek text of 3 Baruch, I have used J. -C. Picard, ed., "Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece," in *Testamentum Iobi, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece* (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 81–96. I have also consulted the commentary and text-critical notes in Kulik, *3 Baruch*. For the translation, I have used Kulik.

[45] For a discussion of the identity of the serpent and the angel Sammael in 3 Baruch, see Kulik,

motivated by the devil's envious passion, denoted by the term φθονέω.[46] Therefore, the author of 3 Baruch identifies evil desire as an important force in the events of Genesis 3. In this case, Adam is portrayed as the object of deception while the evil desire is attributed to the devil.[47]

In *Jewish Antiquities* 1.41–42, Josephus writes,

> At that epoch all the creatures spoke a common tongue, and the serpent, living in the company of Adam and his wife, grew jealous (φθονερῶς μὲν εἶχεν) of the blessings which he supposed were destined for them if they obeyed God's behests, and, believing that disobedience would bring trouble upon them, he maliciously persuaded the woman to taste of the tree of wisdom.

According to Josephus, the serpent was envious of Adam and Eve, which motivated him to deceive Eve. He uses the adverbial form φθονερῶς to describe the motivation and action of the serpent. Therefore, Josephus identified envious desire as an important explanation for the events of Genesis 3.[48]

Philo also explores how desire connects to the events of Genesis 2–3, and this is most clear in the way Philo identifies the serpent[49] as a symbol of desire.[50] In *Questions and Answers on Genesis* 1.31 he states: "To me, however, it seems that this

---

3 Baruch, 193.

[46] As Kulik notes, the final phrase is only present in the Greek manuscript tradition. Kulik, *3 Baruch*, 211. For a treatment of this text in Slavonic, see Andrei A. Orlov, "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants," *CBQ* 65, no. 2 (April 2003): 193–94.

[47] While some argue that this portion of 3 Baruch is late interpolation, Kulik argues against that there are connections between it and the remainder of the work. Kulik, *3 Baruch*, 192–96.

[48] Feldman observes, "Whereas Gen. 3:1 simply says that the serpent was more subtle than any other wild creature, Josephus here introduces the idea that he was jealous of the human pair." Josephus, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, ed. and trans. Louis H. Feldman, FJTC 3 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 16n92.

[49] Booth observes that Philo's identification of the serpent with pleasure served a function in his critique of Epicureanism. A. Peter Booth, "The Voice of the Serpent: Philo's Epicureanism," in *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Wendy E. Helleman (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 159–72.

[50] Andrew Bowden, "'A Delight to the Eyes and Desirous to Make One Wise': The Hellenistic Reception of Desire in Genesis 3" (paper presented at the 21st International Congress of the International Organization for the Old Testament, Munich, Germany, August 25, 2013), 8–11.

was said because of the serpent's inclination toward passion, of which it is the symbol. And by passion is meant sensual pleasure" (ἡδονή; LCL, Marcus).[51] Also, *Questions and Answers on Genesis* 1.47 states,

> The arrangement of curses follows the order of the wrongdoing. The serpent was the first to deceive. Second, the woman sinned through him, yielding to deceit. Third the man (sinned), yielding to the woman's desire rather than to the divine commands. However the order also is well suited to allegory; for the serpent is a symbol of desire (ἐπιθυμίας), as was shown; and woman is a symbol of sense, and man of mind. So that desire becomes the evil origin of sins, and this first deceives sense, while sense takes the mind captive.[52]

To give another example, in *Questions and Answers on Genesis* 1.48, Philo explains why the serpent received a specific curse by asserting that "the serpent is a symbol of desire" (ἐπιθυμίας).[53] Therefore, Philo consistently interprets the serpent as a symbol of desire which demonstrates his diagnosis of the problem in Genesis 3.[54] In particular, he uses ἐπιθυμία to describe what the serpent symbolizes.[55]

Turning to a final example, Wisdom of Solomon 2:24[56] states, "But, by the envy (φθόνῳ) of the devil (διαβόλου), death entered into the world."[57] Wisdom of Solomon seems to attribute the entry of death into the world to the envy of the devil,

---

[51]Philo is responding to the question, "Why does (Scripture) represent the serpent as more cunning than all the beasts?" (Josephus, *QG* 1.31).

[52] Philo is responding to the question, "Why does He first curse the serpent, next the woman, and third the man?" (Josephus, *QG* 1.47).

[53] Philo is responding to the question, "Why is this curse laid upon the serpent—to move upon its breast and belly, to eat dust and to have enmity toward woman?" (Josephus, *QG* 1.48).

[54] For similar discussions in Philo, see *On the Creation of the World* 150–167; *Allegorical Interpretation* 2.71–108.

[55] Philo also uses the term ἡδονή. As Bowden concludes, "Thus, it would be wrong to emphasize *epithymia* in Philo without recognizing its related lexemes, and then admitting that pleasure is just as foundational as desire." Bowden, "'A Delight to the Eyes," 11.

[56] For introduction to Wisdom of Solomon, see Randall D. Chesnutt, "Wisdom of Solomon," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:507–10.

[57] Zurawski helpfully summarizes the history of research on Wis 2:24. Jason Zurawski, "Separating the Devil from the Diabolos: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24," *JSP* 21, no. 4 (June 2012): 368–76.

using the term φθόνος.[58] Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 is helpfully understood against Wisdom of Solomon 1:13, where the author asserts that God does not cause death. Instead, Wisdom of Solomon 1:16 attributes it to evildoers. So, in an effort to identify the source of evil in the world, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon lays it at the feet of the envious passion of the devil.

However, Jason Zurawski argues that διάβολος in Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 does not refer to the devil.[59] Among several arguments, he observes that διάβολος lacks the article in Wisdom of Solomon 2:24. As he notes, when διάβολος refers to a specific individual in the LXX or the New Testament, it almost always has the article.[60] In my view, however, Zurawski fails to adequately account for a piece of crucial evidence: Wisdom of Solomon 2:23 describes the creation of humanity in such a way that Genesis 1:26–27 is evoked. Due to this contextual reference to God's creation of the first humans, it seems likely that the reference to death entering the world is also referencing the events of Genesis 2–3.[61] Also, as noted above, Greek Life of Adam and Eve 16:3–17:4 and 3 Baruch 4:8 reference the envy of the devil, making this interpretation historically credible.[62] Zurawski, however, correctly observes that the author of Wisdom of Solomon

---

[58] Winston, for example, argues for this reading. David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, vol. 43 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 121; Karina Martin Hogan, "The Exegetical Background of the 'Ambiguity of Death' in the Wisdom of Solomon," *JSJ* 30, no. 1 (1999): 18–21. Learoyd argues that the reference is to Cain. W. H. A. Learoyd, "The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom 2,24," *Expository Times* 51, no. 8 (1940): 195–96.

[59] Zurawski, "Separating Devil from Diabolos"; Bowden, acknowledging Zurawski, concludes that Wis 2:24 must reference Cain, not the devil. Bowden, "'A Delight to the Eyes," 3–5.

[60] Zurawski writes, "If the author had wanted to reference a specific individual, whether Cain, the serpent, or the Devil, he probably would have used the article." Zurawski, "Separating Devil from Diabolos," 391.

[61] Zurawski notes this evidence and argues that the author of Wisdom of Solomon is probably not referring to a unique event but the creation of all humanity in the image of Adam. Zurawski, "Separating Devil from Diabolos," 390.

[62] Zurawski suggests that the evidence of these texts does not prove that Wis 2:24 references the devil for two reasons: first, they are often dated later than Wisdom of Solomon; second, they have a fundamentally different worldview than the author of Wisdom of Solomon. Zurawski, "Separating Devil from Diabolos," 381–82.

has a different worldview than the authors of Apocalypse of Moses and 3 Baruch and does not indicate any place for cosmic evil spirits in his work. However, Josephus attributes the serpent's actions to envy and Philo argues that the serpent represents desire. To generalize, their worldview is closer to that of the author of Wisdom of Solomon, which suggests that the author of Wisdom of Solomon may have been referencing the events in the Garden of Eden. So, while the author of Wisdom of Solomon may not have been likely to identify the serpent with the devil, he may have identified the serpent with evil desire and been referring to Genesis 2–3. Perhaps, διάβολος is a reference to the serpent without identifying the serpent with a cosmic evil spirit.[63] Wisdom of Solomon is significant if it connects φθόνος to Genesis 2–3, and it does not matter if Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 identifies the devil as the one responsible. While these two questions are closely related, they are distinct. Therefore, while Zurawski martials an impressive argument, the case for seeing διάβολος as a reference to the serpent in the Garden of Eden to some degree remains compelling. Notably, and similar to Greek Life of Adam and Eve 19:3, the entry of death is attributed to the evil passion of the devil, not Eve or Adam.

Summary. Early Jewish authors and texts such as Philo, Josephus, 3 Baruch, Wisdom of Solomon, and Greek Life of Adam and Eve described the fundamental problem in the Garden of Eden as evil desire using a variety of terms (ἐπιθυμία, πλεονεξία, and φθόνος). While the Tenth Commandment is not directly cited in relation to Genesis 2–3, the terms used to describe the evil desire resonate with it: ἐπιθυμία is the cognate noun of ἐπιθυμέω, the verb used in Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX; πλεονεξία denotes greedy desire, which overlaps significantly with the prohibition against desiring what belongs to a neighbor; and φθόνος references envious passion,

[63] Marie Turner argues that death is personified in Wis 1–2 and is interchangeable with the devil, which provides another possibility of how the author of Wisdom of Solomon could reference the devil in 2:24 without compromising his worldview. Marie Turner, *God's Wisdom or the Devil's Envy: Death and Creation Deconstructing in The Wisdom of Solomon* (Adelaide, Australia: ATF Press, 2009), 138–45.

which also is an apt term for describing what is prohibited by the Tenth Word. Thus, there was clearly an interpretive trajectory in early Jewish literature which identified the fundamental problem in the Garden of Eden as evil desire, and it is therefore historically plausible that early Jews would connect the Tenth Commandment, which prohibits evil desire.

Numbers 11

The translator of Numbers LXX renders אוה using ἐπιθυμέω (Num 11:4) and תַּאֲוָה using ἐπιθυμία (Num 11:4, 34). Also, the translator uses the Greek term ἐπιθυμητής to render a participial form of אוה (הַמִּתְאַוִּים) in Numbers 11:34.[64] By using ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιθυμία, and ἐπιθυμητής, the translator preserves the interpretive options present in the Hebrew Bible. As the Tenth Word and Numbers 11 MT are connected in the Hebrew Bible through the terms אוה (Num 11:4, 34; Deut 5:21) and תַּאֲוָה (Num 11:4, 34), the Tenth Word and Numbers 11 LXX are connected through the terms ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιθυμία, and ἐπιθυμητής, which may help explain later connections made between these texts.

Philo is one example of an early Jewish reader who connects the Tenth Commandment to Numbers 11 (Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.126–31).[65] In fact, his retelling of Numbers 11 functions as the conclusion of his exposition of the Tenth Commandment in *On the Special Laws* (Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.78b–131), which indicates its importance in his

[64] Bowden discusses the translation of Num 11 LXX and traces its reception in the LXX and early Jewish and Christian literature. However, he does not emphasize the role of the Tenth Word, with the exception of his discussion of Philo. Andrew Bowden, "'And the Mixed among Them Desired a Desire': The Reception of Desire in Numbers 11 LXX in Greek Texts, Ending with the Apostle Paul," in *Testing and Temptation in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, ed. Daniel L. Smith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, WUNT 2 519 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 93–115.

[65] Philo exposits the Tenth Commandment and interprets Num 11 in a way coherent with his view of ἐπιθυμία. As Svebakken explains, "Philo holds a coherent, consistently Middle-Platonic theory of ἐπιθυμία." Hans Svebakken, *Philo of Alexandria's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment*, Studia Philonica Monographs 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 79. According to Philo, while ἐπιθυμία is not intrinsically evil and may serve good purposes, it "poses a latent threat" (80). Furthermore, "The moral quality necessary for keeping non-rational desire in check is self-control (ἐγκράτεια)—literally the power (κράτος) to restrain desire when it tries to usurp the dictates of reason" (80).

thought. Philo interprets Numbers 11 as a story about the evils of unrestrained desire.[66] According to Philo, the unrestrained gluttony of those who grumbled against Moses motivated them to demand the types of luxurious food found in cities, even though they were in a wilderness, which was obviously irrational (4.126).[67] Philo suggests that God granted their demand for two reasons: first, to demonstrate his power, and, second, to express judgment on their evil desire (4.127). When God granted their request, they still did not turn away from their gluttony and sealed their own fates by unrestrained eating (4.129–30). Philo suggests that this story teaches that "there is no greater evil (μεῖζον κακόν) in the soul than desire" (ἐπιθυμίας; 4.130 [LCL, Colson]).

While Philo does not directly explain why he connects Numbers 11 to the Tenth Word, there are two likely reasons. First, he observes that Numbers 11:34 records that the location where the events took place was named "Monuments of Lust" (Μνήματα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας; 4.130), and he likely saw a connection between this name and the Tenth Word due to the use of the term ἐπιθυμία.[68] Second, Philo probably connected the texts, because he saw the food laws as a prime way of training oneself to avoid covetousness.[69] Since Numbers 11:4–35 is a narrative about unrestrained eating, it connects well to Philo's exposition and functions as a paradigmatic example. Philo, of course, interpreted the Tenth Commandment to prohibit ἐπιθυμία in general, but Numbers 11 specifically focuses on gluttonous desire, which fits well with his larger exposition.[70]

---

[66] For a discussion of Num 11 in On the Special Laws 4.126–131, see Bowden, "'Mixed among Them Desired Desire'," 107–9.

[67] While Philo clearly has a specific type of desire—unrestrained hunger or gluttony—in view, it is also clear that he regards Num 11 as a story about the dangers of unrestrained desire in general (cf. Philo, *Migr*. 155).

[68] Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 179n232.

[69] James N. Rhodes writes, "According to Philo, Moses introduced laws pertaining to food and drink precisely to bridle the passion incited by desire." James N. Rhodes, "Diet and Desire: The Logic of the Dietary Laws According to Philo," *ETL* 79, no. 1 (April 2003): 123.

[70] Philo gives a more positive interpretation of the giving of the quail in *Decalogue* 16, but he is most likely referencing Exod 16. Philo also comments on Num 11 in *On the Migration of Abraham* 155.

Philo's connection of Numbers 11 to the Tenth Word can be contrasted with the interpretation of the same passage in Wisdom of Solomon 16:2–4 and 19:11–13.[71] Wisdom of Solomon presents the quail as an example of God's kindness toward his people, while Philo sees it as an expression of judgment.[72] While Philo clearly viewed Numbers 11 as a story about God's might and power which should evoke worship, he places the focus on the evil of desire, while Wisdom of Solomon presents it primarily as a story about God's gracious provision for his people.[73] While the two accounts are not fundamentally incompatible, they certainly evidence different interpretations of the same narrative, and this contrast clarifies the distinctiveness of Philo's interpretation.[74]

Josephus also discusses the events of Numbers 11 in *Jewish Antiquities* 3.295–99.[75] He gives minimal attention to the death of those who rebelled against God, although

---

While he clearly uses the passage to reference the evil of desire, his discussion of it is not as focused as the one in *On the Special Laws* 4.126–131. For a discussion of Num 11 in *On the Migration of Abraham* 155, see Bowden, "'Mixed among Them Desired Desire'," 104–7.

[71] Exod 16:1–36 also describes God providing quail for Israel, and Exod 16:13 uses the term ὀρτυγομήτρα, which is the same term used in Num 11:31–32, Ps 104:40, and Wis 16:2 and 19:12, which raises the question of whether Wisdom of Solomon might be referring to Exod 16, as opposed to Num 11, or blending the two narratives together. However, Wis 16:3 uses the term ἐπιθυμέω, which does not occur in Exod 16 but does occur in Num 11:4, and Wis 19:2 uses the term ἐπιθυμία, which also does not occur in Exod 16 but does occur in Num 11:4 and 11:34–35. Also, while Exod 16:13 does describe God providing quail, the majority of the narrative focuses on manna, while Num 11:4 – 34 focuses on quail specifically. For these reasons, Wis 16:2–4 and 19:11–13 are best read as references to Num 11:4–34 specifically.

[72] Winston writes, "The author [of Wisdom of Solomon] has adapted the biblical version of this event to serve his own peculiar exegesis, by omitting all mention of the people's murmuring and gluttony and God's furious anger which culminated in the destruction of many of them (a characteristic feature of encomiastic writing)." Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 293.

[73] Wis 19:12 states, "For quails rose up from the sea for an encouragement to them" (εἰς γὰρ παραμυθίαν ἀνέβη αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ὀρτυγομήτρα). In contrast, Philo suggests that God granted their demands for two reasons: first, to demonstrate his power, and, second, to express judgment on their evil desire (4.127). Wis 19:11 does, however, attribute the request for meat to ἐπιθυμία, which may suggest that the author retained some idea of wrongdoing on the part of Israel. Wis 19:11 states, "When led by desire, they asked for fancy meat" (ὅτε ἐπιθυμίᾳ προαχθέντες ᾐτήσαντο ἐδέσματα τρυφῆς).

[74] Bowden discusses the reception of Num 11 in Wis 16:2–4. Bowden, "'Mixed among Them Desired Desire'," 102–4.

[75] Begg reads the interpretations of Num 11 by Philo and Josephus comparatively, noting both similarities and differences between the two. For example, both Philo and Josephus abridge the narrative in their retelling, but only Philo tells the story with moral commentary. Also, Josephus highlights the positive role of Moses. C. T. Begg, "Two Ancient Rewritings of Numbers 11," *RCT* 32, no. 2 (2007): 315–16.

he does mention the name of the location as "the graves of lust" (ἐπιθυμίας μνημεῖα; *Ant.* 3.299).[76] In general, he focuses more on the heroic Moses than he does on the sin of the people (3.297).[77] Thus, while Philo sees the story as primarily about evil desire, Josephus sees it as primarily about political leadership.

Philo linking the Tenth Commandment to Numbers 11 is significant, because it demonstrates that connections were being made between the Tenth Word and Numbers 11 roughly contemporaneous to Paul. However, as the readings in Wisdom of Solomon 19:11–12 and *Jewish Antiquities* 3.295–99 make clear, there were alternate readings of Numbers 11 in early Jewish thought, so there is no necessary relationship between Numbers 11 and the Tenth Word evidenced in early Jewish readings.[78] However, the translation of the LXX of the two passages is suggestive, and the explanation by Philo confirms, that the two passages were connected in some ways by some early Jewish readers. Also, Philo uses Numbers 11 in an ethical discourse, suggesting that it is a cautionary tale regarding the dangers of evil desire. For Philo, Numbers 11 demonstrates that ἐπιθυμία and εὐσέβεια are incompatible. As Hans Svebakken writes, "Philo's retelling of Numbers 11:4–34 portrays the states of tyrannical desire and piety as radically incompatible and mutually exclusive."[79] Therefore, a reading of Numbers 11 which connected it to the Tenth Word for the purpose of ethical instruction was present in early Jewish thought.

---

[76] Josephus omits the reference to craving in Num 11:4. Josephus, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, 321–22n898.

[77] On the portrayal of Moses and his opponents in Josephus, see Paul Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 94–146.

[78] Bowden concludes, "I suggest that the account in Num 11 LXX about the Israelites desiring meat in the wilderness became an important passage for later authors to reflect creatively on Israel's desire." Bowden, "'Mixed among Them Desired Desire'," 114.

[79] Svebakken, *Philo's Exposition of Tenth Commandment*, 180.

Summary

In early Jewish literature, Genesis 2–3 was often interpreted as a narrative about evil desire, whether that desire was attributed to Adam, Eve, or the serpent. Thus, while these authors do not directly reference the Tenth Word, there is a clear conceptual connection between it and their interpretations of Genesis 2–3. Numbers 11 was directly connected to the Tenth Word by Philo, who saw the gluttony of the wilderness generation as a particularly egregious violation of the rule. As already argued, Genesis 2–3, Exodus 20:17, Numbers 11, and Deuteronomy 5:21 are texts connected within the Hebrew Bible, and evidence from early Jewish literature is consistent with that observation. In fact, these observations are mutually confirming.

Paul: Romans 7

Paul directly quotes the Tenth Commandment twice, so one of those citations, Romans 7:7, is an apt starting point for analyzing the impact of the Tenth Word on his ethical instruction.[80] In Romans 7:7, Paul uses the Tenth Commandment in a way that evokes Adam and Eve's primal sin, and by doing so, he locates covetousness at the core of what it means to rebel against God.

The Citation of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7

In Romans 7:7, Paul writes,

> "What, therefore, will we say? Is the law sin? May it never be! But I would have not known sin except through the law, for I would have not known covetousness (ἐπιθυμίαν) unless the law said, "Do not covet"' (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις).

Immediately, two observations can be made. First, Paul directly cites the Tenth Word, introducing the quotation with the words, "The law said" (ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν). While Paul

[80] Rom 7 is a scholarly battleground, and its interpreters gaze at a host of dilemmas. I do not engage directly with many of those questions in an effort to focus on Paul's use of the Tenth Word. For a recent monograph-length treatment of Rom 7, which engages with the wide variety of questions on this passage, see Will N. Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity: A Study of the "I" in Its Literary Context*, SNTSMS 170 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

abbreviates the citation, only citing the first two words of Exodus 20:17 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:21 LXX, it is unmistakable. Second, by abbreviating the Tenth Word in this way, Paul presents it as a unity, which is consistent with early Jewish practice.

Why does Paul abbreviate the Tenth Word? In one sense, his choice to abbreviate does not need explanation, because it is consistent with early Jewish practice. Paul, however, does not include any objects in his citation, which is only directly paralleled by Philo.[81] In contrast, other early Jewish writers gave a partial listing of objects, or even added them.[82] So, while consistency with early Jewish practice is a helpful explanation for the abbreviated citation, there may be other complementary explanations as well.[83] Paul, for example, may have shortened the Tenth Word in order to make it consistent with the other commands from the Decalogue which he references in Romans 2:21–22 and 13:9.[84]

Also, Paul may have intended for his readers to supply the omitted objects. While Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 explicitly state objects, they are representative, not exhaustive. In fact, Paul's claim that sin used the commandment to produce "every kind of covetousness" (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; Rom 7:8) probably presupposes knowledge of the objects, because the possibility for diverse desires is assumed.

---

[81] Philo's abbreviation of the Tenth Commandment exactly matches the abbreviated citations by Paul (Rom 7:7; 13:9). The only other possible example of the Tenth Commandment being abbreviated with the first two words is 4 Macc 2:6: μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν. However, since the author of 4 Maccabees cites the Tenth Commandment in fuller form in 4 Macc 2:5 and is referring back to that citation in 4 Macc 2:5, it blunts the impact of this connection.

[82] See discussion in chap. 2.

[83] Stanley notes that early Jewish practice explains the shortening of the citation but then concludes, "The foreshortening of the verse here is thus to be attributed to oral tradition, not to Paul's specific literary purpose." Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 103. However, complementary explanations are possible, and reasonable, as will be shown.

[84] Paul almost certainly intended to shorten his citation of the Tenth Word in Rom 13:9 to bring it into conformity with the other prohibitions cited. Perhaps, he chose to shorten the citation in Rom 7:7 for the same reason, even though he did not cite it in a string of citations. If Paul anticipated Rom 13:9 as he composed 7:7, he may have even decided to bring the citations into consistency with each other.

Therefore, Paul may have omitted the objects while intending for the informed reader to supply them.

Lastly, Paul may have shortened the Tenth Word to place the focus on desire itself. That is, Paul may have cited the prohibition without specific objects, because he was intentionally abstracting and spiritualizing it.[85] Emma Wasserman, for example, writes, "Paul does not appropriate the full commandment but rather strips it of its specificity so that it becomes a general prohibition against ἐπιθυμία rather than desire for one's neighbor's house or wife."[86] In one sense, Wassermann is correct: by only citing the first two words of the Tenth Commandment, Paul places the focus on desire itself as opposed to a specific manifestation of it.[87]

At the same time, however, Paul emphasizes desire in a way which is consistent with the original presentation of the Tenth Word in the Pentateuch.[88] The Tenth Commandment primarily deals with desire, so Paul highlighting this fact with his

---

[85] Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 108; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, vol. 1, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 1980), 348–49; Marvin L. Chaney, "The Tenth Commandment: 'Coveting Your Neighbor's House' in Social Context," in *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*, ed. William P. Brown (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 303.

[86] Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*, WUNT 2 256 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 105. According to Stowers, the Tenth Word should be translated, "Do not desire," in Rom 7:7, because translating the command as, "Do not covet," hides "the connections with the motif of gentile desire and Paul's Hellenistic conceptualities." Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 278. However, translating the command, "Do not covet," emphasizes the connection to the Hebrew Bible and is a superior translation for that reason.

[87] To clarify by contrast, the author of 4 Maccabees quotes the Tenth Commandment in 4 Macc 2:5: "Therefore, the law (ὁ νόμος) says, 'Do not covet (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's wife (τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου), nor anything that is your neighbor's (οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν). Likely, the author of 4 Maccabees singled out the wife because of his contextual reference to Joseph resisting the temptation of illicit sex (4 Macc 2:1–4). While the author of 4 Maccabees certainly has desire in general in view, his citation evokes a specific manifestation of desire, sexual lust. Paul, on the other hand, does not cite a specific object in the surrounding context, so he does not evoke a specific manifestation of desire.

[88] Ziesler rightly affirms, "The tenth commandment is to be taken as in Exodus and Deuteronomy, as covetousness in all its aspects." John A. Ziesler, "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7," *JSNT* 33 (June 1988): 47.

abbreviated citation in Romans 7:7 is consistent with its original presentation.[89] Also, to reiterate, Paul references "every kind of covetousness" (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; Rom 7:8), which would seem to reference desire for a variety of objects. Therefore, while Paul does place the focus on desire itself, it is unhelpful to suggest Paul is abstracting or spiritualizing the Tenth Word in a departure from the Pentateuch, because the original form of the prohibition focuses on desire.[90]

To summarize, Paul cites the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7, abbreviating the citation and presenting it as a unity in a way consistent with early Jewish practice. Likely, he abbreviated the citation for pragmatic purposes and intended to place the emphasis on desire itself, but he implies that desire manifests itself in a variety of ways, which evokes the omitted objects.

Paul, of course, could have cited any number of prohibitions from the Decalogue (cf. Rom 2:21–22, Rom 13:9) or the rest of the Mosaic law, which raises another question: why did he choose to cite the Tenth Commandment?[91] Likely, Paul saw the Tenth Commandment as a climax, epitome, or metonym for the Decalogue.[92] Of

---

[89] See discussion in chap. 2.

[90] Robert Jewett, *Romans*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 449; Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter to the Romans*, 2nd ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 434–35; Katja Kujanpää, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*, NovTSup 172 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2019), 317.

[91] Of course, multiple answers are possible. Thielman, for example, suggests that Paul chose the Tenth Commandment, because Rom 7 focuses on tensions in the inner person. Frank Thielman, *Romans*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 350.

[92] In contrast to this explanation, Gundry argues Paul is referencing his coming of age in 7:7–13 and his experience of sexual lust; therefore, Paul is citing the Tenth Word due to his personal experience with it. Robert H. Gundry, "The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7-25," in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris (Exeter, England: Paternoster, 1980), 232. Also, Loader cautiously suggests sexual undertones may be communicated by Paul's citation of the Tenth Word. William R. G. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), 20. In response, however, the semantic range of ἐπιθυμέω and ἐπιθυμία is wider than sexual desire. Jewett helpfully summarizes the connotations of the verb ἐπιθυμέω and the nominal ἐπιθυμία in the ancient world: "The verb ἐπιθυμέω and its cognate forms appeared in a variety of contexts in the Greco-Roman world, ranging from desiring a good thing such as beauty or freedom to desiring sensual pleasures such as food, alcohol, or sex. For philosophers, ἐπιθυμία was associated with the bestial side of human nature, which should be held in check by the mind." Jewett, *Romans*, 448. Furthermore, no evidence in the immediate context necessitates such an interpretation, and

course, whenever a part of the Decalogue is quoted, the whole is certainly invoked in some sense. Also, the Tenth Commandment is the conclusion of the Decalogue, so it has a natural summative function. However, by citing the single prohibition from the Decalogue which targets desire, Paul likely intended to expose the sin which underlies other sins.[93] As Will N. Timmins asserts, "Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις is not simply one of the things that the law says, but it summarises the nature of the law itself in forbidding opposition of the human will to the divine will."[94] To some extent, interpreting Paul's citation of the Tenth Word in this way is an intuitive judgment; however, there is also textual warrant for claiming that Paul intended to be read in this way. For one, by only citing the first two words of the prohibition, Paul places the focus on desire itself which logically lies behind the other sins prohibited by the Decalogue.[95] Additionally, Genesis 2–3 is in the background of Romans 7:7–12, suggesting Paul intended his citation of the Tenth Commandment to be read as a summation of human experience with God's demands.

Echoes of Eden in Romans 7:7–12

When Paul quotes the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7, it is in the wider literary unit of Romans 7:7–12, and this context has a vital role in illuminating his citation. When the

---

his use of the terms ἐπιθυμέω and ἐπιθυμία should not be interpreted as primarily sexual unless contextual evidence points that direction. Also, as Moo notes, "The Greek verb is ἐπιθυμέω, which Paul nowhere else uses to describe sexual desire as such (13:9; 1 Cor. 10:6; Gal. 5:17; 1 Tim. 3:1). And only three of his seventeen uses of the cognate noun ἐπιθυμία outside this context focus on sexual desire (1:24; 2 Tim. 2:22; 3:6)." Moo, *The Letter to the Romans*, 434n34. Finally, Paul's use of the Seventh Commandment in 2:21 and 13:9 suggests it is more likely that Paul viewed the prohibition of adultery as the primary restrictor of human sexuality. Also see Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016), 641n74.

[93] Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 317.

[94] Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 108. Also, Fitzmyer writes, "This epitome expresses the essence of the law." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB, vol. 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 466; Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 435; Michael P. Middendorf, *Romans 1-8*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2013), 531–32; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 300–301.

[95] Also, Moo suggests that Paul cites the Tenth Word because "it stands as a representative summation of the Mosaic law" in some early Jewish literature. Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 459.

Tenth Word is read in this context, it becomes clear that Paul intends for it to be read against the background of Genesis 2–3.

History of interpretation. While I make the case that Paul evokes Genesis 2–3 in Romans 7:7–12, some interpreters have argued that searching for the Old Testament background of this passage is a misguided enterprise. "Rom 7 can be better understood," writes Wasserman, "by appreciating its appropriation of Platonic language and assumptions."[96] Likewise, Robert H. Gundry also denies that the Old Testament is the primary background for Romans 7:7–12. In contrast to Wasserman, he claims the development of sexual lust in Paul as he became bar-mitzvah is the best background for understanding Paul's argument.[97] Robert Jewett, agreeing that a clear Old Testament reference is not present in Romans 7:7–12, proposes Paul's discourse should be understood as "artificially constructed in the light of his preconversion experience as a zealot."[98] Each of these interpretations, while distinctive, shares at least one characteristic: Paul's words in Romans 7:7–12 should not be primarily understood as a reference or allusion to an Old Testament narrative.

A very different stream, however, also runs in the history of interpretation, as many scholars identify an allusion to the Old Testament in Romans 7:7–12. Some of these readers suggest the primary background is Israel's experience with the Mosaic Law. Douglas J. Moo, for example, writes, "Paul in vv. 7-11 is describing his own

---

[96] Wasserman, *Death of the Soul in Romans 7*, 5. Similarly, Stowers sidelines a reference to the Old Testament in favor of a Greco-Roman background. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 278.

[97] Gundry, "Moral Frustration of Paul," 232.

[98] Jewett, *Romans*, 444. Also see Middendorf, who suggests Paul is speaking autobiographically without a primary referent to an Old Testament background. Michael P. Middendorf, *The "I" in the Storm: A Study of Romans 7* (St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 1997), 133–84. As a final example, see Bjørn Øivind Johansen, who argues, "The difficulty of Romans 7 is to be best solved within the context of ancient confessions of sin, like the ones found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) of the Qumran sect." Bjørn Øivind Johansen, "The 'I' of Romans 7 and Confessions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BN* 170 (2016): 102.

involvement, as a member of the people Israel, with the giving of the law to his people at Sinai."[99] Similarly, John K. Goodrich claims Paul is speaking autobiographically but using the story of Israel's failure under Torah to do it.[100]

However, other scholars suggest the narrative of the fall into sin in Genesis 2–3 is the best background for Romans 7:7–12. Ernst Käsemann boldly claims, "There is nothing in the passage which does not fit Adam, and everything fits Adam alone."[101] C. E. B. Cranfield is only slightly less enthusiastic when he writes, "Paul no doubt has the narrative of Genesis 3 in mind. In fact, these verses are best understood as exposition of the Genesis narrative."[102] Similarly, James D. G. Dunn suggests the narrative of Genesis 2–3 is in the backdrop of Romans 7:7–12, and the character of Adam is an interpretive key to the passage.[103] Furthermore, Brian Kidwell proposes Paul is impersonating Adam; therefore, Adam should even be identified as the primary speaker in the passage.[104]

---

[99] Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 431. See also Douglas J. Moo, "Israel and Paul in Romans 7.7-12," *NTS* 32, no. 1 (1986): 122–35. Watson also represents this position. According to him, Paul is using motifs from the Genesis narrative to speak about the historical events from Sinai, but he significantly emphasizes the giving of Torah over the events of the Genesis narratives. Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 329–30, 466–67.

[100] Goodrich also leaves room for the Genesis narratives. He writes, "Paul reconstructs his encounter with the law principally as a recapitulation of Israel's receipt of Torah at Sinai—even though Eve's deception also lies close to the surface." John K. Goodrich, "Sold under Sin: Echoes of Exile in Romans 7.14–25," *NTS* 59, no. 4 (October 2013): 476–95. Similarly, Wright suggests Paul's purpose "is so to tell the one story, that of Israel, that echoes of the other, that of Adam, are clearly heard." N. T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in vol. 10 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 563.

[101] Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 196.

[102] Cranfield, *Commentary on Romans*, 1:350. According to Cranfield, Methodius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret also held the view that Paul was impersonating Adam (1:343).

[103] James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988), 378–86. Also see J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 219–20; Jan Dochhorn, "Röm 7,7 und das zehnte Gebot. Ein Beitrag zur Schriftauslegung und zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des Paulus," *ZNW* 100, no. 1 (2009): 59–77.

[104] Brian Kidwell, "The Adamic Backdrop of Romans," *Criswell Theological Review* 11, no. 1 (Fall 2013): 119–20. Also see Ben Witherington III, *What's in the Word: Rethinking the Socio-Rhetorical Character of the New Testament* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 72–81. Some comments by Origen suggest he may have held this view. Origen, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Books 6-10*, trans. Thomas P. Scheck, FC (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2002), 30–34. Interpreters who see Gen 2–3 as the best background for Rom 7 frequently fixate on Adam as the primary

To summarize, no clear consensus exists in the history of interpretation; however, a strong tradition finds some form of allusion to Old Testament narrative, events, or individuals in Romans 7:7–12. Within that school of thought, however, there is disagreement on the precise referent.[105] Therefore, a case needs to be made for Genesis 2–3 as the primary background for Romans 7:7–12.[106]

Lexical evidence. Paul does not directly cite Genesis 2–3 in Romans 7:7–12; however, there is a significant lexical parallel between the two passages. In Genesis 3:13 LXX Eve says, "The serpent (ὁ ὄφις) deceived me (ἠπάτησέν με), and I ate." Similarly, Romans 7:11 states, "Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία), taking an opportunity through the command, deceived me (ἐξηπάτησέν με) and killed me through it." In these two passages, the subject is different (ὁ ὄφις and ἡ ἁμαρτία), but the predicate (ἠπάτησέν με and ἐξηπάτησέν με) is essentially identical. Paul uses a different verb (ἐξαπατάω) than the translator of Genesis LXX (ἀπατάω), which could raise questions regarding the legitimacy of the parallel. Paul, however, uses ἐξαπατάω in both 2 Corinthians 11:3 and 1 Timothy 2:14 when

---

character in view, but others view Eve as the focal point. Austin Busch writes, "Paul identifies the 'I' of Romans 7 with Eve rather than Adam in the scene of the primeval transgression." Austin Busch, "The Figure of Eve in Romans 7:5-25," *BibInt* 12, no. 1 (January 2004): 15. Similarly, Stefan Krauter argues, "All these motifs point clearly to Gen 3, or more exactly, to the story of Eve in Gen 3—and not the story of Adam." Stefan Krauter, "Is Romans 7:7–13 about Akrasia?," in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*, ed. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson, WUNT 284 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 117; Krauter, "Röm 7: Adam Oder Eva?," *ZNW* 101, no. 1 (2010): 145–47; Krauter, "Eva in Röm 7," *ZNW* 99, no. 1 (2008): 1–17.

[105] Some interpreters also advance a kaleidoscopic approach, which attempts to meld or incorporate proposed backgrounds. Schreiner, for example, claims Paul is primarily speaking autobiographically, but he also evokes the narratives of Gen 2–3, along with Israel's entire experience with Torah. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, 2nd ed., BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 363. See also John G. Strelan, "A Note on the Old Testament Background of Romans 7:7," *Lutheran Theological Journal* 15, no. 1–2 (May 1981): 23–25; Thielman, *Romans*, 350–53.

[106] As a limitation to my study, while acknowledging scholars who find no reference to the Old Testament in Rom 7:7–12, I do not extensively deal with their arguments. This limitation is strategic, since I attempt to build a positive case for an allusion to Old Testament narrative in Rom 7:7–12. In my view, if it can be convincingly demonstrated that an Old Testament background is the likely background for understanding Rom 7:7–12, the need for an appeal to other sources, ideas, or contexts is lessened. Therefore, the following sections constitute both a positive argument for the presence of echoes of Old Testament narrative in Rom 7:7–12 and an implicit response to those who claim there are none.

describing the deception of Eve, which suggests he viewed the verb as an appropriate description of the serpent's deceptive activity in the Garden of Eden. Also, Paul only uses the term ἀπατάω twice in his writings (Eph 5:6; 1 Tim 2:14), and one of the times he uses it interchangeably with ἐξαπατάω.[107] He writes, "And Adam was not deceived (ἠπατήθη), but the woman was deceived (ἐξαπατηθεῖσα) and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:14). In contrast to the two occurrences of ἀπατάω, Paul uses the term ἐξαπατάω six times in his extant corpus, which suggests he may have preferred it. In summary, Paul's usage of ἐξαπατάω and ἀπατάω suggests he preferred ἐξαπατάω, viewed ἐξαπατάω as an appropriate description of the events in the Garden of Eden, and essentially used the terms interchangeably. Therefore, Paul seems to be using essentially the same term as the translator of Genesis LXX. The echo is soft, so to speak, but a parallel between Genesis 3:13 and Romans 7:11 is discernable and suggests an allusion to Genesis 2–3 may be present in Romans 7:7–12.[108]

Conceptual evidence. Significant conceptual similarities between Genesis 2–3 and Romans 7:7–12 can be identified. First, both passages deal with a divine command.[109] In Genesis 2–3, 2:16–17 describes the restriction, and it is restated in 3:1–3. In Romans 7:7, the law recounts the Tenth Word.

Second, knowledge is pervasive in both passages. "The entire story of Genesis

---

[107] Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 125.

[108] Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 120, 125–26; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 384–85; Schreiner, *Romans*, 358; Cranfield, *Commentary on Romans*, 1:352–53. Timmins points out five additional parallels to the one I have noted. First, the lexemes ἀποθνήσκω and θάνατος both occur in both Gen 2:16, 3:4, and Rom 7:10. Second, the verbs γινώσκω and οἶδα appear in both Gen 2:9 and Rom 7:7. Third, the occurrence of λαβοῦσα in Gen 2:6 and Rom 7:8, 11. Fourth, ψυχὴν ζῶσαν in Gen 2:7 and ἐγὼ ἔζων in Rom 7:9. Fifth, the occurrence of ἐντέλλομαι in Gen 2:16 and the six occurrences of ἐντολή in Rom 7:8–13. Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*. Although Timmins identifies these as verbal correspondences, he overstates his case. The constructions in which these various lexemes occur in Genesis and Romans are substantially different; therefore, I find them most helpful when drawing attention to the conceptual parallels between the two passages.

[109] Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 123–24.

3," Dru Johnson claims, "turns on the matter of knowing: *who* knows *what* and *how*."[110] To give two examples of the prominence of knowledge in Genesis 2–3, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (2:17, 3:5) and the first humans' realization of their nakedness (3:7) both factor prominently in the narrative. In Romans 7:7–12, the role of the law in producing knowledge of sin is a critical piece of Paul's case (Rom 7:7). Also, the verbs γινώσκω and οἶδα appear in both Genesis 2:9 LXX and Romans 7:7.

Third, a personified agent of evil is present in both passages. In Genesis 3 LXX the snake (ὁ ὄφις) is the agent who deceives and brings death. In Romans 7 sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) is the agent who also deceives and brings death.[111] The two entities, of course, are different; however, their function and actions in the narrative are very similar. Observing this connection, Origen proposed, "It is possible that here he has called the author of sin, 'sin,' concerning whom it is written, 'The serpent seduced me.'"[112]

Fourth, deception figures prominently in both passages, and the deception is accomplished in the same way. In Genesis 2–3 the snake accomplishes deception through the command by altering its meaning. By recapitulating and twisting God's command, the snake is able to bend Eve to his will (Gen 3:1, 4). Similarly, in Romans 7:11 Paul writes, "Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία), taking an opportunity through the command (διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς), deceived me and killed me through it" (δι' αὐτῆς). The prepositional phrases διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς and δι' αὐτῆς emphasize that sin accomplished its purposes through the commandment itself.[113] Both passages, therefore, describe deception that takes place through a God-given prohibition.

Fifth, desire is a powerful idea in both passages. In Genesis 3:6 LXX Eve

---

[110] Dru Johnson, *Scripture's Knowing: A Companion to Biblical Epistemology* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015).

[111] Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 400.

[112] Origen, *Commentary on Romans*, 34.

[113] Cranfield, *Commentary on Romans*, 1:352–53.

experiences an arousal of desire for forbidden fruit: "And the woman saw that the tree was good (καλὸν) for food and saw that it was pleasing (ἀρεστὸν) to the eyes and that it was desirable (ὡραῖόν) to make wise." While the term ἐπιθυμία is not present, the adjectives καλός, ἀρεστός, and ὡραῖος establish the desirable nature of the forbidden fruit. In Romans 7:8 Paul writes, "But sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία), taking an opportunity through the commandment, produced in me every kind of covetousness" (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν). Conceptually, both passages heavily emphasize desire for what God forbids.[114]

Sixth, and finally, the two passages share the concept of death—specifically, fatality as consequence of deception by evil and the subsequent violation of the command. In Genesis 2–3 LXX, death is forecasted as the consequence for disobedience: "θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε" (Gen 2:16; 3:4 LXX). After Adam and Eve's failure, God pronounces a curse on the man in Genesis 3:19, which finds its fulfillment in Genesis 5:5. In between those two points, the first death described in Genesis occurs (4:8). Death, therefore, permeates Genesis 2–3 and its surrounding context. Similarly, the lexemes ἀποθνήσκω (7:10), θάνατος (7:10), and ἀποκτείνω (7:11) occur in Romans 7:7–12, and the speaker experiences death as a result of transgressing the commandment.

To summarize, Genesis 2–3 and Romans 7:7–12 share a striking set of concepts: a divine command, knowledge, a personified agent of evil, deception, arousal of desire, and death.

Narrative evidence. One of the distinguishing marks of Romans 7:7–12 is its narrative character.[115] Since Genesis 2–3 is also narrative, it opens the possibility of

---

[114] Dochhorn rightly observes that this connection is even stronger in the MT. Dochhorn, "Röm 7,7 und das zehnte Gebot," 63–64. I argue for this connection in detail earlier in this chapter.

[115] Rom 7:7–12 can be distinguished from the following section, Rom 7:13–25, by its primary use of the aorist tense, as opposed to the use of the present tense in Rom 7:13–25. Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 424. While Moo does not identify a reference to the Genesis narratives in Rom 7:7–12, he observes, the narrative "sequence provides the strongest evidence for the 'Adamic' view" (429).

comparing the structure of the two passages and significant parallels quickly appear. Since the narrative of Genesis 2–3 is longer and more complex than Romans 7:7–12, I will first examine Romans 7:7–12 and use my findings to guide analysis of Genesis 2–3.

Within the narrative of Romans 7:7–12, there is an identifiable structure: freedom from sin, the arrival of a command, deception, the arousal of desire, and death. Prior to the arrival of the commandment, the speaker did not know sin (Rom 7:7). Furthermore, Paul writes, "I was alive (ἔζων) apart from the Law (χωρὶς νόμου) at one time" (Rom 7:9). Since the consequence of sin is death, the implication is that before the arrival of Torah, the speaker was experiencing some degree of freedom from sin and its effects. However, at some point, "the commandment came" (Rom 7:9), which is the temporal turning point in the narrative. "Sin came to life" (Rom 7:9) in conjunction with the arrival of the commandment. After the arrival of the commandment, "Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία), taking an opportunity through the commandment, deceived me (ἐξηπάτησέν με); Rom 7:11). Paul highlights that this deception resulted in an arousal of desire: "every kind of covetousness" (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; Rom 7:8). Finally, death came: "and through it killed me" (Rom 7:11). Through these five movements—freedom from sin, the arrival of a command, deception, the arousal of desire, and death—Romans 7:7–12 presents a clearly defined narrative structure.[116]

In Genesis 2–3, the same narrative movements are discernable. First, Adam and Eve exist in a state of life and freedom from sin and death (Gen 2:7–9; 18–25). Second, a command arrives in Genesis 2:16–17. Third, deception occurs in Genesis 3:1–5, as the snake twists and uses God's prohibition to accomplish his own purposes. Fourth, after the deception, Eve begins to desire the forbidden fruit (Gen 3:6). Fifth, after Adam

[116] Timmins identifies "sequential mirroring" between Rom 7:8–10 and Gen 3:1–6. The sequence is sin/serpent to I/woman to sin/serpent to I/woman. Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 120–21. In agreement with Timmins, I believe the narrative structure outlined above further develops these parallels in an even more convincing way.

and Eve transgress God's command, negative effects are instantly felt (Gen 3:7–13) and culminate in curses (Gen 3:16–19). Adam and Eve are banished from the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:22–24) and, beyond Genesis 2–3, Adam eventually dies (Gen 5:5).[117] Therefore, the narrative structure of Romans 7:7–12 parallels and evokes the narrative structure of Genesis 2–3.

Summary. Paul evokes Genesis 2–3 in Romans 7:7–12. This claim is supported by lexical, conceptual, and narrative parallels between these two passages.[118] In light of the significant evidence, it is reasonable to conclude that Paul intended for his readers to hear echoes of Eden in Romans 7:7–12.[119] Furthermore, there is warrant for

---

[117] As a caveat, much more could be said about the narrative of Gen 2–3 than I have said. For one, between the arrival of God's commandment (Gen 2:16) and Adam and Eve's transgression (Gen 3:1–7), the narrative surrounding the creation of Eve occurs (Gen 2:18–25). For a fuller treatment of the narrative of Gen 2–3, see Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 41–91; Hamilton, *Genesis 1–17*, 1:150–218. Although this and other aspects of the narrative of Gen 2–3 are unparalleled in Rom 7:7–12, Paul should not be expected to recount every element of the narrative, especially if he has a specific purpose in using it. Rather, he should be expected to concisely and selectively use the elements which are most salient.

[118] Is Paul impersonating a specific individual in Rom 7:7–12? According to Stowers, Paul is certainly impersonating someone. He argues that Rom 7 is an example of *prosopopoeia*, or speech-in-character, which is an ancient rhetorical device where the speaker takes on the persona of another person. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 264–84. While Stowers himself does not see an Old Testament background to Rom 7, his basic claim has been coopted by interpreters who do. Witherington, for example, claims that Paul is utilizing *prosopopoeia* to take on the persona of Adam. Witherington, *What's in the Word*, 62–71. For Witherington, the interpretive payoff of his hypothesis is explaining why Paul can speak in the first person without speaking autobiographically. Witherington, *What's in the Word*, 75–76. Witherington self-consciously follows Stendahl, who concluded Paul's words in Rom 7 could not be descriptive of his time as a Christian, because Paul did not have a plagued conscience. Krister Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56, no. 3 (July 1963): 211–14. While *prosopopoeia* may be an attractive explanatory category for what Paul is doing in Rom 7:7–12, it is fundamentally inadequate. For one, if Paul is making use of *prosopopoeia* in Romans 7, he does so without formally introducing it to his audience. This raises several questions: First, how could Paul's audience be reasonably expected to identify speech-in-character with no introduction? Second, how can a modern interpreter be trusted to reliably identity *prosopopoeia* with no introduction? Furthermore, as Timmins writes, "The evidence of the classical sources, both from the *progymnasmata* and the poets, points towards formal introduction of both character and speech as the norm." Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 17. For a full, and cogent critique of Stowers' position, see Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 12–34; Richard B. Hays, "'The Gospel Is the Power of God for Salvation to Gentiles Only'? A Critique of Stanley Stowers' *A Rereading of Romans*," *Critical Review of Books in Religion* 9 (1996): 27–44. In light of these critiques, Paul is most likely not using *prosopopoeia* in Rom 7:7–12, which casts doubt on the hypothesis that he is impersonating a specific individual.

[119] Kidwell claims that Paul is impersonating Adam throughout his discourse, and he appeals to *prosopopoeia* in making his argument. Kidwell, "Adamic Backdrop of Romans," 104–5. In making this point, Kidwell appeals to Kümmel who famously argued that the first-person references in Rom 7 were fictive. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*, UNT 17 (Leipzig, Germany: J. C. Hinrichs, 1965), 90. As noted in the previous footnote, however, *prosopopoeia* is a shaky foundation for understanding Rom 7. In contrast, Busch claims Paul is impersonating Eve. For Busch, the emphasis on

concluding that Paul intended for Genesis 2–3 to be the primary background, as opposed to Sinai or other Old Testament backgrounds.[120]

Significance. What is the significance of the connection between Genesis 2–3 and the Tenth Word?[121] By presenting the Tenth Word in his evocation of Genesis 2–3,

---

deception in Rom 7:7–12 decisively determines the identity of the speaker. "Paul always associates deception," he observes, "in the context of Genesis 3 with Eve, as opposed to Adam, in the extant writings." Busch, "Figure of Eve in Romans 7," 15. In one sense, Busch is correct. Paul does associate deception with Eve, as opposed to Adam (2 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:13–14). Also, deception is a prominent theme in Rom 7:7–12. Busch, "Figure of Eve in Romans 7," 13–14. Three factors, however, work against his conclusion. First, although Busch rightly identifies Eve as the primary object of deception, he presses the evidence too far by dissociating Adam from the concept of deception entirely. Schreiner, commenting on 1 Tim 2:13–1, helpfully observes, "Paul emphasizes that it was Eve (not Adam) who was deceived by the Serpent. Thus, we need not conclude that Adam was undeceived in every respect." Thomas R. Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016), 215. Second, and more importantly, Busch's conclusion is only necessary if Paul is employing speech-in-character to impersonate one individual to the exclusion of others. If not, a reference to Adam is not necessarily precluded by a reference to Eve, since more than one character, or an entire complex narrative, may be in Paul's mind. Third, and finally, Busch's style of argument could be turned against him. Although Paul may always associate deception with the figure of Eve, as opposed to Adam, he always associates death with Adam, as opposed to Eve (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:22). Therefore, since the themes of both deception and death prominently protrude in Rom 7:7–12, it is more likely Paul has both of the first humans in mind. Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 122. Paul, in conclusion, is not impersonating a specific character to the exclusion of others. He is using the language of a complex Old Testament narrative to describe an experience. Paul is not impersonating Adam, to the exclusion of Eve; or Eve, to the exclusion of Adam. Therefore, I reject Busch's contention that "Paul identifies the 'I' of Romans 7 with Eve rather than Adam in the scene of the primeval transgression." Busch, "Figure of Eve in Romans 7," 15. Also, therefore, I reject Käsemann's assertion that "There is nothing in the passage which does not fit Adam, and everything fits Adam alone." Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 196.

[120] To give Israel's history with Torah a fair hearing, a significant lexical parallel can also be identified between Rom 7:7–12 and Israel's experience with the law: Paul directly cites the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21 LXX) in Rom 7:7. Therefore, based on lexical parallels alone, an allusion to Israel's history with Torah is every bit as probable, and maybe even more so, than an allusion to Gen 2–3. However, the concentrated conceptual and narrative parallels tilt the scales decidedly in favor of seeing Gen 2–3 as the primary background. By way of contrast, Israel's experience at Mount Sinai also parallels this narrative structure, but only to a limited extent. The book of Exodus describes the giving of the Law (Exod 19–31) and Israel's subsequent falling into sin followed by deadly consequences (Exod 32); however, freedom from sin, deception, and desire are noticeably absent from the narrative. Therefore, aspects of Israel's experience at Mount Sinai parallel the narrative, which is unsurprising since the primal sin of Adam and Eve is repeated throughout Israel's history, but significant aspects of the Genesis narrative are not paralleled in Exodus, which suggests Gen 2–3 should be viewed as the primary background. For one example of how the sin of Adam and Eve is repeated throughout Israel's history, see James M. Hamilton Jr. who has pointed out some of the parallels between the failure of Adam and Aaron. James M. Hamilton, *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 103. For a second example, see the parallels between the failures of Adam and Noah drawn out in Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 203.

[121] A variety of answers have been given to this question. Boyarin, for example, argues that Paul is referencing Gen 2–3 by using the Tenth Word in a way that evokes sexual desire. Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 162–64. Boyarin claims, "The Torah has exacerbated the plight of Adamic humanity because of one provision it contains" (159). As he further explains, the one command is "the command to procreate, and the desire it produces in the members" (159). However, as I have traced above, the affinities between the Tenth Word

Paul suggests that it accurately summarized the moral demand which God placed on Adam and Eve. Paul did not believe that the Tenth Word, as articulated at Sinai, was in effect in the Garden of Eden, because he clearly had a strong view of the temporal institution of the Mosaic covenant (e.g., Gal 3:17). However, he seemed to think that the Tenth Word describes the essence of sin. By tying the Tenth Word to the sin of Adam and Eve, Paul suggests that the Tenth Word defines and describes sin, for through Adam "sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) entered the world" (Rom 5:12).

The Tenth Word and Moral Instruction in Romans 7:7

As I have traced, Paul cites the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7:7 and does so in a way that evokes Genesis 2–3. But a question remains: is the Tenth Commandment influencing Paul's ethics in Romans 7? Perhaps, someone might object that Paul cites the Tenth Commandment but not for the purpose of moral instruction. In fact, Paul clearly argues in Romans 7:1–6 that Christians are not under the law, concluding, "But now, we are released (κατηργήθημεν) from the law (ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου), dying to that by which we were bound, so that we might serve in the newness of the spirit (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος) and not in the oldness of the letter" (οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος; Rom 7:6). Paul clearly rejects the idea that Christians serve God through keeping the law, and he juxtaposes it with serving God in the spirit. So, it could be concluded that the Tenth Word only makes an appearance in Romans 7:7 to illustrate a system of morality which Paul believes is no longer in effect for his churches.

However, while Paul does not primarily cite the Tenth Word for the purpose of moral instruction in Romans 7:7, his citation does reveal important things about his

---

and Gen 2–3 are abundant, and none of them have to do with sexual desire; therefore, Boyarin's theory is not cogent.

ethics.[122] First, Paul asks in Romans 7:7, "Is the law sin (ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία)?" By doing so, he raises an inescapably ethical question—the rightness or wrongness of a system of morality. While ethics and moral instruction encompass a wide range of issues, the question of whether or not a moral norm is justified and good is inherently ethical. Paul answers his own question with a firm denial (μὴ γένοιτο; Rom 7:7). Also, he summons the Tenth Word as his prime example of ὁ νόμος. So, the Tenth Word stands in for the whole of the law as Paul affirms the goodness of the Mosaic law. Therefore, Paul asserts that the Tenth Word is a right and good moral norm.

Additionally, Paul does not deny that the Tenth Commandment continues to function as a moral norm for his churches. In fact, he suggests the exact opposite. When Paul writes, "But I would have not known sin if not through the law (εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου). For I would have not known covetousness (ἐπιθυμίαν) if the law did not say (εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν), 'Do not covet'" (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις; Rom 7:7), he establishes that the law in general, and the Tenth Word specifically, plays the vital role of defining sin. Therefore, if someone was to conclude from Paul's discussion that coveting is not wrong, they would certainly be missing the point. For Paul, the problem with the law in general, and the Tenth Word specifically, is not that it is an inaccurate standard of right and wrong, but that it does not possess the efficacy to bring about obedience.

Now, a serious objection could be raised to this argument. If, as is commonly held in scholarly discussion, the speaker in Romans 7:7–25 is intended to be read as a non-Christian, then Paul's statements in Romans 7:7 regarding the ethical relevance of the Tenth Word may only apply to ethical living apart from Christ.[123] Or, another similar

---

[122] Kujanpää represents a widely held view when she writes, "In contrast to 13:9 . . . Paul's use of the tenth commandment [in 7:7] is not paraenetic. Rather, it exemplifies the dynamic of how the law's prohibition awakens sin." Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 317. While I fully agree with the basic assertion of this statement, I am also arguing that ethical insights can still be gleaned from Paul's use of the Tenth Word.

[123] For a recent example of an argument for the non-Christian interpretation of Rom 7, see King, who argues, on the basis of rhetorical chain-link construction, that the speaker in Rom 7 is a non-

objection is possible: Romans 7:7–25 can be divided into two sections, Romans 7:7–12 and 7:13–25.[124] Whether or not someone holds that the speaker in 7:13–25 is a Christian, it is commonly argued that in Romans 7:7–12 Paul may be reflecting on his own pre-Christian experience with the law.[125] If so, it could be concluded that the law in general, and the Tenth Word specifically, only has the ethical role of defining and describing sin for non-Christians. That is, the Tenth Word exposes sin, but it does not continue to define right and wrong for the Christian.

However, several factors suggest this is not the case, and that the Tenth Word continues to describe and define sin for Christians. First, if the law filled that function for Paul before his conversion, it does not follow it discontinued after his conversion. There is no evidence that the Pauline definition of sin is fundamentally different for Christians and non-Christians. Second, Paul affirms that the law is spiritual, writing, "For we know that the law (ὁ νόμος) is spiritual" (πνευματικός; Rom 7:14), which is a term used by Paul of Christian experience (1 Cor 2:15; 14:37; cf. 1 Pet 2:5). Third, Paul cites the Tenth Word again in Romans 13:9 in the context of ethical instruction to Christians.[126] Notably, none of these three reasons depend on the identity of the "I" in Romans 7; therefore, it is

---

Christian. King also puts forward a proposal for how Rom 7:1–6 is connected to 7:7–8:39. Justin D. King, "Rhetorical Chain-Link Construction and the Relationship between Romans 7.1-6 and 7.7-8.39: Additional Evidence for Assessing the Argument of Romans 7-8 and the Identity of the Infamous 'I,'" *JSNT* 39, no. 3 (2017): 258–78. For discussions of the identity of the "I" in Rom 7, see Schreiner, *Romans*, 356–63; Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 448–56; Longenecker, *Epistle to the Romans*, 651–56.

[124] Rom 7:13 is a transitional verse which could be included with either section.

[125] Schreiner writes, "Paul probably reflects on the time in his youth when he became a son of the commandment and took the law upon himself. When the law intruded on his consciousness with the prohibition against coveting, he died." Schreiner, *Romans*, 361. Timmins writes, "It is likely, therefore, that the coming of the law in 7:9 refers to the time of Paul's coming of age, when he came bar-mitzvah." Timmins, *Romans 7 and Christian Identity*, 133.

[126] While there is debate as to Paul's purpose in citing the Decalogue in Rom 13:9, it is a widely held view that Paul is using the commands to instruct Christians. As Rosner suggests, "The four commandments are cited as examples of what love looks like as a minimum." Brian S. Rosner, *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2013), 194–96. Also see Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 320–21. I will discuss this passage in detail in chap. 5.

reasonable to conclude that the citation of the Tenth Word provides a window into Paul's ethical instruction to his churches.

Paul's citation of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7, however, does have a distinctively negative flavor, because he links the Tenth Word specifically, and the law generally, to the malevolent power of sin and resultant death, and this also is revealing regarding his moral instruction.[127] To illustrate this, Paul's use of the Decalogue would have been at odds with many of his Jewish contemporaries' views. On the one hand, Paul clearly distinguishes between Torah and sin, and he heavily emphasizes the goodness of the former and evilness of the latter (7:7). But on the other hand, Paul also points out that sin was able to seize and work through the commandment of Torah (ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς; 7:8). Then, Paul makes the striking statement, "For without the law, sin is dead" (χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά; 7:8). In contrast to Paul, many early Jewish writers viewed Torah as a powerful restraint of desire and the inclination toward evil. For the author of 4 Maccabees, "Reason," which is defined as a mind instructed by Torah, "is the complete master over the emotions" (αὐτοκράτωρ ἐστὶν τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμός; 4 Macc 1:7).[128] By placing Paul's claims next to claims of the author of 4 Maccabees, it quickly becomes clear that Paul is saying something distinctive.[129] When Paul claims, "For sin, taking an opportunity through the commandment, deceived me and, through it, killed me" (7:11), he seems to clearly reject, by extension, the idea that Torah can dominate and control human desire and inclinations. Rather, Torah, even though it is

---

[127] Nebe claims the citation of the Decalogue in 7:7 "has a negative sense." Gottfried Nebe, "The Decalogue in Paul, Especially in His Letter to the Romans," in *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, LHBOTS 509 (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 72.

[128] As Watson puts it, for the author of 4 Maccabees, "Devout reason is reason schooled in the law of Moses." Francis Watson, "Constructing an Antithesis: Pauline and Other Jewish Perspectives on Divine and Human Agency," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, ed. John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, LNTS 335 (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 99–139.

[129] David Arthur deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2006), 96.

fundamentally good (7:12), is impotent to control the power of evil. Paul finds Torah ineffective for salvation, while many other early Jews wholeheartedly embraced it as a means to self-mastery within a covenantal context.[130] Therefore, Paul's use of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7 constitutes a distinctively Christian use, and it is revealing regarding his ethical instruction.

Fourth, and lastly, I have argued that Paul chose to cite the Tenth Word, because it specifically fit his purpose of affirming that evil desire is the root of sin.[131] Paul likely recognized the connection between the Tenth Word and Genesis 2–3 in the Pentateuch, and was aware of the early Jewish interpretive tendency to identify desire as fundamental to the events in the Garden of Eden.[132] Therefore, Paul's citation of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7 provides an important window into Paul's moral instruction: he believed that the Tenth Word defined the essence of sin, and he saw this rooted in the Scriptures.

In conclusion, while Paul cites the Tenth Word for more purposes than just moral instruction, clear conclusions about the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul's ethics can be drawn. First, Paul affirms the goodness of the Tenth Word as a moral norm. Second, Paul suggests the Tenth Word continues to be binding for his churches. Third, Paul denies that the Tenth Word can effect obedience and ties it to sin and death. Fourth,

---

[130] As Nebe writes, "Under the influence of sin, the Law affects something which the Law itself prohibits in the Decalogue: coveting. The Law thus creates a contradiction for itself by the very prohibitions we find in the Decalogue. As a way of salvation, the Law 'bursts,' as it were. Nebe, "Decalogue in Paul," 78–79.

[131] As J. G. Strelan observes, "Underlying every evil act is the sin of covetousness. Whether that covetousness is traced back to the story of the origins of humanity, or to the account of the birth of Israel as a nation, it is still the sin of which all others are the consequence and symptom." Strelan, "Note on OT Background of Romans 7," 24. Or, as de Vos writes, "Das Begehrensverbot steht also exemplarishch für das Gesetz im Allgemeinen und die Begierde für die Sünde." de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs*, 222.

[132] Dochhorn notes the parallels between Apocalypse of Moses 19.3 and Rom 7:7–12. Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*, 346.

and finally, Paul uses the Tenth Word to suggest that desire is the root of sin.[133]

Paul: 1 Corinthians 10:6

In this section, I argue that 1 Corinthians 10:6 also evidences the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul's moral instruction. Paul, however, does not directly reference the Tenth Commandment in 1 Corinthians 10:6, which raises a question: if he does not cite it, what warrant is there for seeing its influence?

The Tenth Word in 1 Corinthians 10:6

While Paul does not directly cite the Tenth Word in 1 Corinthians 10:6,[134] there are a few reasons for seeing its influence on his moral instruction. First, when Paul exhorts the Corinthians, he uses language from Numbers 11, writing, "But these things were examples (τύποι)[135] for us, so that we might not be desirers (ἐπιθυμητὰς) of evil, just

---

[133] For a recent work on Pauline hamartiology, see Steffi Fabricius, *Pauline Hamartiology: Conceptualisation and Transferences; Positioning Cognitive Semantic Theory and Method within Theology*, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen Zur Theologie 74 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

[134] First Corinthians 10:6 is located in the wider literary unit of 1 Corinthians 8–10, a passage which is heavily debated. For works which address the broader issues in this section, see David G. Horrell, "Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul," in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. Stephen C. Barton, T & T Clark Theology (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 120–40; Trent A. Rogers, *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8–10*, WUNT 2 427 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Michael Li-Tak Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*, StBibLit 83 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010); Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1–11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*, LNTS 299 (London: T & T Clark, 2005); John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*, WUNT 2 151 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "Drawing the Line: Paul on Food and Idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1," in *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, WUNT 290 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 109–32.

[135] By translating τύποι as "examples," I am highlighting that Paul is engaging in moral instruction by using the Israelites as negative role models. Paul uses the term τύπος in this way regularly (Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7), and it fits the context in 1 Cor 10:6. However, τύποι is also often translated as "types," with the intention of emphasizing the predictive nature of events in the Old Testament. For discussions see, Moisés Silva, ed., "Τύπος, Τυπικῶς, Ἀντίτυπος, Ἐντυπόω, Ὑποτύπωσις," *NIDNTTE* 4:505–8; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, AB, vol. 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 384–85; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 453–54; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 731–32; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 459–60; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014), 499–500. By opting for the translation "examples," I am not denying that there may be some predictive element to typology in this context. However, I am suggesting that at a minimum, Paul is suggesting that the history of Israel is a moral example for his audience. Richard M.

as those desired" (ἐπεθύμησαν). By using ἐπιθυμητής (Num 11:34) and ἐπιθυμέω (Num 11:4), Paul connects his exhortation to Numbers 11.[136] First Corinthians 10:6 is a part of the broader literary unit 1 Corinthians 10:1–13, which focuses on the history of Israel, so a reference to Numbers 11 in 1 Corinthians 10:6 coheres with the context.[137] Additionally, since Paul returns to the matter of food offered to idols in 1 Corinthians 10:14–33, it makes sense he would have chosen Numbers 11, which has to do with desiring food, to use in his teaching.[138] For these reasons, commentators almost universally recognize the

---

Davidson argues that τύπος is used as a hermeneutical term in 1 Cor 10:6 with far-reaching implications. However, in making this argument, Davidson does not deny that it functions to communicate the exemplary nature of the experiences it describes. Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical ΤΥΠΟΣ Structures*, vol. 2, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 193–297. Also see Silva, *NIDNTTE* 4:505–8. Therefore, while some make the argument that τύπος means much more than moral example in 1 Cor 10:6, it is generally accepted that Paul does not intend to communicate less.

[136] Garland notes that the reference to Num 11:4–35 may be mediated through Ps 105:14–15 LXX (106:14–15 MT), which references Num 11:4–35, stating, "And, they desired (ἐπεθύμησαν) a desire (ἐπιθυμίαν) in the wilderness, and they tested God in a waterless place." Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 464. Trent A. Rogers also notes that Paul may be drawing on Ps 105:14–15 LXX (106:14–15 MT) and suggests that Paul is, therefore, not drawing on Num 11. Rogers, *God and the Idols*, 190–91. However, while Ps 105:14–15 LXX (106:14–15 MT) is most likely an important background for 1 Cor 10:6, Paul directly references Num 11:4–35, as demonstrated by his usage of ἐπιθυμητής, which is a rare word in the LXX, occurring only in Num 11:34 and Prov 1:22. Also, as Goldingay shows, Ps 106:14–15 MT clearly references Num 11, so if Paul does rely on Ps 105:14–15 LXX (106:14–15 MT), it would be creating a false choice to say that he does not appeal to Num 11. Goldingay, *Psalms 90–150*, 229. As Fotopoulos states, "Paul has made fundamental use of the events recorded in Numbers 11 which are commented on in Psalms 77 [78] and 105 [106]." Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 229.

[137] For example, immediately preceding 1 Cor 10:6, Paul points back to the history of Israel in the wilderness in 1 Cor 10:1–5, referencing several events: the crossing of the Red Sea (10:1–2), the giving of the manna (10:3), the water from the rock (10:4), and the death of the wilderness generation (10:5). Wayne A. Meeks argues that 1 Cor 10:1–13 is an independent literary unity which predates its context. Wayne A Meeks, "'And Rose up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1–22," *JSNT* 5, no. 16 (September 1982): 65. Jerry Hwang, however, challenges Meeks' assertion that 1 Cor 10:1–13 is midrashic and shows how Paul exegetes Exod 32:6 with sensitivity to its literary context. Jerry Hwang, "Turning the Tables on Idol Feasts: Paul's Use of Exodus 32:6 in 1 Corinthians 10:7," *JETS* 54, no. 3 (September 2011): 573–87. G. D. Collier also sees 1 Cor 10:1–13 as an independent exposition, which may or may have not predated 1 Corinthians. G. D. Collier, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil': The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10.1-13," *JSNT* 55 (January 1995): 74. Sandelin, following Meeks, identifies 1 Cor 10:1–13 as a pre-Pauline unit and attempts to reconstruct the original form and then bases an argument around tracing the Pauline additions as a key to understanding the main point of the passage. Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "'Do Not Be Idolaters!' (1 Cor 10:7) (1995)," in *Attraction and Danger*, 94–108. In contrast to this approach, whether or not 1 Cor 10:1–13, was a pre-Pauline or independent exposition, I am taking the form of the text in 1 Cor 10:1–13 as the object of study.

[138] Charles Perrot, "Les exemples du désert (1 Co. 10.6-11)," *NTS* 29, no. 4 (October 1983): 437–38. Garland also argues that Paul chose specific vices relevant to the Corinthians, so Num 11:4–35 is an apt choice. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 460.

reference to Numbers 11 in 1 Corinthians 10:6.[139]

While the reference to Numbers 11 in 1 Corinthians 10:6 is relatively clear, how this observation establishes warrant for connecting 1 Corinthians 10:6 and the Tenth Word may not be. To see the influence of the Tenth Word on 1 Corinthians 10, therefore, it is vital to consider the close link between the Tenth Word and Numbers 11 in the Hebrew Bible. Due to this connection, while Paul does not directly reference the Tenth Word in 1 Corinthians 10:6, he references a text which is connected to it. Therefore, at the very least, the Tenth Word is indirectly connected to 1 Corinthians 10:6, mediated through Numbers 11. Notably, Paul references the portions of Numbers 11 which resonate most deeply with the Tenth Word. Paul uses ἐπιθυμέω, which is used to render אוה in Numbers 11:4 LXX, and ἐπιθυμητής, which is used to render a participial form of אוה in Numbers 11:34 LXX. Since Paul uses these two terms, the possibility that his reference to Numbers 11 mediates a reference to the Tenth Word is strengthened. Thomas R. Schreiner rightly observes, "The craving and desire are related to the sin of coveting" in Numbers 11,[140] and that means that Paul's exhortation in 1 Corinthians 10:6 is also related to the Tenth Word.

Second, 1 Corinthians 10:6 is similar to the Tenth Word in substantive ways. In 1 Corinthians 10:6, Paul warns his audience regarding evil desire: "So that we might not be (εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς) desirers (ἐπιθυμητὰς) of evil, just as those desired" (ἐπεθύμησαν). When Paul cites the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7:7 and 13:9, he writes "Do not covet" (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). While these two statements are different in several ways, they

---

[139] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 385; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 452–55; Thiselton, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 732–33; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 460; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, TNTC (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 202. Fee is an exception who acknowledges the possibility that Paul is referencing Num 11 but concludes, "Paul makes no point here of anything from the Numbers passage." Fee, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 500n494. Also, Conzelmann does not mention Num 11:4–35 in his comments; however, he does not propose an alternate background. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 165, 167; Paul Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 433.

[140] Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 202.

share the term ἐπιθυμέω and are exhortative in nature.[141] First Corinthians 10:6 is not a direct command, like Romans 7:7, but Paul intends to exhort the Corinthians against evil desire through explaining the purpose of the example of Israel. As Joseph A. Fitzmyer observes, "Paul then is trying to forestall a consequence that is destructive."[142] Therefore, both 1 Corinthians 10:6 and Paul's citation of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7 are exhortative statements which use the term ἐπιθυμέω.[143] Paul Gardner notes the lexical connection between 1 Corinthians 10:6 and the Tenth Word and suggests, "Because of this link to the Ten Commandments, it may be that the word 'desiring' or 'craving' came to be a prominent and general description of sin."[144] Gardner rightly identifies that the choice of the term ἐπιθυμέω is significant in light of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature.

To give a third reason for seeing the Tenth Word informing 1 Corinthians 10:6, there are significant parallels between 1 Corinthians 10:6 and Romans 7:7–12, which suggests that the two texts should mutually inform one another.[145] First Corinthians 10:6 and Romans 7:7–12 both reference narratives from the Hebrew Bible (Num 11; Gen 2–3), focus on the transgression of God's law, use similar terms for desire (ἐπιθυμέω), and emphasize that desire leads to death (1 Cor 10:5; Rom 7:10–11). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that Paul would have been engaging with a similar set of concepts

---

[141] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 167n32. Paul uses the term ἐπιθυμέω five times in his extant corpus, and two of those instances are references to the Tenth Word (Rom 7:7; 13:9) and a third is found in 1 Cor 10:6. When it comes to the other two uses, Gal 5:17 states, "For the flesh desires (ἐπιθυμεῖ) against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," and in 1 Tim 3:1, Paul uses ἐπιθυμέω to describe a positive desire.

[142] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 385.

[143] Watson notes the "close parallel" between 1 Cor 10:6 and Rom 7:7. Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 333.

[144] Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 434.

[145] Watson notes the "close parallel" between 1 Cor 10:6 and Rom 7:7–12. Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 333; also see Perrot, "Les exemples du désert," 438; Strelan, "Note on OT Background of Romans 7," 23–24; Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 243–44.

and backgrounds when composing these two texts. Since the Tenth Word is directly cited in Romans 7:7, it increases the likelihood that it influenced Paul's thinking, even in the absence of a direct citation, in 1 Corinthians 10:6.

To further illustrate this, when Psalm 77:26–31 LXX (78:26–31 MT) references Numbers 11, the connection between desire and death is highlighted.[146]

> And he lifted up a south wind from heaven, and he brought on the southwest wind in his power. And he rained meat on them like dust, and winged birds like the sand of the seas. And they fell in the middle of their camp, in a circle around their tents. And they ate and were very satisfied, and he carried their desire (τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτῶν) to them. They were not deprived of their desire (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν). While their food was still in their mouth, the wrath of God rose against them, and he killed (ἀπέκτεινεν) among their multitude, and he bound the feet of the elect of Israel.

Paul likely recognized the strong connection between desire, death, and Numbers 11 in his Scriptures.[147] Therefore, when Paul wrote Romans 7:7–12, where he focuses on the connection between desire and death, he likely reflected on Numbers 11, and the Tenth Word emerges in that context.[148] When it comes to 1 Corinthians 10:6, Paul, again emphasizing the connection between desire and death, likely considered the Tenth Word as he reflected on Numbers 11. Thus, there is good reason to think that Paul was operating within a frame of thought which was closely connected to the Tenth Word as he composed 1 Corinthians 10:6.

Fourth, Philo explicitly connects Numbers 11 to the Tenth Commandment (Philo, *Spec*. *Laws* 4.126–31), which means Paul associating the two is historically

---

[146] Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 334.

[147] Paul writes in Rom 7:11 that, "For sin, taking the opportunity through the commandment, deceived me and through it, killed (ἀπέκτεινεν) me." Ps 77:31 LXX describes how God "killed" (ἀπέκτεινεν) in response to the desire of Israel.

[148] Watson recognizes this and suggests that "in Romans 7 likewise, this correlation of desire and death derives not from Genesis but from Numbers." Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 333. Also see Segal, *Paul the Convert*, 243–44. In response, while Watson is right to observe that Num 11 may have influenced Rom 7, he establishes a false choice: illicit desire is clearly linked to death in Gen 3, and Paul shows an awareness of that fact in his composition of Rom 7, as demonstrated in the previous section.

plausible.[149] When the historical plausibility of this interpretation is combined with the evidence noted above, it seems reasonable to reach the conclusion that the Tenth Word is influencing Paul in 1 Corinthians 10:6. Additionally, while early Jewish writers referenced Numbers 11 for diverse reasons (e.g., Wis 16:2–4, 19:11–13; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.295–99), Philo focused on the presence of illicit desire in Numbers 11, as did Paul.[150] Therefore, there is reason to think that Philo and Paul were reading Numbers 11 in similar ways.

To summarize, while Paul does not cite the Tenth Word in 1 Corinthians 10:6, there are reasons for concluding that the Tenth Word exerted influence on 1 Corinthians 10:6, which raises a question: Was Paul conscious of this influence? In the absence of a direct citation, it is difficult to answer this question conclusively; however, there is evidence that Paul was operating within a frame of thought where the Tenth Word would have been near at hand as he composed 1 Corinthians 10:6. In the immediate context (1 Cor 10:7), Paul references Exodus 32:6, a citation from the golden calf narrative, which describes how the people of Israel violated the Decalogue.[151] Due to this reference, the events at Sinai, and the Decalogue specifically, were probably not far from Paul's mind when he was composing 1 Corinthians 10:6.[152] Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude

---

[149] Fitzmyer notes the potential of Philo's explanation of Num 11 for interpreting 1 Cor 10:6, but he does not note that Philo's exposition happens in the context of his exposition of the Tenth Commandment. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 385.

[150] While Wisdom of Solomon focuses on the way God giving the quail showed his provision and preference for Israel (Wis 16:2–4; 19:11–13), and while Josephus uses the narrative in his presentation of Moses as a masterful leader (Josephus, *Antiquities* 3.295–99), Philo focuses on the destructive nature of desire (Philo, *Spec*. 4.126–31). While the reference to Num 11 in 1 Cor 10:6 is short, it clearly picks up on evil desire as the primary theme of the narrative, which meshes best with Philo's interpretation.

[151] On the connection between Exod 32 and the Decalogue, see chap. 4. Also, Scott D. Mackie argues that Paul is influenced by the two tables of the Decalogue in his ethical instruction in the wider context of 1 Corinthians, pointing especially to 1 Cor 6:12–20 and 10:23–11:1. Scott D. Mackie, "The Two Tables of the Law and Paul's Ethical Methodology in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20 and 10:23–11:1," *CBQ* 75, no. 2 (April 2013): 315–34.

[152] Deut 9:22 references the location of the events of Num 11, along with other locations, after an extended retelling of the golden calf incident in Deut 9:12–21. Deut 9:22 makes it clear that the events of Num 11 were interpreted as another example of Israel rebelling against God in the pattern of the golden calf. Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 334.

that the Tenth Word influenced Paul in his composition of 1 Corinthians 10:6, and Paul was conscious of it. However, whether this influence was direct or indirect, and conscious or subconscious, it is detectable, as the evidence above demonstrates.

The Tenth Word and Moral Instruction in 1 Corinthians 10:6

If the Tenth Commandment influences Paul in 1 Corinthians 10:6, it is a clear example of the Tenth Word influencing his moral instruction, because Paul directly exhorts his readers in 1 Corinthians 10:6–13. While 1 Corinthians 10:6 is not an imperatival statement, it does have an exhortative function, and Paul introduces a series of direct instructions with it: "neither be idolaters" (μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε; 10:7), "neither let us commit sexual immorality" (μηδὲ πορνεύωμεν; 10:8), "neither let us test Christ" (μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστόν; 10:9), "neither grumble" (μηδὲ γογγύζετε; 10:10). As Richard B. Hays puts it, Paul's "argumentative purpose is deliberative, seeking to persuade the readers to action."[153] Paul, therefore, is engaging in direct moral instruction in the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 10:6, which suggests this is his intention when he addresses evil desire also. Also, Paul concludes his references to the history of Israel (1 Cor 10:6–10) with the statement in 1 Corinthians 10:11, "But these things happened to them as an example (τυπικῶς), and it was written for our instruction."[154] Therefore, Paul believed that the violation of the Tenth Word by the wilderness generation was recorded in Numbers 11 for the instruction (νουθεσία) of the Corinthians.

Ruben Zimmermann helpfully observes that Paul is engaging in a discussion of mimetic ethics in 1 Corinthians 10:1–13, with Israel being presented as a negative

---

[153] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 91.

[154] In addition to 1 Cor 10:11, Paul uses νουθεσία twice, and the focus is on moral instruction in both cases (Eph 6:4; Titus 3:10).

example.[155] As Zimmermann explains, mimetic ethics is "a reference to the imitation of a person as a role model with a view toward his or her conduct or character."[156] To further illustrate this, 1 Corinthians 10:6 begins with the statement "But these things were examples for us" (Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν), and 10:11 states, "But these things happened to them as an example" (ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις). Through these similar statements, it can be seen that Paul's intention is to present Israel's past as a moral example for the Corinthians, and the Tenth Word played a role in that presentation.[157]

Additionally, Paul clearly saw his exhortations in 1 Corinthians 10:6–10 as connected in some way, which offers important insight into his ethical thought. At the very least, Paul saw them as unified in the experience of Israel, but he probably also saw them connected in the Corinthian situation.[158] In addition, however, they are also ethically related as Paul places the series of exhortations in 1 Corinthians 10:7–10 under the heading of 1 Corinthians 10:6, which seems to suggest evil desire is a fountain for the ensuing sins: idolatry (10:7), sexual immorality (10:8), testing Christ (10:9), and grumbling (10:10).[159] In favor of this interpretation is the simple observation that evil

---

[155] Ruben Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love: Discovering Paul's "Implicit Ethics" through 1 Corinthians*, trans. Dieter T. Roth (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018), 168–69.

[156] Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 70. For a brief discussion of mimetic ethics in the New Testament, see Zimmermann, 70–72. In 2 Thess 3:9, Paul uses τύπος alongside μιμέομαι, which seems to give warrant to this understanding in 1 Cor 10:1–13.

[157] Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love*, 168–69.

[158] In contrast, some readers reject the idea that Paul chose vices relevant to the Corinthian situation and instead assert that they were a conventional list of sins used by Paul. Wendell Lee Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*, SBLDS 68 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 144–53. Still III, however, briefly demonstrates how "all the sins of 1 Corinthians 10:7-10 may be easily related to the circumstances in Corinth." Elias Coye Still III, "The Rationale behind the Pauline Instructions on Food Offered to Idols: A Study of the Relationship between 1 Corinthians 4:6–21 and 8:1–11:1" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2000), 181–84.

[159] Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 434. Collier argues that 1 Cor 10:1–13 is a midrashic exposition of Num 11 and desiring evil (1 Cor 10:6) is the heading under which the other sins listed fall. Collier, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil,'" 63–74; Watson, *Paul and Hermeneutics of Faith*, 334–38; Bowden, "'Mixed among Them Desired Desire'," 111. Fee also takes this view, although he does not recognize the allusion to Num 11. Fee, *First Epistle to Corinthians*. Similarly, although Conzelmann does not note the allusion to Num 11:4–35, he comments, "The warning against ἐπιθυμία . . . is comprehensive; it is then made specific in terms of the two topics already discussed before: εἰδωλολατρία, 'idolatry,' and πορνεία, 'sexual

desire is addressed first.[160] Also, 1 Corinthians 10:6 is grammatically distinct from the remaining exhortations, because it is not a direct imperative or hortatory subjunctive, which sets it off from the remaining statements. Although 1 Corinthians 10:6 is still exhortative in function, this distinction suggests it may have had a distinct purpose from the following exhortations, such as functioning as a heading for what follows.[161]

How would craving evil lead to the other sins? As Trent A. Rogers notes, "Paul might also intend a parallel between the Israelite's desire to eat the food they did in Egypt with the Gentile Christians desire to eat the food they did before their belief in Christ."[162] Or, as Richard Liong-Seng Phua writes,

> Paul could well view the eating of idol-meat by the 'strong' as an indication of the dissatisfaction with what they have (non-idolatrous food) and are (status without the freedom to freely eat idol-meat); and so view any dissatisfaction with what God has given to be a form of 'rebellion.' The second thing Paul might have in mind is the fact that the 'craving' of the Israelites suggests their desire for their former way of life in Egypt. When Paul uses this example of Israel as a way to warn the 'strong,' it is highly possible that he is suggesting that by freely eating idol-meat and thus committing the sin of idolatry, the 'strong' are expressing their desire for their former way of life.[163]

Furthermore, if Paul intended to be read in this way, it is consistent with his thought. As Anthony C. Thiselton puts it, if evil desire is central, it "entirely coheres with Paul's theology of human sin."[164] Also, as previously noted, this view of human sin would seem to cohere with Paul's use of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7:7.[165]

---

immorality.'" Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 167.

[160] Collier, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil,'" 63–65.

[161] Thompson, under the influence of 10:8, identifies the evil desires as specifically sexual. James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 114, 142. However, this overly restricts the meaning of evil desire in this context. Instead, illicit sexual desire is one manifestation of the evil desire which Paul warns against.

[162] Rogers, *God and the Idols*, 191.

[163] Phua, *Idolatry and Authority*, 160–61.

[164] Thiselton, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 733. Thiselton goes on to conclude, "The unity of 10:7-13 is no less theological than it is rhetorical or hermeneutical" (734).

[165] Perrot argues that covetous desire is the primary sin under which the other four sins fall,

Therefore, there is good reason for thinking that Paul may intend for evil desire to be the rubric under which the other sins are conceptualized.[166]

Alternatively, since the only direct citation of Scripture in 1 Corinthians 10:1–13 is Exodus 32:6, some have concluded that Exodus 32:6 is the primary text in Paul's mind.[167] However, while Exodus 32:6 is the only direct citation Paul offers, other factors tip the scales toward Numbers 11 being the primary text: namely, the allusion to Numbers 11 is placed first and separated grammatically from the following prohibitions, including the prohibition against idolatry which the citation of Exodus 32:6 grounds. Additionally, the fact remains that evil desire as the root of sin meshes particularly well with Pauline thought.[168] In his moral instruction, therefore, Paul does not warn the Corinthians primarily about the concrete sins (e.g., idolatry, sexual immorality) that they may be tempted towards. Instead, he warns them against the sin which underlies those sins: evil desire, which is forbidden by the Tenth Word.

Summary. Paul references Numbers 11:4–35 in the context of moral instruction in 1 Corinthians 10:6. By doing so, he evokes a narrative which connects to

---

and he suggests that this is consistent with early Jewish literature and Paul's use of the Tenth Commandment in Rom 7:7. Perrot, "Les exemples du désert," 437–38.

[166] Also, Paul uses the term νουθεσία in 1 Cor 10:11, and this term only occurs once in the LXX: Wis 16:6. While it is most likely coincidental, it is surprising that Wisdom of Solomon uses the term in the context of discussing Numbers, and even Num 11 specifically. Wis 16:6 states, "But they were troubled for a little while for a warning" (νουθεσίαν). If Paul is picking up on an early Jewish idea that the events in Numbers, and Num 11 specifically, were intended to be a warning, whether to Israel at the time or later generations, this may lend support to the idea that Paul sees Num 11 as the foundational narrative from which he instructs in 1 Cor 10:6–10.

[167] Meeks argues that Exod 32:6 is the primary text and the other prohibitions flow from it. Meeks, "'And Rose up to Play'," 65; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 456; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 91; G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008), 154–55, 225; Sandelin, *Attraction and Danger*, 108.

[168] While, however, there is good reason for identifying 1 Cor 10:6, and therefore Num 11, as a heading for the remaining prohibitions, it is important not to push this too far, because, as Deut 9:12–22 makes clear, the golden calf incident was viewed as the fundamental sin of Israel, and the events of Num 11, along with other events, further confirmed that initial rebellion against God. Also, idolatry is certainly fundamental to Paul's conception of sin also (e.g., Rom 1:18–25). In chap. 4, I will explore the connection between evil desire and idolatry and return to 1 Cor 10:7. However, despite these qualifications, there is good reason for reading 1 Cor 10:6 as presenting the sin from which the sins catalogued in 1 Cor 10:7–10 proceed.

the Tenth Commandment. Furthermore, Paul instructs his audience in a way similar to the Tenth Word, and his exhortation parallels Romans 7, where Paul directly cites the Tenth Commandment. When these phenomena are considered alongside the historical plausibility of Paul making such a connection, it is reasonable to conclude that the Tenth Word, mediated through Numbers 11:4–35, influenced Paul as he composed 1 Corinthians 10:6. With this being the case, the Tenth Word influences Paul as he engages in a discussion of mimetic ethics, presenting evil desire, as defined and described by the Tenth Word, as fundamental to sin.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the influence of the Tenth Commandment on Paul's ethical instruction is visible in Romans 7:7 and 1 Corinthians 10:6. In both instances, Paul presents evil desire, as defined and prohibited by the Tenth Commandment, as fundamental to human rebellion against God. Paul directly cites the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7, and his usage of Numbers 11, as well as other factors, makes it reasonable to see its influence on 1 Corinthians 10:6 also. Notably, therefore, I have argued that the influence of the Tenth Commandment is detectable in Paul's moral instruction in both the presence and absence of a direct reference to it, which further supports the argument that the Tenth Word is foundational to his ethical instruction.

CHAPTER 4

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT AND IDOLATRY

In this chapter, I argue that Paul connects the violation of the Tenth Commandment to idolatry (1 Cor 10:6; Eph 5:3–5; Col 3:5), following an interpretive trajectory present in the Hebrew Bible and sustained in early Jewish literature. By doing so, Paul instructs his congregations that the violation of the Tenth Word leads to the violation of the First (worship)[1] and Second (idolatry) Words.[2]

The Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible, covetousness and idolatry are connected. At the most basic level, the Decalogue contains prohibitions against both idolatry (Exod 20:4–6; Deut 5:8–10) and covetousness (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21).[3] While this observation could seem trivial, the Hebrew Bible further develops the connection between covetousness and

---

[1] When it comes to the enumeration of the Decalogue, I addressed Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 in detail in chap. 2, concluding that these texts are best understood as the Tenth Word. However, still another question is whether Exod 20:3–6 and Deut 5:7–10 should be numbered as one or two commandments. Additionally, interpreters differ as to whether or not Exod 20:2 and Deut 5:6 should be identified as a preamble or the first word. As discussed in chap. 2, however, I do not directly engage with this discussion in this project. Instead, I adopt the Reformed enumeration for convenience.

[2] While the Second Word explicitly forbids worshipping divine images, idolatry is also a violation of the First Word. As Judge shows, there are linguistic, grammatical, and theological ambiguities involved in rigidly distinguishing between the prohibition against false gods and the prohibition against divine images. Idolatry, therefore, is best understood as a violation of both the First and Second Words of the Decalogue. Thomas A. Judge, *Other Gods and Idols: The Relationship between the Worship of Other Gods and the Worship of Idols within the Old Testament*, LHBOTS 674 (London: T & T Clark, 2019), 3–58. For a helpful discussion of the First and Second Words, in addition to the prologue, see Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 13–62.

[3] In one sense, covetousness is connected to idolatry in the same way that it would be connected to any other command of the Decalogue. However, the placement of the commands about worship at the beginning of the Decalogue and the command against coveting at the end of the Decalogue may be significant. Smith, for example, argues that idolatry pairs with covetousness in the structure of the Decalogue, signifying that envy is fundamental to sin. Louis Smith, "Original Sin as 'Envy': The Structure of the Biblical Decalogue," *Dialog* 30, no. 3 (Summer 1991): 227–30. I will return to this question in the conclusion of this chapter.

idolatry, showing that their shared place in the Decalogue is significant.

In the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy 7:25 directly connects covetousness to idolatry using the terminology of the Tenth Word. Moses commands Israel to destroy the idols they find when entering Canaan, but he warns against a danger: "You will burn the idols of their gods with fire. Do not covet (לֹא־תַחְמֹד) the silver or gold on them and take it for yourself, so that you will not be ensnared by it, for it is a detestable thing to the Lord your God" (Deut 7:25).[4] Moses, therefore, connects covetousness, using the term חמד (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21), to idolatry.[5] He likely knew that a desire for the precious metal on an idol would eventually lead to compromising exclusive worship of YHWH.[6] If an idol were burned, as commanded, the threat of idolatry would be eradicated. However, destroying an idol would result in losing the precious metals on it, so if someone coveted them, the person might choose not to destroy the object of their desire.[7] If one did not follow the command, due to covetousness, the ongoing existence of idols in the community would pose a latent threat of idolatrous worship.[8]

Outside of the Pentateuch, additional passages connect covetousness and

---

[4] Fuhrmann notes the lexical connection between the Tenth Word and Deut 7:25. Justin Fuhrmann, "Deuteronomy 6–8 and the History of Interpretation: An Exposition on the First Two Commandments," *JETS* 53, no. 1 (March 2010): 56.

[5] חמד occurs seven times in the Pentateuch. Three occurrences are in either Exod 20:17 or Deut 5:21, so the occurrence of the term in Deut 7:25 is likely connected to the Tenth Word.

[6] Of course, the instruction makes best sense in light of the fact that idols were often finished with precious metals. Weinfeld observes, "The images were made of wood plated with gold or silver." Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, AB, vol. 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 376. Craigie suggests that Exod 32 may lie in the background of this instruction. Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 182–83; Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, rev. ed., WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 166.

[7] Deut 7:26 prohibits Israelites from bringing an idol into their houses, which implies that an Israelite who coveted the silver and gold on an idol (7:25) might place it in his or her home.

[8] Miller suggests that the sin of Achan (Josh 7) should be read against the background of Deut 7:25. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 399–400. While Achan does act in contradiction to the command in Deut 7:25 by taking forbidden silver and gold, idols are not mentioned in Josh 7. Also, Josh 6:18–19 is a command in the immediate context that Achan clearly violates. Most likely, therefore, the sin of Achan is an indirect violation of Deut 7:25, but not a direct one since it does not involve idolatry. For this reason, I do not deal with it in this chapter, but I will discuss it in the following chapter.

idolatry using the verbiage of the Tenth Commandment. In Isaiah 1:29, Isaiah writes, "For they will be ashamed of the sacred trees (מֵאֵילִים) which you coveted (חֲמַדְתֶּם), and you will be disgraced because of the garden shrines which you chose." Isaiah uses the term חמד to refer to the idolatrous behavior of his audience, evoking the Tenth Word.[9] In this case, "the sacred trees" (מֵאֵילִים) are the object of חמד, which suggests that the idol worshippers desired trees which marked shrines or functioned as objects of worship.[10] Similarly, Isaiah 44:9 states, "All who form idols are nothing, and their coveted things (וַחֲמוּדֵיהֶם) do not profit." As in Isaiah 1:29, Isaiah connects idolatry to covetous desire using the term חמד. In this instance, a participial form of חמד is used to describe things desired by idol worshippers, most likely the idols themselves (Isa 44:9–10). Isaiah, therefore, is critiquing idolatrous worshippers for making worthless idols the object of their covetous desire.[11] While Isaiah does not explain the precise relationship between covetous desire and idolatry in Isaiah 1:29 and 44:9, the two are clearly connected in his indictments.

When Deuteronomy 7:25, Isaiah 1:29, and Isaiah 44:9 are considered together,

---

[9] On the usage of חמד in Isaiah, see Samo Skralovnik, "Raba korena חמד na religioznem področju. Semantična analiza besednega polja חמד pri Izaiji," *Bogoslovni vestnik* 79, no. 4 (2019): 909–21.

[10] While commentators generally note the emphasis on idolatry in Isa 1:29, they do not connect it to the Tenth Commandment. John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 110–11; J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993), 51; Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 22–23; H. G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 159–60; Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*, Forms of the Old Testament Literature 16 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 86–87; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, AB, vol. 19 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 188.

[11] Motyer suggests that Isaiah is referencing the "infatuation" which idols inspire. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 346. Baltzer, on the other hand, suggests that the usage of חמד may suggest that the manufacturers of idols have a commercial interest in the idols they produce. Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*, trans. Margaret Kohl, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 194. As in the case of Isa 1:29, commentators generally note the reference to idolatry in 44:9, but they do not mention the connection to the Tenth Commandment. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, rev. ed., WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 688–89; Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 346; Childs, *Isaiah*, 343; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40–66*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 176; Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*, 2nd ed., OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 46–47; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1 - 39*, 87; Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 40-66*, Forms of the Old Testament Literature 19 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016), 99; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, AB, vol. 19A (New York: Doubleday, 2002), 240–42; Claus C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 148.

a clear interpretive trajectory emerges: covetousness is connected to idolatry. Also, חמד is often used in the context of a warning against or critique of idolatry.[12] Notably, the object of חמד varies—precious metals on idols (Deut 7:25), trees used in idol worship (Isa 1:29), or idols themselves (Isa 44:9)—which suggests that the term was deemed appropriate for describing a variety of idolatrous desires.[13] Samo Skralovnik observes this pattern and concludes that חמד denotes an inherently bad desire opposed to God.[14] While this is an overstatement, because חמד is used for both good and neutral desires in the Hebrew Bible, the usage of חמד to describe idolatrous desire is striking.[15] Deuteronomy 7:25, Isaiah 1:29, and Isaiah 44:9 suggest that the authors of the Hebrew Bible believed that evil desire is wrapped up in idolatry, and they see חמד as a fitting term for describing this dynamic. By doing so, they connect the Tenth Word to idolatry and expand and nuance its meaning. As I maintained in chapter 3, covetousness extends beyond desiring what belongs to a neighbor to unrestrained craving for anything that God has forbidden. Deuteronomy 7:25, Isaiah 1:29, and Isaiah 44:9 further expand the meaning of covetousness in the Hebrew Bible to idolatrous desire. As Justin Fuhrmann notes in regard to Deuteronomy 7:25,

> The term 'covet' has moved from the realm of thy neighbor (5:21) to that of the *herem* (7:25) . . . transferred from the realm of one's relationship with others, to one's relationship with Yahweh, suggesting that the Decalogue, including commands five through ten, should be interpreted as commands for covenant

---

[12] While the occurrences of חמד in Isa 1:29 and 44:9 could be attributed to coincidence, the strong association of the term with the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible, along with the conceptually similar use in Deut 7:25 makes this explanation unlikely. Instead, the best explanation for the shared verbiage is that there is an interpretive trajectory in the Hebrew Bible that the violation of the Tenth Word is connected to idolatry.

[13] While there are two verbs used in the Tenth Word, חמד and אוה, only חמד is used in the Hebrew Bible to describe idolatrous desire.

[14] According to Skralovnik, "A desire expressed by the verb form of the lexical root *ḥmd* indicates something diametrically opposite to longing for God, i.e. it denotes the objectification of God." Samo Skralovnik, "The Meaning and Interpretation of Desire in the Tenth Commandment (Exod 20,17): The Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* Word Field," *BN* 171 (2016): 17; Skralovnik, "Raba korena חמד na religioznem področju," 909.

[15] See discussion in chap. 2.

faithfulness to Yahweh, not others.[16]

Violation of the Tenth Word, therefore, is viewed as a breach of fidelity to YHWH, and by extension, a violation of the First and Second Words of the Decalogue.[17]

In addition to the use of חמד, the connection between covetousness and idolatry in the Hebrew Bible can be further substantiated. Idols are often described as being made of precious metals, which makes them an expected object of desire. Exodus 32:1–4, which is the foundational text regarding idolatry in the Hebrew Bible, repeatedly emphasizes that Aaron created the calf out of gold.[18] In the Hebrew Bible, narratives often emphasize that idols are made of precious metals (e.g., Judg 8:24–27, 17:1–5), and prophetic critiques of idolatry emphasize the valuable metals of which images were made (e.g., Isa 2:20, 30:22, 31:7, 40:19; Jer 10:4, 8–9; Ezek 16:17).[19] Therefore, there seems to be a clear connection between precious metals and idolatry in the Hebrew Bible. Most likely, one explanation for this phenomenon is that the allure of idolatry is partly explained by an attraction to silver and gold. Additionally, there is a stream of thought which emphasizes that trusting in riches is in competition with trusting in YHWH. Psalm 10:3, for example, suggests that greedy desire results in denying YHWH (cf. Prov 30:7–9),[20] and Job 31:24–28 suggests that it is possible to trust wealth in a religious way (cf.

---

[16] Fuhrmann, "Deuteronomy 6–8 and History of Interpretation," 56.

[17] Durham also notes this pattern in the use of חמד in the Hebrew Bible and reflects, "Coveting for oneself the gold and silver with which idols are decorated leads to idolatry, the violation of the first commandment. Desiring the 'free love' of the fertility cults leads both to the worship of other gods and to sexual irresponsibility, the violation of the first and seventh commandments (Isa 1:29)." John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 298.

[18] As Childs notes, Exodus presents the golden calf narrative as "representative of all subsequent idolatry." Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 565. MacDonald, however, argues that the golden calf is not directly connected to greed in the Hebrew Bible. Nathan MacDonald, "Recasting the Golden Calf: The Imaginative Potential of the Old Testament's Portrayal of Idolatry," in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. Stephen C. Barton, T & T Clark Theology (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 37. In light of MacDonald's observation, it is important to clarify that I am not claiming that the golden calf is presented as a product of greed. Instead, I am noting that Exod 32:1–4 is important evidence that precious metals and idolatry are bound together in biblical narrative.

[19] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 399–400.

[20] As Goldingay comments, "Instead of glorying in/praising Yhwh, the faithless gloried over

Job 22:23–30; Jer 48:7).[21] Also, Psalm 52:7 presents trusting in YHWH and trusting in riches as alternatives (cf. Psalm 118:36).[22] Thus, the Hebrew Bible seems to connect greedy desire, wealth, and precious metals to idolatry and denying YHWH.

In summary, idolatry is connected to the violation of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible. This connection is evident in specific texts which connect the Tenth Word to idolatrous desire through the use of חמד, but it can also be seen in a general pattern where greedy desire, wealth, and precious metals are connected to idolatry. When this data is considered, it suggests that the commands which open and close the Decalogue are connected.

Early Jewish Literature

In early Jewish literature, the link between covetousness and idolatry is sustained. Of course, idolatry is regarded as a particularly heinous sin by early Jewish authors. Therefore, it is frequently criticized and even identified as the root cause of evil.[23] Wisdom of Solomon 14:27, for example, concludes: "For the worship of nameless idols (τῶν ἀνωνύμων εἰδώλων) is the beginning, cause, and end of every evil."[24] Similarly, Pseudo-Philo 44.6–7 connects idolatry to violating all of the other commandments of the

---

the thing his heart desired." John Goldingay, *Psalms 1–41*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 179.

[21] For discussions of Job 31:24–28, see Brian S. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 76–79; Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 407. Clines notes that Job "conjures up the picture of a personal relationship with wealth." David J. A. Clines, *Job 21–37*, WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 1024. While Clines does not suggest Job is referencing worship of wealth in Job 31:24–25, he does note the emphasis on idolatry in Job 31:26–28. Clines, *Job 21–37*, 1025–27.

[22] Douglas J. Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 257.

[23] On the connection between idolatry and other sins, see Wis 14–15; Testament of Reuben 4.6; Testament of Judah 23.1; Pseudo-Philo 44.6–7.

[24] As Andrew M. King shows, one function of such critiques in Wisdom of Solomon is reinforcing distinct Jewish identity in the Hellenistic world. Andrew M. King, "Idolatry and Jewish Identity in Wisdom 13-15," *Conversations with the Biblical World* 36 (2016): 76–96.

Decalogue.[25]

Additionally, a general disdain for greed can be seen in early Jewish writings. In Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab),[26] for example, the Wicked Priest is described as being obsessed with wealth, leading to abandoning God. Pesher Habakkuk VIII, 9–11 states, "When he ruled over Israel his heart became proud, he deserted God and betrayed the laws for the sake of riches." Pesher Habakkuk goes on to describe the greed and other sins of the Wicked Priest in detail (1QpHab VIII, 7–IX, 7). While idolatry is not explicitly mentioned,[27] the author clearly believed that greed was incompatible with devotion to God.[28]

There is also a specific link between greed and idolatry in early Jewish literature. In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,[29] for example, Judah speaks to the connection between greed and idolatry.[30] Testament of Judah 19.1–4 presents Judah

---

[25] For a treatment of idolatry in early Jewish texts, see Trent A. Rogers, *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8–10*, WUNT 2 427 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 29–155.

[26] For the translation of Pesher Habakkuk, I have used Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997). For a succinct introduction to Pesher Habakkuk, see Alex P. Jassen, "Pesher of Habakkuk," in *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (London: T & T Clark, 2020), 1:231–34.

[27] Idolatry is explicitly condemned in Pesher Habakkuk XII, 10–XII, 3. Pesher Habakkuk comments on Hab 1:14–16 that the Kittim "offer sacrifices to their standards and their weapons are the object of their worship" (1QpHab VI, 4–5). Pesher Habakkuk had previously explained that they revered their implements of war because they bring them wealth (1QpHab VI, 1).

[28] In addition to this example, other texts show that this sentiment was widespread in Qumran texts (e.g., 1QS X, 19; CD IV, 17; 4QH VI, 20; 4Q169 3–4 I, 11). For a helpful discussion of greed and idolatry in Qumran texts, see Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 80–82.

[29] For a succinct introduction to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, see Vered Hillel, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:411–15.

[30] Davila challenges the legitimacy of using the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs for making claims regarding Judaism. James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?*, JSJSup 105 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005), 181. DeSilva, however, argues that the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs still has value as a witness to pre-Christian Judaism. David Arthur deSilva, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment," *JSP* 23, no. 1 (September 2013): 67–68. Also see Robert Kugler, "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 337–60. Hillel, therefore, concludes, "No scholarly consensus has yet been reached as to the document's origins or language of composition." Hillel, "Testaments of

warning,

> My children, love of money leads to idols; because, when led astray through money, (men) name gods (beings) who are not, and him who has it to fall into frenzy. For the sake of money I lost my children, and without the repentance of my flesh, and the humiliation of my soul, and the prayers of Jacob my father, I would have died childless. But the God of my fathers, the compassionate and merciful, forgave me, because I did it in ignorance. For the prince of deceit blinded me and I was ignorant as a man and as flesh corrupted through sins, and I recognized my own weakness while thinking myself invincible.[31]

Judah directly connects love for money to idolatry, as well as a host of other failures. In particular, he clearly states that greed is a precipitating factor for idolatry and explains that the influence of money causes people to misidentify deity. In addition to leading to idolatry, Judah suggests that his desire for gain resulted in the loss of his children. Testament of Judah 17.1 suggests that he is referencing his ill-advised marriage to a foreign woman motivated by greed and lust (cf. T. Jud. 13.3–8).[32] Judah, therefore, connects covetous desire to idolatry, as well as other failures.

Philo literally interprets the first two commandments of the Decalogue as prohibiting idolatry, but he also extends his interpretation to critique lovers of money.[33] He comments,

> But apart from the literal prohibition, he seems to me to suggest another thought of great value for the promotion of morality, and to condemn strongly the money-lovers who procure gold and silver coins from every side and treasure their hoard like a divine image in a sanctuary, believing it to be a source of blessing and

---

Twelve Patriarchs," 413. In the absence of consensus among specialists, I have opted to present the data from the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs in this project as a possible witness to early Judaism while acknowledging that a consensus could emerge in the future that either supports or undermines this approach.

[31] For the translation of the Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, I have used Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP 8 (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1985).

[32] Testament of Judah 17.1 states, "I command you, therefore, my children, not to love money nor to gaze upon the beauty of women, because also for the sake of money and beauty I was led astray to Bath-shua the Canaanite." Hollander and de Jonge, *Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs*, 218.

[33] Sandelin gives a helpful study of the complexity of idolatry in Philonic thought. Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria (1991)," in *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, WUNT 290 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 27–76.

> happiness of every kind. And further, all the needy who are possessed by that grievous malady, the desire for money, though they have no wealth of their own on which they may bestow worship as its due, pay awe-struck homage to that of their neighbours, and come at early dawn to the houses of those who have abundance of it as though they were the grandest temples, there to make their prayers and beg for blessing from the masters as though they were gods. (Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.23–24)

Philo, therefore, suggests that greed is a form of idolatry. On the one hand, those with money may worship their money like an idol, and the rich may expect to obtain blessing and satisfaction from their wealth like a divinity. On the other hand, the poor may worship the rich like an idol with the hope of sharing in their wealth. In doing so, they make both the rich themselves and their possessions objects of devotion. Philo identifies both of these dynamics as idolatrous and, therefore, shows the connection between greed and idolatry in his thinking.

Pseudo-Philo 44.6–7 connects the Tenth Word to idolatry by suggesting that lusting after foreign women is idolatrous.[34] Pseudo-Philo 44.6 recounts the Decalogue, including the Tenth Word, and Pseudo-Philo 44.7 describes the violation of each of the Ten Words, connecting each one to idolatry.[35] When it comes to the Tenth Word, the corresponding violation is that they "have lusted after strange women."[36] Most likely, Pseudo-Philo is suggesting that the lust for foreign women leads to idolatry for the obvious reason: if an Israelite man is drawn toward a non-Israelite women for sexual

---

[34] For a full treatment of idolatry in Pseudo-Philo, see Frederick J. Murphy, "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo," *JBL* 107, no. 2 (June 1988): 275–87. Also see Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Humanity and the Idols of the Gods in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities," in Barton, *Idolatry*, 58–72.

[35] As Murphy describes, "In the latter half of 44:7, God shows in detail how idolatry violates each of the Ten Commandments. Idolatry is the root of all sin, and by committing it Israel has transgressed each of the Ten Commandments." Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 175. Jacobson, however, rightly questions whether each violation of the Decalogue is presented as equivalent to idolatry and suggests instead that some of the sins are listed because they lead to idolatry. Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*, 2 vols., AGJU 31 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1996), 2:1015. While this distinction is subtle, it is a better interpretation to suggest that Pseudo-Philo is making the case that lusting after foreign women leads to idolatry, rather than identifying the two.

[36] "Et concupierunt mulieres alienas."

reasons, it will eventually result in him adopting the religious practices of his paramour.[37]

Notably, there is diversity regarding the specifics: Testament of Judah 19.1–4, for example, argues that the love of money leads to idolatry, but Philo argues that the love of money is itself idolatry in a figurative sense. Lastly, Pseudo-Philo 44.7 suggests that idolatry and the violation of the Tenth Word are connected in the desire for foreign women. While all of these desires can be rightly subsumed under covetousness, their object varies. Though Pseudo-Philo is the only writer who explicitly references the Tenth Word, the conceptual connection between greedy desire, wealth, and idolatry is also clear in Testament of Twelve Patriarchs and Philo. Therefore, a clear connection between covetousness and idolatry is identifiable in early Jewish thought. While there are likely multiple explanations for this pattern, the Tenth Word is a helpful explanation for this interpretive trajectory in light of the pattern identified in the Hebrew Bible.

Paul: Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5

Paul also connects covetousness to idolatry in his writings. By doing so, he follows the pattern observed in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, and, as I argue, the Tenth Word helpfully explains this phenomenon.

---

[37] Diane L. Hakala, "The Decalogue as a Summary of the Law: Jewish and New Testament Approaches" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2014), 60. According to Murphy, "The connection between lust for foreign women and idolatry is implicit here but explicit throughout Pseudo-Philo." Murphy, "Retelling the Bible," 279. In light of my reading of Pseudo-Philo, however, Murphy overstates. While sexual involvement with foreign women is highlighted as leading to bad consequences (LAB 43.5, 47.1), and idolatry may be implied in one instance (LAB 18.13–14), there is not a clearly identifiable pattern connecting foreign women and idolatry, as Murphy suggests. Jacobson, however, even challenges the idea that Pseudo-Philo 18:13–14 implies idolatry, which would further undermine the claim that there is a connection between idolatry and foreign women in Pseudo-Philo. Jacobson, *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's LAB*, 1:610. While Jacobson rightly observes that idolatry is not explicitly mentioned in Pseudo-Philo 18.13–14, it seems to be implied, especially since idolatry is portrayed as the consequence of associating with foreigners in Pseudo-Philo (e.g., LAB 21.1). Nevertheless, it seems that the interpretation of lust for foreign women leading to idolatry in Pseudo-Philo 44.6–7 must be based on that text and not on an interpretive trajectory present in Pseudo-Philo.

Ephesians 5:5[38] and Colossians 3:5[39] are similar statements which link covetousness and idolatry.[40]

Table 3. Comparison of Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5

Ephesians 5:5	Colossians 3:5
τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.	Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία.
"For knowing you will know this that every sexually immoral or unclean or covetous person, who is an idolater, does not have an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God."	"Put to death, therefore, the members which are on the earth, sexual immorality, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness which is idolatry."

In Colossians 3:5 Paul claims one of two things: (1) that "sexual immorality, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness" (πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν) is idolatry or (2) that "covetousness" (πλεονεξίαν) specifically is idolatry. The decision hinges on a grammatical question: what is the antecedent of the indefinite relative pronoun ἥτις? Most likely, the antecedent of ἥτις is

[38] Eph 5:5 is a part of the Ephesians household code (Eph 4:17–6:9). For a survey of scholarship on the Ephesians household code, see Daniel K. Darko, *No Longer Living as the Gentiles: Differentiation and Shared Ethical Values in Ephesians 4.17–6.9*, LNTS 375 (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 2–12.

[39] Frederick summarizes some of the significant scholarship on ethical lists in the New Testament. John Frederick, *The Ethics of the Enactment and Reception of Cruciform Love: A Comparative Lexical, Conceptual, Exegetical, and Theological Study of Colossians 3:1–17*, WUNT 2 487 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 5–27. Also see Allan R. Bevere, *Sharing in the Inheritance: Identity and the Moral Life in Colossians*, JSNTSup 226 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 182–98.

[40] Moo observes that the similarities between Eph 5:5 and Col 3:5 suggest "a customary cluster of terms and ideas." He points to 1 Cor 5:10–11; 6:9 and Rev 21:8; 22:15 to further support this conclusion. Moo, *Letters to Colossians and Philemon*, 257–58.

"covetousness," and there are a few reasons why: First, ἥτις is feminine, and the preceding list of terms includes a neuter noun (πάθος), which suggests the referent is the feminine noun πλεονεξίαν.[41] Also, ἥτις is singular and when Paul refers back to the same list of vices in Colossians 3:6, he uses the neuter plural relative pronoun ἃ,[42] which suggests that a neuter plural form would also be expected in Colossians 3:5 if the referent was the entire preceding phrase (cf. Col 2:17). Second, "covetousness" is set off from the remainder of the vices with the conjunction καί, which suggests a break between it and the preceding items of the list.[43] Third, "covetousness" (τὴν πλεονεξίαν) is articular but the preceding nouns (πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν) are anarthrous.[44] In light of these observations, the referent of ἥτις is most likely "covetousness" specifically.[45]

In Ephesians 5:5, there are also two possible readings: (1) Paul could be

---

[41] G. K. Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 274. While Beale takes this position, he qualifies it by noting that it is grammatically possible that the referent of ἥτις is the entire previous list, because a relative pronoun can take the gender of the immediately preceding word while still referring back to a larger clause. Beale also claims that the parallel statement in Eph 5:5, which he takes to be asserting that a list of types of people are idolatrous, suggests the entire previous clause might be the referent in Col 3:5 also (274n12). While this reading may be grammatically possible, I argue below that the most likely reading of Eph 5:5 is that the antecedent of ἥτις is "covetousness" (τὴν πλεονεξίαν) specifically, especially in light of the other grammatical arguments.

[42] Col 3:6 states, "Because of which (ἃ), the wrath of God is coming on the sons of disobedience."

[43] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 109; R. McL Wilson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 246.

[44] While abstract nouns in Greek often do not have the article (as exemplified by the majority of the items in the list in Col 3:5), BDF §258(1) states, "The addition of the relative clause ἥτις etc. occasions the use of the article by making the preceding noun definite." Also see Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274; Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 109; Wilson, *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, 246.

[45] Commentators generally take this view. For example, see Moo, *Letters to Colossians and Philemon*, 257; Scot McKnight, *The Letter to the Colossians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 305; Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274; Peter T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982), 182; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), 143–44; David W. Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 220–21; James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1996), 215; Wilson, *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, 246; Joachim Gnilka, *Der Kolosserbrief*, HThKNT (Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1980), 182; Jerry L. Sumney, *Colossians*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 190–91; C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 116–17.

asserting that a "covetous person" (πλεονέκτης) specifically is "an idolater" (εἰδωλολάτρης); or (2) he could be saying that any one of a series of people, "every sexually immoral or unclean or covetous person" (πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης), is "an idolater" (εἰδωλολάτρης). Therefore, the precise meaning of his statement hinges on a grammatical question: what is the referent of the relative pronoun ὅ? Thomas M. Winger argues that it refers to "every sexually immoral or unclean or covetous person," because it is neuter.[46] However, according to BDF §132(2), "In explanatory phrases Koine employs the neuter ὅ ἐστιν . . . a formulaic phrase used without reference to the gender of the word explained or to that of the word which explains."[47] Thus, Paul may be referring to a "covetous person" specifically, and not the entire preceding phrase, with the phrase ὅ ἐστιν.[48] Since grammatical clues do not conclusively point to a reading of Ephesians 5:5, it should be read in light of Colossians 3:5.[49] Paul, therefore, most likely

---

[46] Winger suggests that if the antecedent was "covetous person," the masculine relative pronoun would be expected, because relative pronouns usually match their antecedent in gender. Thomas M. Winger, *Ephesians*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2015), 556n23. Winger also makes a conceptual case, arguing that all three terms in the list refer to sexual sin. Paul, therefore, is likely making a statement about a series of vices in the same category (555–56). If all three terms referred to the same class of sin, it would lend weight to Winger's view; however, I will argue later in this chapter that πλεονέκτης is best understood as a reference to the desire for more without a direct reference to sexual lust. Also see Stanley E. Porter, "Ἴστε Γινώσκοντες in Ephesians 5,5: Does Chiasm Solve a Problem?," *ZNW* 81, no. 3–4 (1990): 274–75; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, trans. Helon Heron (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 219–20; Joachim Gnilka, *Der Epheserbrief*, HThKNT (Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1971), 248–49.

[47] Also see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 713–14. Additionally, BDF §132(2) notes that while "the gender is readily assimilated to the predicate where there is identification," Eph 5:5 is listed as an exception where identification to the predicate takes place, but the gender is not assimilated. Also, as Metzger discusses, there is a well-attested variant where scribes corrected to ὅς. However, the reading in the text has significantly more support. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 539. Moule, however, claims, "Sometimes a neuter relative is used where strictly a masculine or feminine might have been expected—presumably with reference to the 'whole idea' of the preceding clause rather than to the single word which is the immediate antecedent of the relative." Moule cites Eph 5:5 as an example. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 130. Moule suggests Col 3:5 should be read in contrast to Eph 5:5, but I argue below that the two texts should inform one another.

[48] Eph 6:17 is an example of this phrase being used in this way by Paul (cf. Mark 15:16). Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians*, ZECNT 10 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 324; Frank Thielman, *Ephesians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 332–3n13.

[49] Beale, however, raises the possibility that Col 3:5 should be interpreted in light of Eph 5:5, resulting in the reading the that entire list of sins is idolatrous in both cases. Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274n12. However, the grammar of Col 3:5 seems to be clearer than Eph 5:5. Therefore, Eph 5:5

affirms in Ephesians 5:5 that a covetousness person, specifically, is an idolater.[50] To put the two texts together, Paul probably affirms that a covetous person (πλεονέκτης) is an idolater in Ephesians 5:5 and asserts that covetousness (πλεονεξία) is idolatry in Colossians 3:5.[51]

When these two passages are read together, a conclusion emerges. Paul taught that covetousness was idolatry, which raises a pair of interrelated questions: what is the origin of the claim that covetousness is idolatry, and what is its meaning?[52] While both of these questions are important, the first intersects directly with the argument of this project, and I argue that the Decalogue is a particularly prominent background for Paul's statement. Therefore, Paul intended to instruct his congregations that violation of the Tenth Word results in the violation of the First and Second Words.

What Is the Origin of Paul's Statement?

On the one hand, interpreters regularly suggest that the Ten Words may illuminate the Pauline assertion that "covetousness is idolatry." However, while this is often asserted, I am not aware of an argument substantiating this frequently suggested connection.[53] Therefore, linking the two seems to be based on intuition and is not a

---

is best read in light of Col 3:5, not the other way around.

[50] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 109–11; Thielman, *Ephesians*, 332–3n13; Arnold, *Ephesians*, 324; Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 660; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990), 316–17, 324; Bruce, *Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 369, 372; Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 480–81; Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 362n13.

[51] Rosner marshals an additional argument for this view by suggesting that greed fits as idolatry in the conceptual framework of early Judaism and Christianity better than sexual immorality. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 111–15.

[52] Rosner organizes his focused study of Eph 5:5 and Col 3:5 around these two questions. See Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*.

[53] Brueggemann, for example, writes regarding Col 3:5 and Eph 5:5, "That equivalence, in the horizon of the Sinai commandments, brings together the first commandments on idolatry (Exod. 20:1–6) and the tenth commandment on coveting (Exod. 20:17), which forms an envelope for the whole of the Decalogue." Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 229. While Brueggemann makes this observation, he does not develop it or argue for it.

foregone conclusion. J. Cornelis de Vos, for example, excludes Colossians 3:5 from his treatment of the reception of the Decalogue in the New Testament, because he considers it to be too ambiguous to connect it with certainty to the Tenth Word.[54] Therefore, I intend to contribute to this discussion around the origin of this Pauline phrase by providing an argument for reading Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 against the background of the Tenth Commandment.

I believe this connection can be moved from the realm of intuition to relative certainty for several reasons. First, the ethical teaching of both Ephesians and Colossians is Jewish in nature, so the Decalogue is a reasonable background for the phrase "covetousness is idolatry." When it comes to Colossians, John Frederick makes a comprehensive case that the ethical teaching of Colossians 3:1–17 draws significantly from Jewish traditions.[55] While he highlights multiple possible backgrounds (e.g., the Two Way tradition and the teachings of Jesus), the Decalogue is one.[56] When it comes to

---

Also see Lars Hartman, "Code and Context: A Few Reflections on the Parenesis of Col 3:6–4:1," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth-Century Approaches*, ed. Brian S. Rosner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 183–85; Richard R. Melick, *Philippians, Colossians, Philemon*, NAC, vol. 32 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1991), 291; Robert M. Grant, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity," *HTR* 40, no. 1 (1947): 6–7; Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 220. In some cases, writers simply acknowledge the Tenth Word, or the Decalogue in general, as a possible cross reference: Wilson, *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, 243, 246; Bruce, *Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 143–44; Thielman, *Ephesians*, 332–34; Dunn, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 215–16; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 322; O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, 184.

[54] J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 6, 247. To further illustrate this point, de Vos does not mention Eph 5:5 in his work. Also, many commentators do not mention the Tenth Word as a possible background for Paul's Eph 5:5 or Col 3:5. Winger, *Ephesians*, 555–58, 572; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 660–61; Best, *Commentary on Ephesians*, 480–81; O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, 361–64.

[55] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*. More succinctly, Rosner lists a variety of examples of the influence of Jewish tradition on the ethics of both Colossians and Ephesians. Brian S. Rosner, *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2013), 52–59. Also see Hartman, "Code and Context"; James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 190–94.

[56] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 55, 132, 155, 158, 162, 175. Frederick argues that the vice terms in Colossians correspond to the Two Ways tradition in the LXX, the sayings of Jesus, and "the common Hellenistic stock of incidental moral terms of the day" (221). Frederick, therefore, emphasizes much more than just the Decalogue as a background for Paul's ethics, and the Decalogue is not the primary background which he emphasizes. However, he consistently shows in his research that the Decalogue is a helpful background for understanding the vices in Colossians. Also see Bevere, *Sharing in*

Ephesians, the citation of the Fifth Commandment (honoring parents) in Ephesians 6:1–3 is direct evidence of the influence of the Decalogue. Also, Benjamin G. Wold argues that Jewish traditions, especially the Decalogue, form an important background for the household code in Ephesians 5–6.[57] Therefore, as some recent scholarship has highlighted, the ethical teaching of Ephesians and Colossians is Jewish in nature, and the Decalogue is one of the likely backgrounds for it. In light of this, the suggestion that the Decalogue is in the background of the statement "covetousness is idolatry" is plausible.

Second, covetousness and idolatry are connected in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, so Paul likely connected them under the influence of this tradition.[58] Miller perceptively draws a line from the teaching regarding idolatry in the Hebrew Bible to Paul:

> Further, one learns of a danger in fooling with idols and images of gods, which might not have been expected. They are often if not usually made of precious metals or jewels (e.g., Exod. 32:2–4, 24, 31; Judg. 8:24–27; 17:1–5) and so become enticing in a different way, as access to wealth. No wonder the prophets often inveighed against idols made of silver and gold (e.g., Isa. 2:20; 30:22; 31:7; 40:19; Jer. 10:4, 8–9; Ezek. 16:17) or that the Letter to the Colossians equates covetousness with idolatry (3:5). The two are intimately intertwined in the biblical story.[59]

As I have catalogued, covetousness and greed are connected in general terms in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, and the violation of the Tenth Word is also specifically connected to idolatry (Deut 7:25; Isa 1:29; 44:9; LAB 44:6–7). Therefore,

---

the Inheritance, 182–224; Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 216–18, 220.

[57] Wold focuses on the Fifth Word (honoring parents) and does not engage with the Tenth Word, but his argument lends weight to the idea that the Decalogue more broadly may be influencing Paul's ethical instruction in Ephesians. Benjamin G. Wold, "Family Ethics in *4QInstruction* and the New Testament," *NovT* 50, no. 3 (2008): 286–300.

[58] Marcus briefly surveys the connection between idolatry and money in early Christianity and suggests that this connection may be a partial explanation for Col 3:5. Joel Marcus, "Idolatry in the New Testament," in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. J. Ross Wagner, Christopher Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), 114–20.

[59] Miller partly bases this observation on the sin of Achan (Josh 7), which he sees against the background of Deut 7:25–26. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 399–400. While I do not see the sin of Achan (Josh 7) as connecting to idolatry specifically, Miller correctly highlights the interpretive trajectory.

reading Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 against the background of the Decalogue is historically plausible, because the First, Second, and Tenth Words are connected in sources which shed light on Paul's patterns of thought, or even could have influenced him.

Third, the specific terms which Paul uses—πλεονέκτης and εἰδωλολάτρης (Eph 5:5) and πλεονεξία and εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3:5)—evoke the Decalogue. When it comes to εἰδωλολάτρης and εἰδωλολατρία, Exodus 20:4 LXX and Deuteronomy 5:8 LXX state, "Do not make an idol (εἴδωλον) for yourself."[60] Paul, therefore, would have understood the terms εἰδωλολάτρης and εἰδωλολατρία to be describing activities forbidden by the Decalogue.[61] In regard to εἰδωλολάτρης, Frederick writes, "Although the form εἰδωλολάτρης never appears in the LXX, the related form εἴδωλον is attested in a variety of different genres and most importantly in the Ten Commandments."[62] Thus, Paul's use of εἰδωλολάτρης and εἰδωλολατρία is plausibly connected to the Decalogue, and the Second Word in particular.[63]

Paul also evokes the Decalogue with the terms πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία, because these terms describe the desire which the Tenth Word prohibits. To demonstrate this, a brief examination of these lexemes will be helpful. To put it broadly, πλεονεξία is a noun which describes the vice of greedy desire, and πλεονέκτης is an adjective, often used as a substantive, which attributes the characteristic of greedy desire to something or someone.[64]

---

[60] Moisés Silva, ed., "Εἴδωλον, Εἰδωλολάτρης, Εἰδωλολατρία, Εἰδωλεῖον, Εἰδωλόθυτος, Κατείδωλος," *NIDNTTE* 2:98–102.

[61] Paul uses εἰδωλολάτρης in 1 Cor 10:7 when referring to the sin of the golden calf (see discussion later in this chapter).

[62] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 158.

[63] Dunn, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 215.

[64] For general treatments of πλεονεξία, πλεονέκτης, and the related verb πλεονεκτέω, see Silva, *NIDNTTE* 3:780–81; Gerhard Delling, "Πλεονέκτης, Πλεονεκτέω, Πλεονεξία," *TDNT* 6:266–74.

In Hellenistic ethical thought, πλεονεξία was widely condemned, and it regularly makes an appearance in early Jewish literature.[65] It appears in the LXX seven times and is usually used to render בֶּצַע (Ps 118:36; Hab 2:9; Jer 22:17; Ezek 22:27).[66] Psalm 118:36 LXX (119:36 MT), for example, juxtaposes it with devotion to God: "Bend my ear to your testimonies, and not to covetousness" (πλεονεξίαν). According to the author of 2 Maccabees, Menelaus was only able to remain in power because of the "the covetousness (πλεονεξίας) of those in power" (2 Macc 4:50). Sirach 14:9 uses πλεονέκτης for the only time in the LXX: "The eye of the covetous (πλεονέκτου) is not satisfied with a part." In the surrounding context, there is a discussion of wise dealings in material possessions (Sir 14:3–19), which highlights that the term refers to someone who greedily desires more possessions.

Philo regularly condemns πλεονεξία.[67] In *On the Life of Joseph* 216 he writes, "Covetousness (πλεονεξία) and the desire for what is another's (τὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμεῖν) is against all law" (cf. *Spec. Laws* 4.20). While this statement is not a formal definition of πλεονεξία, Philo associates it with desiring what belongs to another person. Likewise, Josephus condemns πλεονεξία by writing, "But avarice (φιλοχρηματία), it seems, defies all punishment and a dire love of gain (τοῦ κερδαίνειν ἔρως) is ingrained in human nature, no other passion being so headstrong as greed (πλεονεξία)" (*J. W.* 5.558–559 [LCL, Thackeray]).[68]

---

[65] Frederick notes the condemnation of πλεονεξία in Aristotle. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 55–56. In particular, Frederick observes "a notable increase in . . . the use of the vice πλεονεξία in the Roman Stoic Literature" (132).

[66] To be more specific, when the LXX translators use πλεονεξία, they are rendering בֶּצַע in every case where it is clear what Hebrew text the translator is working from (Ps 118:36; Hab 2:9; Jer 22:17; Ezek 22:27).

[67] Philo identifies it as "that insidious foe which is the source of our misery" (*Mos*. 2.186).

[68] Josephus makes this statement as he recounts how a group of soldiers gruesomely murdered civilians while searching for loot. In other contexts, he uses the term to describe the motivation behind violent plundering by soldiers (*J. W.* 2.464) or the warmongering of political leaders (*J. W.* 2.346, 9.7).

In the New Testament, πλεονεξία "always appear[s] to involve human greed that leads to exploiting others."[69] Luke 12:15, for example, records Jesus warning a man against πλεονεξία after being asked to arbitrate in an inheritance dispute, which suggests that the term describes the greedy desire for material possessions. Also, 2 Peter 2:3 uses πλεονεξία to describe the exploitative activities of false teachers (cf. 2 Pet 2:14). Paul uses πλεονεξία six times (Rom 1:29; 2 Cor 9:5; Eph 4:19; 5:3; Col 3:5; 1 Thess 2:5). In addition to including it in vice lists (Rom 1:29; Eph 5:3; Col 3:5), he uses it as a characterization of typical Gentile patterns of life (Eph 4:19), contrasts πλεονεξία with εὐλογία (2 Cor 9:5), and denies that his ministry is characterized by it (1 Thess 2:5). Paul is the only New Testament author to use πλεονέκτης, and he uses it four times in a list of vices (1 Cor 5:10, 11; 6:10; Eph 5:5). Paul, therefore, uses πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία in a way consistent with its usage in early Jewish and early Christian literature: to describe a greedy desire for more with connotations of corruption and exploitation.[70] Therefore, πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία are apt terms for evoking the Tenth Word, because they describe the desire which the Tenth Word prohibits.

It could be objected that ἐπιθυμέω, and the related terms ἐπιθυμία and ἐπιθυμητής, are the lexemes which most directly connect to the Tenth Word, not πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία.[71] So, perhaps, if Paul wanted to evoke the Tenth Word, he would have used ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιθυμία, or ἐπιθυμητής. It is also true that Philo does not

---

[69] Silva, *NIDNTTE* 3:780–81. If the related verbal form πλεονεκτέω is considered, 2 Cor 2:11 would be an exception to this pattern. Also, the verb may take on a sexual undertone in 1 Thess 4:6.

[70] Does πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης refer to greed or violent action for personal gain? Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 115–21. While Moule does not advocate for it meaning an external action, he does suggest that it means ruthless activity which is self-seeking. Moule, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 116–17.

[71] When Paul cites the Tenth Word, he states, "Do not covet"' (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις; Rom 7:7; 13:9). Also, Paul refers back to the Tenth Word by stating that sin created "every kind of covetousness" (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; Rom 7:8). Paul, therefore, uses ἐπιθυμέω when citing the Tenth Word and ἐπιθυμία to reference it also. Paul also uses ἐπιθυμητής in 1 Cor 10:6 when referencing Num 11:4–34, a narrative connected to the Tenth Word, so the connections between this word group and the Tenth Word are particularly strong. In light of this, it is interesting that Paul lists ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν in Col 3:5 immediately prior to τὴν πλεονεξίαν.

explicitly connect πλεονεξία to the Tenth Word. Instead, he connects it to the Seventh Word (stealing):

> The third is that against stealing under which are included the decrees made against defaulting debtors, repudiations of deposits, partnerships which are not true to their name, shameless robberies and in general covetous feelings (πλεονεξίαις) which urge men openly or secretly to appropriate the possessions of others. (Philo, *Decalogue* 171; cf. 135; *Spec. Laws* 4.5, 19)

Philo, therefore, uses πλεονεξία to describe desire leading to the violation of the Seventh Word. However, although Philo mentions πλεονεξία in his exposition of the Seventh Commandment, he describes it in a way consistent with the Tenth. In *On the Decalogue* 135 Philo writes,

> The third commandment in the second five forbids stealing, for he who gapes after what belongs to others is the common enemy of the State, willing to rob all, but able only to filch from some, because, while his covetousness (πλεονεξίαν) extends indefinitely, his feebler capacity cannot keep pace with it but restricted to a small compass reaches only to a few.

Also, when Philo asserts, "Covetousness (πλεονεξία) and the desire for what is another's (τὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμεῖν) is against all law" (Philo, *Joseph* 216; cf. Spec. Laws 4.20),[72] his statement bears similarity to Josephus' paraphrase of the Tenth Word: "The Tenth (δέκατος) to covet nothing that belongs to another." (ὁ μηδενὸς ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιθυμίαν λαμβάνειν; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:92 [LCL, Thackeray]). Furthermore, Philo associates πλεονεξία with ἐπιθυμία when he writes, "He does not allow the purchasers to have absolute possession of what belongs to others, thus barring the roads to covetousness (πλεονεξίαν), in order to curb that insidious foe and source of all evils, desire" (ἐπιθυμίαν; *Virt*. 100 [LCL, Colson]).[73] Therefore, although Philo does not associate πλεονεξία

---

[72] Philo puts these words in the mouths of Joseph's brothers when they are accused by Joseph's steward of stealing his cup (*Joseph* 211–16). Philo, therefore, associates πλεονεξία with theft in this instance also.

[73] Wilson notes the link between Philo's comments here and his exposition of the Tenth Word. Walter T. Wilson, *Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, vol. 3, PACS (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2011), 251. If Wilson is correct, this may be an instance of Philo associating πλεονεξία with the Tenth Word.

explicitly with the Tenth Word, he does describe it in a way that resonates with it, and he associates it with ἐπιθυμία. Perhaps, Philo did not associate πλεονεξία with the Tenth Commandment directly, because it did not fit with his Middle-Platonist position on desire, but that should hardly prevent a reader from identifying the clear overlap between πλεονεξία and the Tenth Word.

Most importantly, in early Christian literature, there is evidence that πλεονεξία may have been associated with the Tenth Word. In Mark 7:22, Jesus places πλεονεξία in a list of vices along with terms that evoke the Decalogue like κλοπή, φόνος, and μοιχεία (Mark 7:21-22).[74] In this context, πλεονεξία is most likely intended to be a reference to the Tenth Word.[75] This being the case, Paul may have used πλεονεξία to evoke the Tenth Word in a similar way, and he may have even done so under the influence of the teaching of Jesus.[76]

The Apostolic Fathers provides an important example of πλεονέκτης being associated with the Decalogue.[77] Barnabas 19.6 states, "You must not covet (οὐ μὴ γένῃ ἐπιθυμῶν) your neighbor's possessions (τὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου), you must not become greedy" (οὐ μὴ γένῃ πλεονέκτης). Barnabas paraphrases the Tenth Word, using

---

[74] Also, in Rom 1:29, Paul lists πλεονεξία along with φόνος and γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς.

[75] Mark 7:21–23 states, "For evil thoughts come out from within, from the heart of men, sexual immorality, theft (κλοπαί), murder (φόνοι), adultery (μοιχεῖαι), covetousness (πλεονεξίαι), wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, and foolishness. All these evil things come out from within and defile the man." France observes, "The first part of the list reflects (though less clearly than that of Matthew) some of the commandments of the decalogue: κλοπαί, φόνοι, and μοιχεῖαι represent the eighth, sixth, and seventh commandments respectively, πορνεῖαι may be seen as a further extension of the seventh, and πλεονεξίαι relates loosely to the tenth. Beyond that point the list does not seem to reflect a particular source, but is simply a gathering up of some of the more obvious ways in which διαλογισμοὶ κακοί are manifested in human conduct." Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 293.

[76] Frederick observes that Paul may use πλεονεξία in Col 3:5 as a result of influence of the teaching of Jesus, but he does not note how this connects to the Tenth Word. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 157–58, 162.

[77] For the text of the Apostolic Fathers, I have used Michael W. Holmes, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

ἐπιθυμέω,[78] then immediately references πλεονέκτης, which suggests there was a connection between the two in the mind of the author.[79]

In addition to this rather clear example from Barnabas, there are a couple of other examples in which πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης may be associated with the Decalogue in the Apostolic Fathers. In Didache 2.6, πλεονέκτης is prohibited along with a summary of the second table of the Decalogue (2.2–7).[80] Kurt Niederwimmer observes that Didache 2.6–7 "begin with prohibitions recalling the ninth and tenth commandments of the Decalogue."[81] Thus, Didache 2.6 would seem to give further evidence that πλεονέκτης was associated with the Tenth Word by early Christian communities. Lastly, Polycarp lists πλεονεξία alongside "false witness" (ψυδομαρτυρία), which is prohibited by the Decalogue (Pol. *Phil*. 2.2).[82] It seems, therefore, that πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης were terms associated with the Decalogue in early Christian thought. Perhaps, the Apostolic Fathers provide evidence of an early interpretive tradition where πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης were associated with the Tenth Word.

---

[78] Barnabas quotes the Seventh Word (adultery) in 19:4 and the Third Word (name) in Barnabas 19.5, which removes any doubt that 19.6 is a direct reference to the Tenth Word.

[79] On Deuteronomic language and motifs in the Epistle to Barnabas, see James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*, WUNT 2 188 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 95–101.

[80] On Didache 2.2–7 as a summary of the second table of the Decalogue, see Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Assen, Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2002), 29, 162. In Didache 2.2–3, some of the commands of the Decalogue are paraphrased, and the Tenth Word is in Didache 2.2: οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τά τοῦ πλησίον. After the paraphrase of the Decalogue, a variety of other commands related to the Decalogue are given (Did. 2.3–7). Milavec observes that some of the five speech infractions in Didache 2.3–5 are modeled on the Decalogue. Aaron Milavec, ed., *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 55–56. In similar way, therefore, in Didache 2.6 πλεονέκτης is most likely presented as an outworking of the Tenth Word.

[81] Niederwimmer divides Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:21 into two injunctions, so he is referring to what I have been terming the Tenth Word in this project. When it comes to πλεονέκτης specifically, he writes, "The content probably reflects Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21 (MT), but this is no longer clear because of the rearrangements that have occurred in the text." Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 92.

[82] Polycarp, *Philippians* 2.2 states, "Avoiding every kind of unrighteousness (πάσης ἀδικίας), greed (πλεονεξίας), love of money (φιλαργυρίας), slander (καταλαλιᾶς), and false testimony" (ψευδομαρτυρίας).

To respond to another possible objection, I am arguing that the Tenth Word is a likely background for Paul's use of πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης, but the terms could be explained against a Hellenistic, as opposed to Jewish, background. Dio Crysostom, for example, dedicates an entire discourse to condemning πλεονεξία.[83] In *Discourses* 17.6–7 He states, "So I maintain in regard to covetousness (περὶ τῆς πλεονεξίας) too, that all men do know it is neither expedient nor honourable, but the cause of the greatest evils; and that in spite of all this, not one man refrains from it or is willing to have equality of possessions with his neighbour" (LCL, Crosby). For Dio Crysostom, therefore, πλεονεξία was a particularly dangerous vice which gave rise to variety of other evils. However, πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης being widely despised and condemned in the Hellenistic world does not discount that early Jewish thinkers seem to have connected these terms to the Tenth Word. Frederick observes the prevalence of the term πλεονεξία in Hellenistic ethics but concludes that it probably had a Jewish origin for Colossians "because of the almost certain centrality of the Ten Commandments."[84] Frederick also observes that the identification of πλεονεξία with εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3:5) makes a Jewish origin more likely.[85]

To summarize, although πλεονεξία, and the related term πλεονέκτης, was a widely condemned vice in the Hellenistic world, it has roots in the LXX and was commonly addressed by early Jewish writers.[86] Also, it overlaps conceptually with the

---

[83] Frederick suggests that the increase in the usage of πλεονεξία in Dio Chrysostom is "unprecedented" in other Hellenistic ethical literature. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 122. Frederick suggests that this increase is evidence of "a general disdain present at the time of Paul" for the vice (125). Frederick also observes the attention paid to πλεονεξία in Musonius Rufus, which illustrates its wide usage in Roman Stoic ethical thought (131–32).

[84] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 55, 135.

[85] Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 56.

[86] Due to the usage of πλεονεξία in the LXX, Frederick cautiously suggests that Paul's usage of the term can be traced back to the LXX but also emphasizes the fact that "the term also had strong Hellenistic usage roughly around the time in which Colossians was being composed." Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 135. Of course, there may be other complementary explanations for why Paul uses the term. Luke 12:15 records Jesus warning a man who asks him to arbitrate in an inheritance dispute

Tenth Word, and there is some evidence that early Christian writers associated it with the Tenth Word specifically. Therefore, with regard to Colossians 3:5 and Ephesians 5:5, there is reason to think that Paul used πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης to describe the violation of the Tenth Commandment.[87]

Fourth, the influence of the Tenth Commandment helpfully explains the similarities between the affirmation that "covetousness is idolatry" and Romans 7:7–12. In particular, Paul identifying covetousness with idolatry parallels his broad interpretation of the Tenth Word in Romans 7:7.[88] Also, immediately prior to referencing πλεονεξία in Colossians 3:5, Paul mentions ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν, which parallels the references to ἐπιθυμία and ἐπιθυμέω in Romans 7:7–8.[89] Paul, therefore, seems to be engaging in a broad discussion of the danger of evil desire in both texts. Perhaps, the influence of the Tenth Word on Colossians 3:5, Ephesians 5:5, and Romans 7:7–12 explains the presence of these similar concepts in these three texts.

G. K. Beale notes this and suggests that ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν and πλεονεξία refer to the covetous desire of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. To support this claim, Beale argues that Colossians 3:9–10 alludes to Genesis 1–3[90] and also points to Greek Life of Adam and Eve 19.3.[91] To further support this claim, Greek Life of Adam and Eve 11.1–3,

---

against πλεονεξία. Perhaps, a partial explanation for Paul using the term is that it was remembered as an emphasis of Jesus' teaching. Frederick also emphasizes the teachings of Jesus (e.g., Mark 7:22; Luke 12:15), noting the ubiquity of the term as a vice opposed by writers from various streams of thought. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 157–58, 162.

[87] Thus, I believe Lars Hartman is correct to suggest that πλεονεξία (Col 3:5) is a reference to the Tenth Commandment and εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3:5) is a reference to the Second Commandment. Hartman, "Code and Context," 183–85.

[88] Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 275, 287–88; Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 411; Bruce, *Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 144; O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, 184.

[89] In fact, Paul lists ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν among the vices of Col 3:5, and it connects to the Tenth Word. Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 155, 175. Most likely, the influence of the Tenth Word can also be seen on this vice.

[90] On an allusion to Gen 1:26–27 in Col 3:10, see Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, BibInt 96 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 231–45.

[91] Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 287, 288–90. In Greek Life of Adam and Eve 19.3, Eve

as discussed in the previous chapter accuses Eve of exhibiting πλεονεξία, which suggests that it may have been a term associated by early Jews with Adam and Eve's sin the garden. If Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 should be understood against the background of Adam and Eve's sin, there is a strong parallel between the assertion "covetousness is idolatry" and Romans 7:7–12. In summary, there seems to be an intersection between Ephesians 5:5, Colossians 3:5, and Romans 7:7–12, which is helpfully explained by the influence of the Tenth Word.

Fifth, the influence of the Tenth Word helpfully explains a phenomenon which has puzzled interpreters: Paul unites sexual lust and material greed in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5. In Ephesians 5:5, πόρνος and ἀκάθαρτος precede πλεονέκτης, and commentators generally identify these two terms as referencing sexually immoral behavior or desire.[92] Similarly, in Colossians 3:5, the terms preceding πλεονεξία are πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, πάθος, and ἐπιθυμία, which are generally interpreted as denoting sexual misconduct.[93] When Paul lists πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία, therefore, he seems to shift suddenly from instruction regarding sexual ethics to material greed.[94]

In light of this apparent shift, some interpreters have concluded that πλεονεξία

---

states that Satan "sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit which he gave me to eat which is covetousness (τῆς ἐπιθυμίας). For covetousness (ἐπιθυμία) is of every sin" (πάσης ἁμαρτίας).

[92] Winger, *Ephesians*, 555–56; Arnold, *Ephesians*, 319–21, 324; Thielman, *Ephesians*, 328–29, 332–33; Best, *Commentary on Ephesians*, 475–76, 480–81; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 217–18, 219; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 321–22, 324–25. O'Brien takes πόρνος as a reference to sexual immorality, but he argues that ἀκάθαρτος is a broader term which encompasses sexual immorality and much more. O'Brien, *Letter to the Ephesians*, 359–60, 361–63; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 652, 659.

[93] Pao is representative when he writes, "The first four items are directly related to sins of a sexual nature." Pao, *Colossians and Philemon*, 220; McKnight, *Letter to the Colossians*, 302–5; Sumney, *Colossians*, 189–90; Of course, there is diversity regarding the specifics, with some commentators taking all four terms as a reference to sexual desire, and others suggesting some are while others only take the first two or three terms as directly referencing sexual desire. For additional discussions, see Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 273–74; Wilson, *Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, 245–46; Bruce, *Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 143; Dunn, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 213–16; O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, 181–82.

[94] Best, for example, writes, "In view of this sexual 'atmosphere' the introduction (as in 4.19) of the third term, πλεονεξία, seems surprising." Best, *Commentary on Ephesians*, 476.

and πλεονέκτης actually refer to sexual greed in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5.[95] If this is the case, Paul actually continues to instruct his readers regarding sexual behavior, and there is no need to explain a shift to material greed. In support of this claim, some commentators have suggested that the Tenth Word listing the wife as an object of covetousness explains why Paul would have used a term which denotes greed to refer to sexual lust.[96]

While these readers rightly observe that the Tenth Word influences Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5, they err by attempting to redefine πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης, terms which clearly denote greedy desire for material objects. Rosner convincingly argues that there is no evidence of πλεονεξία and πλεονέκτης being used to denote sexual greed in early Christian literature, and the survey of these terms above is consistent with his research.[97] Thus, Paul most likely refers to material greed with the terms.[98]

---

[95] Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274–75; Winger, *Ephesians*, 556; Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 186; O'Brien, *Letter to the Ephesians*, 359–60; 362–63; Dunn, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 215; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 322; Louis William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed, and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 108–9; Jean Noël Aletti, *Saint Paul, Epître aux Colossiens: introduction, traduction et commentaire* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 224–25.

[96] Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274–75; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 322. While Sumney does not suggest that πλεονεξία refers to sexual greed, he notes the Tenth Word as an explanation for how these ideas are associated. Sumney, *Colossians*, 190. Hoehner observes that the Tenth Word may be in view in Eph 5:3. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 652–53. Also, some commentators advance other arguments without appealing to the Tenth Word. Dunn, for example, argues that Plato uses πλεονεξία to refer to sexual greed in *Symposium* 182D; however, on my reading, this use actually refers to corrupt political officials with no reference to sexual desire. Of course, in the wider discussion in *Symposium*, sexual desire is very much in view, but the particular reference does not seem to involve it. While there may be other examples of πλεονεξία referring to sexual desire in the classical period, the one which Dunn proposes does not seem to fit. Dunn, *Epistles to Colossians and Philemon*, 215. Also, Beale, in addition to appealing to the Tenth Word, argues that the terms refer to both sexual and material greed, citing 1 Thess 4:3–7 as a parallel. G. K. Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 274. First Thess 4:6 states, "Let no one sin against or exploit (πλεονεκτεῖν) his brother in this matter," in a context where sexual desire is being discussed. Therefore, a good argument can be made that the related verb, πλεονεκτέω, can connote sexual exploitation. Beale, *Colossians and Philemon*, 274.

[97] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 103–15.

[98] McKnight, *Letter to the Colossians*, 305; Arnold, *Ephesians*, 319–21, 324. While many commentators advocate for the material meaning, they acknowledge the possibility of a sexual undertone due to the use of πλεονεκτέω in 1 Thess 4:6. J. Armitage Robinson, *Commentary on Ephesians: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indexes*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979), 199; Ralph P. Martin, *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*, IBC (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1991), 122.

Instead, since the Tenth Word helpfully explains that covetous desire broadly expresses itself in both sexual lust and material greed, these terms rightly belong together in a list of vices. Thus, πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία do not need to be taken as sexual greed to mesh with the context, because what the terms have in common is not that they are sexual, but that they are desires.[99] In conclusion, πλεονέκτης and πλεονεξία are best understood in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 as referring to the desire for more focused on material things, but their pairing with terms denoting sexual desire raise the likelihood that Paul intends to reference the Tenth Word.[100]

Summary. The Pauline assertion that "covetousness is idolatry" is helpfully explained by the influence of the Tenth Word for several reasons. First, the ethical teaching of both Ephesians and Colossians is Jewish in nature, so the Decalogue is a reasonable background for Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5. Second, covetousness and idolatry are connected in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, so it is reasonable that Paul would have connected them under the influence of this interpretive tradition. Third, the terms πλεονέκτης and εἰδωλολάτρης (Eph 5:5) and πλεονεξία and εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3:5) evoke the Decalogue.[101] Fourth, the influence of the Tenth Commandment helpfully explains the similarities between Ephesians 5:5, Colossians 3:5, and Romans

---

[99] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 107–8.

[100] Sumney writes, "After the first four vices have addressed sexual misconduct, the list seems to take a sharp turn with the final sin, covetousness. But perhaps the turn is not a radical break; after all, among the things one is commanded not to covet in the Decalogue is the neighbor's wife (Exod 20:17). This connection perhaps suggests why this would have seemed to be a reasonable member of this vice list." Sumney, *Colossians*, 190.

[101] In making this argument, I am making a contribution to the discussion around the interpretation of Eph 5:5 and Col 3:5. Rosner concludes that the origin of the expression "greed is idolatry" is best explained by "the comprehensive scope of the first commandment, by the characterization of idolatry in terms of evil desire, and above all by the association of wealth with apostasy." In this project, I am building on the work of Rosner by drawing attention to the role of the Tenth Commandment in shaping Paul's statements. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 99. Also, in making this argument, I am agreeing with Frederick that the teachings of Jesus form an important background for Paul's ethics in Colossians; however, I am suggesting, in contrast to Frederick, that the Tenth Commandment forms a primary background to Paul's teaching in Col 3:5. See Frederick, *Ethics of Enactment and Reception*, 162.

7:7–12. Fifth, the influence of the Tenth Word usefully explains why Paul unites sexual lust and material greed in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5.[102] In light of this evidence, the Decalogue is an appropriate background against which to understand Colossians 3:5 and Ephesians 5:5. This indicates that Paul unites the First and Second Words to the Tenth Word in his ethical instruction.[103]

What Is the Meaning of Paul's Statement?

Having concluded that the Tenth Word informs Paul's statement, "Covetousness is idolatry," I intend to briefly explore what this conclusion reveals about the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul's ethical instruction. In his comprehensive work on Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5, Rosner details the history of interpretation of this statement,[104] and concludes that it means that "the greedy are those with a strong desire to acquire and keep for themselves more and more money and possessions, because they love, trust, and obey wealth rather than God."[105] To build on this conclusion, by

---

[102] Paul's statement seems to have influenced later Christian writers. Polycarp, for example, writes, "Anyone who does not avoid love of money will be polluted by idolatry" (Pol. *Phil*. 11.2).

[103] As a clarification, I am not denying the possible role that other backgrounds may play. McKnight, for example, comments on Col 3:5: "Paul is probably intentionally evoking stories of material greed and indulgence at table and festal occasions so typical of high society in Rome." McKnight, *Letter to the Colossians*, 305. However, I am claiming that the Decalogue is a particularly prominent background.

[104] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 7–47. Fowl deals with Col 3:5 and Eph 5:5 in some detail and suggests that the doctrine of creation provides a partial explanation of Paul's language. Fowl argues that humans, being created out of nothing, are owed nothing from God. When, therefore, humanity rejects God and greedily pursues other things, they are committing idolatry. Stephen E. Fowl, *Idolatry* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019), 57–73. Fowl distinguishes himself from Rosner slightly by claiming that Rosner focuses on wealth as opposed to greed. Fowl, *Idolatry*, 147n3. Col 3:5 and Eph 5:5 have a long history of interpretation, but one example is that when Col 3:5 and Eph 5:5 are considered from the perspective of liberation theology, interpreters have often emphasized the structural sin of greed and the power capitalism holds over human societies. For example, see Luise Schottroff, "Die Befreiung vom Götzendienst der Habgier," in *Wer ist unser Gott? Beiträge zu einer Befreiungstheologie im Kontext der "ersten" Welt*, ed. Luise Schottroff and Willy Schottroff (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1986), 137–52. Johnson, reflecting on Col 3:5 and Eph 5:5, writes, "All idolatry is a form of covetousness, for by refusing to acknowledge life and worth as a gift from the Creator, it seeks to seize them from the creation as booty." Luke Timothy Johnson, *Sharing Possessions: What Faith Demands*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2011), 50. Johnson suggests that "every form of idolatry is a form of possessiveness," which explains the connection between greed and idolatry. Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 49.

[105] Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 129. While Rosner does not emphasize the influence of the Tenth Commandment on Eph 5:5 and Col 3:5, he helpfully observes, "In Jewish thought both greed and

connecting covetousness and idolatry, Paul shows that the First, Second, and Tenth Word of the Decalogue are connected in such a way that when one is violated, others are violated also.

If the Tenth Word informs Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5, then it has an influence on Paul's direct moral instruction to his congregations. Also, it would seem to influence the connection between covetousness and idolatry in Paul's mind and, in turn, his ethical instruction. Additionally, Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 reveal that Paul interprets the Tenth Word as an injunction toward faithfulness to God. While greedy desire expresses itself in human relationships, Paul sees it as a violation of exclusive worship of God, which highlights that he sees a close connection between behavior in human relationships and faithfulness to God.

Paul: 1 Corinthians 10:6–7

Paul also connects evil desire to idolatry in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7, which further suggests that Paul connects the violation of the Tenth Word to violating the First and Second Words. In this way, the Tenth Commandment shows its influences on his ethical teaching.

> But these things were examples for us, so that we might not be desirers (ἐπιθυμητὰς) of evil, just as those desired (ἐπεθύμησαν). And do not be idolaters (εἰδωλολάτραι), just as some of them. As it as written, "The people sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up to play" (παίζειν).

As he exhorts the Corinthians, Paul links evil desire, using the terms ἐπιθυμητής and ἐπιθυμέω, and idolatry, using the term εἰδωλολάτρης, in back-to-back statements. In this way, 1 Corinthians 10:6–7 fits a Pauline pattern of connecting evil desire and idolatry observed in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5.

---

idolatry involved evil desire, greed in connection with covetous grasping and idolatry from the incident of the golden calf onward. The Hebrew verb for 'covet' used in the tenth commandment, חמד ('desire, wish, crave, long for'), is used not only of another person's property (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) but also of silver and gold (Deut 7:25), treasure (Prov 21:20), and even idols (Isa 44:9)" (150).

Is, however, the connection of evil desire and idolatry merely incidental? Or, is it purely situational, that is, does Paul list evil desire and idolatry side-by-side simply and only because they both were relevant to the Corinthian situation? Or, is there reason for concluding that Paul sees a specific connection between evil desire and idolatry that is deeper than a given local situation?

Paul likely saw these two vices joined in the Corinthian situation.[106] As Joseph Fitzmyer observes, "Craving for food might lead to craving for idol meat, and so he now introduces idolatry as a specific danger."[107] However, Paul likely identified a deeper connection between evil desire and idolatry, and he may have been exhorting the Corinthians similarly to how Moses commanded the Israelites in Deuteronomy 7:25. As Moses warned the Israelites against the danger of desiring the precious metals of an idol, because idolatry would ensue, Paul may have warned the Corinthians against gluttonous and greedy desire, knowing that idolatry could result.[108] Paul, therefore, may have listed evil desire and idolatry side-by-side both because they were relevant to the Corinthians situation *and* because he saw a specific connection between the two.[109]

Additionally, it is reasonable to see the Decalogue in the background of 1

---

[106] Still III writes, "The sins in which the desire for evil things is expressed are both grounded in the wilderness traditions and relevant to the current situation at Corinth." Elias Coye Still III, "The Rationale behind the Pauline Instructions on Food Offered to Idols: A Study of the Relationship between 1 Corinthians 4:6–21 and 8:1–11:1" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2000), 180.

[107] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, AB, vol. 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 385.

[108] Additionally, Shen suggests that Paul conceives of idolatry in terms of indulgence in some cases, and this fits with 1 Cor 10:7. Michael Li-Tak Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*, StBibLit 83 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 66–67. To advance Shen's observation, the proximity of Paul's warning about evil desire (1 Cor 10:6), makes sense if Paul saw indulgence as a route to idolatry. Similarly, Collier suggests, "It was eating and drinking in an idol feast in an attempt to fulfill their own desires." G. D. Collier, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil': The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10.1-13," *JSNT* 55 (January 1995): 66.

[109] Minear concludes that Paul saw idolatry as a form of desiring evil. Also, however, he targeted it, and the other topics of his exhortation, because he saw them as specific dangers to his audience. Paul Sevier Minear, "Paul's Teaching on the Eucharist in First Corinthians," *Worship* 44, no. 2 (February 1970): 87. Hwang rightly observes that the themes of eating and drinking do not fully explain Paul's use of Exod 32:6. Jerry Hwang, "Turning the Tables on Idol Feasts: Paul's Use of Exodus 32:6 in 1 Corinthians 10:7," *JETS* 54, no. 3 (September 2011): 584.

Corinthians 10:6–7. In chapter 3, I argued that 1 Corinthians 10:6 is best understood in light of the Tenth Word. Additionally, εἰδωλολάτρης (1 Cor 10:7) is a term which is readily understood against the background of the Second Word, as demonstrated above. Paul, therefore, places exhortations connected to the Tenth and Second Words, respectively, side-by-side in his moral instruction, which makes it unlikely that the proximity of these statements is incidental. In addition to the use of the term εἰδωλολάτρης, Paul gives another reason for reading 1 Corinthians 10:6–7 against the background of the Decalogue when he quotes Exodus 32:6 LXX in 1 Corinthians 10:7.[110] With this citation, drawn from the infamous golden calf narrative (Exod 32), Paul evokes the experience of Israel at Sinai, and by extension the Decalogue.[111]

Exodus 32 is in sharp and specific contrast with the Decalogue, which can be seen by its placement in Exodus.[112] After the giving of the Decalogue (Exod 20:1–17),

---

[110] Exod 32:6 LXX: καὶ ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. Paul may have chosen to cite Exod 32:6, because it was the concluding phrase of a section of the narrative, or he may have chosen it, because it explicitly referenced eating, which would have connected to the Corinthian situation. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014), 502. Ciampa and Rosner concur with Fee but challenge the specificity of his conclusions. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 457; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 461. For a treatment of this citation, see Shen, *Canaan to Corinth*, 64–67.

[111] As noted in the previous chapter, Exod 32:6 is the only explicit citation of Scripture in the immediate context, so some commentators have interpreted it as the primary text in view. Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 456; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 91–94. However, I have argued that Num 11 is the primary text in view. While the golden calf narrative occurs in both Exod 32 and Deut 9, I am focusing on Exod 32 due to the citation of Exod 32:6. For a comparative reading of these two narratives, see Tracy J. McKenzie, *Idolatry in the Pentateuch: An Innertextual Strategy* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010).

[112] For a focused treatment of the literary context of Exod 32:6 and the way it influences Paul's use of it, see Hwang, "Turning Tables on Idol Feasts," 573–87. Exod 32 had a profound effect on Jewish thinking regarding idolatry. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry*, 73–74. In the Hebrew Bible, the golden calf is directly referenced in Deut 9:8–21, Neh 9:16–18, and Ps 106:19–23, which demonstrates its importance. Krašovec, however, reaches a different conclusion from the same data, arguing that the golden calf incident is referenced rarely in the Hebrew Bible. Jože Krašovec, *Reward, Punishment, and Forgiveness: The Thinking and Beliefs of Ancient Israel in the Light of Greek and Modern Views*, VTSup 78 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1999), 103–5. Beale, however, traces some of the references to the golden calf idolatry in the Hebrew Bible, which further confirms that it was a definitive event. G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008), 86–122. Also, MacDonald traces some of the intertextual connections between the golden calf incident and the canonical narrative of the Hebrew Bible. See MacDonald, "Recasting the Golden Calf". For early Jewish interpretation of Exod 32, see Pekka Lindqvist, *Sin at Sinai: Early Judaism Encounters Exodus*, Studies in Rewritten Bible 2 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008). On the history of interpretation of Exod 32, see Scott M. Langston, *Exodus through the Centuries*, BNTC (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 231–53; Leivy

God gave a series of instructions to Moses which expand on it (Exod 20:22–23:33), which are then followed by instructions regarding the building of the Tabernacle (Exod 25:1–31:17). Exodus 32 takes place immediately after these events, which highlights that it is a direct rejection of God's law, including, of course, the Ten Words. However, the Decalogue is placed front and center, because YHWH spoke only one part of the law to the people of Israel directly, and it was the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:22; Deut 5:22). This means that the sin of the golden calf is presented as a rejection of the Ten Words specifically. Since Israel corporately heard the Ten Commandments, it is the part of the law which they corporately and knowingly rejected. As Roger Brooks points out, the Ten Commandments "provides the legislative foil for the upcoming incident regarding the golden calf."[113] Therefore, the creation of the golden calf is not only the rejection of the God's law in general but particularly the violation of the Ten Words. More specifically, when Israel asks Aaron to create the golden calf, they are clearly violating the Second Word. As John I. Durham writes, "In demanding such an image, the people have violated, first of all, the second commandment."[114] Or, as Douglas K. Stuart writes, "Yahweh was now being represented by an idol, the very sort of thing forbidden clearly by the second word/commandment."[115] Also, the breaking of the tablets of the testimony emphasizes that the Decalogue was violated in Exodus 32. Immediately preceding the golden calf episode, Exodus 31:18 describes how God gave Moses "two tablets of the testimony" (שְׁנֵי לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת), and the same point is reemphasized in Exodus 32:15–16 as Moses heads

---

Smolar and Moshe Aberbach, "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature," *HUCA* 39 (1968): 91–116.

[113] Roger Brooks, *The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 30.

[114] Durham, *Exodus*, 422.

[115] Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus*, NAC, vol. 2 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 665. For a discussion of the precise nature of the sin perpetrated in the golden calf narrative, see McKenzie, *Idolatry in the Pentateuch*, 112–15.

down Sinai to investigate. As is made clear in the Pentateuch, the content of these tablets was the Ten Words (Exod 24:28; Deut 4:13, 5:22, 9:10).[116] In reaction to what he sees, Moses smashes these tablets (Exod 32:19), which communicates that Israel had broken their covenant with God.[117] Therefore, the narrative seems to communicate that Moses interpreted the actions of Israel as a clear violation of the Decalogue, which partially explains the symbolic action of breaking the tablets. Additionally, while God rewrites the tablets, it is only after the sin of the golden calf has been addressed (Exod 34:1–28). As Nathan MacDonald writes, "The narrative flow of Exodus 32–34 does not allow the calf and the tablets to coexist. When Moses sees the calf he smashes the tablets, and only when the sin of the calf has been fully resolved are the tablets remade."[118] Therefore, the golden calf narrative is integrally related to the Decalogue.

In conclusion, since Paul references Exodus 32 in 1 Corinthians 10:7, there is good reason for seeing the Decalogue in the background of the exhortations in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7.[119] Also, as Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5 show, a connection between the Tenth Word and idolatry coheres with Paul's moral instruction elsewhere.[120] Therefore, I would suggest that a reasonable, if partial, explanation for Paul connecting evil desire and idolatry in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7 is the Tenth Word.

---

[116] In Exodus, there is a degree of ambiguity regarding the content of these tablets, but Exod 34:28 is explicit that the second copy of the tablets had the Ten Words on them. Deuteronomy further clarifies that the content of the two tablets was the Ten Commandments specifically (Deut 4:13, 5:22, 9:10).

[117] Childs writes, "He threw down the tablets and shattered them . . . to dramatize the end of the covenant." Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 569. Stuart notes that Moses broke the tablets at the same location where the people heard the Ten Words (cf. Exod 19:17, 32:19). Stuart, *Exodus*, 677.

[118] MacDonald, "Recasting the Golden Calf," 29.

[119] Hwang argues that the theme of covenant breaking and restoration is in the background of Paul's use of Exod 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7, which further highlights how this citation evokes the Decalogue. Hwang, "Turning Tables on Idol Feasts."

[120] Schreiner insightfully notes this connection: "An interesting connection between verses 6 and 7 should be noted. The sin in verse 6 is about evil desire, but elsewhere in Paul coveting is identified as idolatry (Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5). Even though a different Greek word is used in these latter texts for coveting (pleonexia), the words are in the same semantic range and the conception is the same." Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, TNTC (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 202–3.

Turning to the main question of this project, how is the Tenth Word influencing Paul's moral instruction in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7? Paul directly exhorts the Corinthians with the use of an imperative, writing, "And do not be (γίνεσθε) idolaters, just as some of them. As it as written, 'The people sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up to play.'" Thus, the connection between evil desire and idolatry serves a purpose in Paul's moral instruction as he warns his congregations about the dangers of both. Perhaps, Paul cautioned against the danger of evil desire and idolatry in close proximity, because he knew that the commission of one could lead to committing the other.

Additionally, Paul has a clear ethical purpose in referencing Exodus 32:6.[121] As Richard B. Hays writes,

> Paul's quotation from Exodus, by coaxing the reader to recall the golden calf story, links the present Corinthian dilemma (whether to eat meat offered to idols) to the larger and older story of Israel in the wilderness. This metaphorical act creates the imaginative framework within which Paul judges—and invites his readers to judge—the proper ethical response to the problem at hand.[122]

By citing Exodus 32:6, Paul warns the Corinthians against committing the sins prohibited by the Ten Words—specifically, covetousness and idolatry.[123] If the Corinthians allow covetousness to exist in themselves or their community, they will find themselves in the same position as the Israelites in Exodus 32; therefore, the appropriate response is to reject evil desire and idolatry. By appealing to the Decalogue, Paul effectively impresses on his readers the seriousness of his warning.[124] While they might

---

[121] At the most basic level, Paul "quotes it to demonstrate the displeasure of God with idolatry." Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1–11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*, LNTS 299 (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 162. Or, as Gardner writes, "The command is clear. There must be no taking part in the sort of cultic idolatry that is referred to in the account of Exodus 32." Paul Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 434.

[122] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*, 92.

[123] As Thompson writes, "The negative examples become the basis for the moral appeals not to repeat the sins of idolatry and sexual immorality." Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 114.

[124] Hwang observes, "Paul's argument against idol feasts in 1 Corinthians 8–11 stands in the tradition of the OT's hortatory recitals of apostasy in Exodus 32, most notably Deuteronomy 9–10 and Psalm 106." Hwang, "Turning Tables on Idol Feasts," 584–85.

be tempted to see their behavior as inconsequential, they are dangerously close to following the pattern of covenant unfaithfulness laid out by Israel. While Paul does not explicitly state in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7 that evil desire leads to idolatry, there is good reason for thinking that he would agree with that assertion, which partly explains the severity of his warning. If the Corinthians allow evil desire to take root, idolatry will be the result.[125]

Conclusion

In the Hebrew Bible, idolatry is connected to the violation of the Tenth Word, and early Jewish literature continues this trajectory. Paul makes a similar connection in Ephesians 5:5, Colossians 3:5, and 1 Corinthians 10:7. Paul, therefore, seems to have connected the first word(s) of the Decalogue to its final word when teaching his congregations, demonstrating the influence of the Tenth Word on his moral instruction.

In many cases, writers have observed that the First and Second Words of the Decalogue may be connected to the Tenth Word by virtue of their respective placements at the beginning and end of the Ten Commandments. Louis Smith, for example, argues that idolatry pairs with covetousness in the structure of the Decalogue, signifying that envy is fundamental to sin.[126] Regarding Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5, Miller writes,

> The Tenth Commandment represents a kind of inclusion, returning to the most fundamental issue of all, what one finds in the first two commandments, the proper relation to God. What Paul discerned is the power of greed to turn the heart away from true devotion to God and create objects of great desire, the kind of desire that

---

[125] Sandelin notes a similarity between Paul and Philo: "For Paul there is also a link between idolatry and passions as for Philo (1. Cor. 10, 8; cf. Rom. 1, 23-26). And finally Paul uses and interprets Old Testament stories, especially from Exodus, in his attempts to keep the Corinthians away from pagan religion (1. Cor. 10, 1-10)." Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria," *Temenos - Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* 27 (1991): 143.

[126] Smith, "Original Sin as 'Envy'." While Smith may not succeed in demonstrating that the structure of the Decalogue is chiastic, his argument seems to hold true conceptually. Also, Christensen notes the parallels between the First and Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, 113–15.

belongs rightly only to the heart's love of God.[127]

However, whether Paul saw significance in the shape of the Decalogue or not, he connected covetousness and idolatry, demonstrating the influence of the Tenth Word on his moral instruction.

As a final question, is it possible to say what the specific connection between the violation of the First and Second Words and the violation of the Tenth Word is for Paul? Paul seems to affirm two distinct, but similar, ideas. First, when a person covets, they are committing idolatry. Second, when a person covets, it leads them into idolatry. While these two ideas are distinct, they are complementary, because Paul was writing in a context where he needed to warn his congregations about the dangers of both metaphorical and literal idolatry. For Paul, covetousness is a precipitating factor for idolatry; however, covetous desire itself is a form of idolatry as well.

[127] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 411.

CHAPTER 5

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT AND THE SECOND TABLE

In this chapter, I argue that Paul's instructions to his congregations suggest that he viewed violating the Tenth Word as leading to the violation of other commands from the second table of the Decalogue. In the Hebrew Bible, covetousness is connected to murder, adultery, stealing, and false witness (Josh 7; 2 Sam 11–12; 1 Kgs 21), and early Jewish literature also evidences this interpretation. Paul, similarly, cites the majority of the second table together, including the Tenth Word (Rom 13:9), and directly connects covetousness to sexual immorality (1 Cor 10:6–8; 1 Thess 4:3–7), evidencing that he connected breaking the Tenth Commandment to the violation of the other prohibitions of the second table of the Decalogue.

Second Table of the Decalogue

The Pentateuch records that YHWH wrote the Decalogue with his own finger on two tablets of stone (Exod 24:12; 31:18; 34:28; Deut 4:13; 5:22; 9:10; 10:1, 3). The term *second table* of the Decalogue has been used to refer to the contents of the second stone tablet. Philo and Josephus represent an ancient interpretive tradition which maintained that the Ten Commandments were divided into two sets of five injunctions, and the Sixth through Tenth Commandments were the second table of the Decalogue. Philo describes this in detail in *On the Decalogue*:

> We find that He divided the ten into two sets of five which He engraved on two tables, and the first five obtained the first place, while the other was awarded the second. Both are excellent and profitable for life; both open out broad highroads leading at the end to a single goal, roads along which a soul which ever desires the best can travel without stumbling. The superior set of five treats of the following matters: the monarchical principle by which the world is governed: idols of stone and wood and images in general made by human hands: the sin of taking the name

> of God in vain: the reverent observance of the sacred seventh day as befits its holiness: the duty of honouring parents, each separately and both in common. Thus one set of enactments begins with God the Father and Maker of all, and ends with parents who copy His nature by begetting particular persons. The other set of five contains all the prohibitions, namely adultery, murder, theft, false witness, covetousness or lust. (*Decalogue* 50–52; cf. *Heir* 167–73)

Similarly, Josephus writes, "Within this ark he deposited the two tables, whereon had been recorded the ten commandments, five on each of them, and two and a half on either face" (*Ant*. 3.138).[1]

This way of categorizing the Decalogue is ancient, but is it legitimate? In answering this question, there are two angles from which to approach: historical and ethical. Taking the historical angle, the Hebrew Bible is largely silent regarding how the commandments were inscribed on or divided between the stone tablets.[2] Despite this silence, it is rather unlikely that they were divided between the two tablets into two groups of five, because the first five are significantly longer than the second.[3] Also, in light of ANE evidence, some have concluded that the two tablets would have been two identical copies of the Decalogue.[4] Beyond these tentative observations, however, it is

---

[1] Josephus enumerates the Ten Commandments in the same way as Philo in *Antiquities* 3.90–92, so the injunctions which they identify as the second table of the Decalogue are identical. In contrast to Philo and Josephus, later Christian interpreters, such as Abrosiaster (*Quast*. *Vet*. *Novi Test*. 7.2) and Augustine (*Quaest*. *Hept*. 2.71.1–2; *Faust*. 15.7; *Let*. 55.11.20) divided the tables differently by placing the Fifth Commandment (honoring parents) on the second table. Hakala helpfully summarizes the history of interpretation of the division between the first and second tables of the Decalogue in later interpretation. Diane L. Hakala, "Jesus Said 'Keep the Commandments' and the Rich Man Asked, 'Which Ones?': The Decalogue as a Law Summary in the Story of the Rich Man," in *Searching the Scriptures: Studies in Context and Intertextuality*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Jeremiah J. Johnston, LNTS 543 (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 177–80.

[2] As Childs summarizes, "Nowhere in the biblical tradition is there indication of how the commandments were to be divided." Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 395. Exod 32:15 provides the most detail regarding the way the tablets were inscribed: "Tablets written on both sides, written on one side and the other" (לֻחֹת כְּתֻבִים מִשְּׁנֵי עֶבְרֵיהֶם מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה הֵם כְּתֻבִים). However, this does not shed light on which prohibitions were written on which tablet or whether the entire Decalogue was repeated on both.

[3] As Derby summarizes, "Specifically, the total number of words in the Decalogue as stated in Exodus is 172 (there are more in the Deuteronomic version). The first five commandments consist of 146 words and the second five of only 26 words." Josiah Derby, "The Two Tablets of the Covenant," *JBQ* 21, no. 2 (April 1993): 74–75.

[4] Derby, therefore, argues that the entirety of the Ten Words would have been inscribed on each tablet, supporting his argument with archeological evidence and comparison with Hittite treaties. Derby, "Two Tablets of Covenant," 77–79. Also see Meredith G. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975), 113–30. Baker, however, defends the view that the Decalogue

difficult to say anything with certainty regarding how the Ten Words may have been inscribed on the tablets. Thus, the term *second table* of the Decalogue should not be used as a historical description of which commands were written on the second stone tablet.

However, turning to the second angle, there is an ethical rationale for dividing the Ten Commandments into two tables. As many readers have observed, there seems to be a clear division in the Decalogue between commandments which focus on relating to God and those which focus on relating to people. Brevard Childs, for example, writes, "The grouping of commands in the beginning of the series which refer solely to God stands in contrast to the following commands which relate to one's fellows."[5] In light of this, while the term *second table* of the Decalogue should not be used as historical description, it can helpfully function as an ethical one.

While there is debate regarding which commandments should be categorized as a part of which table,[6] I use the division of the Decalogue which seemed to have be in use at the time of Paul.[7] By using the term *second table* of the Decalogue, therefore, I am referring to the Sixth through Tenth Commands. To restate the thesis of this chapter in light of this discussion, by arguing that Paul connected covetousness to transgressing the

---

was divided between the two tablets, although he suggests that the commands were most likely not divided into two equal groups of five. David L. Baker, "Ten Commandments, Two Tablets: The Shape of the Decalogue," *Themelios* 30, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 8–10; Baker, *The Decalogue: Living as the People of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017), 6–9.

[5] Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 395. Kaufman observes that the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Commandments are significantly shorter than the preceding ones, which may imply a division within the Decalogue itself. He also suggests that Jer 7:9 and Hos 4:2 may indicate that these commandments were associated together. Additionally, he points to other ANE law codes which seem to indicate that murder, adultery, theft, and lying was a summary of their law. In light of this, he concludes that a division of the law might have been inherent in the Decalogue. Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Second Table of the Decalogue and the Implicit Categories of Ancient Near Eastern Law," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, ed. John H. Marks and Robert McClive Good (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987), 111.

[6] Hakala helpfully charts the alternatives. Hakala, "Jesus Said 'Keep the Commandments'," 177–80.

[7] As Hakala concludes, "It appears that before the NT, the extant division of the tables was five on each." Hakala, "Jesus Said 'Keep the Commandments'," 180.

second table of the Decalogue, I am arguing that Paul connected the violation of the Tenth Word to the Sixth (murder), Seventh (adultery), Eighth (stealing), and Ninth (false witness) Commandments.

The Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible, covetousness is connected to murder, adultery, stealing, and false witness in multiple narratives where envious, greedy, and lustful desire leads to injustice. Cain enviously murders Abel (Gen 4:3–5),[8] Potiphar's wife lustfully propositions Joseph and bears false witness against him when he refuses (Gen 39:6–20),[9] and Dinah (Gen 34:2)[10] and Tamar (2 Sam 13:1–14) are raped when Shechem and Amnon violently act on their unrestrained lust.[11] In each of these narratives, greedy or lustful desire leads to murderous and adulterous actions. But the connections between the Tenth Word and the second table of the Decalogue are exceptionally clear in three narratives in the Hebrew Bible: the sin of Achan (Josh 7), the Bathsheba affair (2 Sam 11–12), and the taking of Naboth's vineyard (1 Kgs 21). In each of these narratives, disregard for the Tenth Commandment leads to breaking other commandments from the second table of the Decalogue.

Joshua 7

In the wake of the triumph over Jericho, Joshua 7 describes the sin of Achan.

---

[8] On the question of why Cain murdered Abel, see Callie Joubert, "Genesis 4:8: Why Did Cain Murder His Brother?," *Conspectus* 26 (September 2018): 99–113.

[9] Miller writes, "Coveting the handsome young man, Potiphar's wife seeks to seduce him and, when that fails, brings about his imprisonment by false accusations." Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 369–70.

[10] Of course, the events of Gen 4:3–5, 34:2, and 39:6–20 take place before the Decalogue in the canonical narrative of the Hebrew Bible; however, that does not negate the pattern observable in these narratives.

[11] While a detailed discussion of the connection of rape to the Decalogue is outside the purview of this project, rape is a particularly heinous violation of the Ten Words. In my view, it should be located at the intersection of the Sixth and Seventh Words, where violence meets sexual transgression.

This takes place against the background of a warning from Joshua: "But you, keep yourselves from the things devoted to destruction,[12] lest when you have devoted[13] them you take any of the devoted things and make the camp of Israel a thing for destruction and bring trouble upon it. But all silver and gold, and every vessel of bronze and iron, are holy to the Lord; they shall go into the treasury of the Lord" (Josh 6:18–19).[14] In violation of this order, Achan took "from the devoted things" (מִן־הַחֵרֶם; Josh 7:1).[15] He is eventually discovered and confesses, "Indeed, I sinned against YHWH, the God of Israel, and I did this: I saw among the spoil one beautiful robe from Shinar (אַדֶּרֶת שִׁנְעָר),[16] one hundred shekels of silver, and one bar of gold fifty shekels in weight, and I coveted them (וָאֶחְמְדֵם), and I took them" (Josh 7:20–21). Achan uses חמד (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) to describe how he desired the forbidden plunder (Josh 7:21), showing that he acted in violation of the Tenth Word.[17] In addition to the presence of this lexeme, his confession

---

[12] For a recent discussion of the root חרם and its meaning and implications, see Arie Versluis, "Devotion and/or Destruction? The Meaning and Function of חרם in the Old Testament," *ZAW* 128, no. 2 (2016): 233–46. E. E. Meyer approaches the question from the perspective of source criticism. E. E. Meyer, "The חֵרֶם in Joshua 6 and 7, Influenced by P?," *Acta Theologica* 26 (2018): 71–87.

[13] While I have rendered תַּחֲרִימוּ, there is some textual support for a form of חמד. For discussion, see Trent C. Butler, *Joshua 1-12*, 2nd ed. WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2014), 351; Adolph L. Harstad, *Joshua*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2004), 284–85; Robert G. Boling, *Joshua*, AB, vol. 6 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 201, 203. For the purposes of my argument, the confession of Achan in Josh 7:21 provides a direct reference to covetousness, whether or not it is present in Josh 6:18 also.

[14] As Hawk observes, "The command is important thematically, because it not only asserts the radical otherness of this Canaanite city but also foreshadows Achan's transgression." L. Daniel Hawk, *Joshua*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 102. Also see Hartmut N. Rösel, *Joshua*, HCOT (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011), 102; Harstad, *Joshua*; Marten H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 114; Boling, *Joshua*, 207. Joshua's command seems to be a restatement of Moses' command in Deut 7:25–26. Carolyn Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, WBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 56–57. While Achan does not desire and take idols, his actions are in direct defiance to this similar command from Moses. Hawk, *Joshua*, 122. While this connection should not be overstated, because Josh 7 does not mention idolatry, Achan seems to act in direct contradiction to the warning of Deut 7:25 by coveting silver and gold and taking them. If this is the case, it creates an additional link within the Hebrew Bible between texts which address covetousness.

[15] Harstad, *Joshua*, 321–22; Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 106.

[16] Although it is not particularly germane to my argument, it is worth noting for translation purposes that אַדֶּרֶת שִׁנְעָר is taken as a reference to clothing from a geographic region in lower Mesopotamia. Butler, *Joshua 1-12*, 413. However, see David M. Stec, "The Mantle Hidden by Achan," *VT* 41, no. 3 (July 1991): 356–59.

[17] Harstad, *Joshua*, 321–22; Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, 129–30; R. E. Clements, "Achan's

reveals that he engaged in coveting by seeing desirable objects, wanting to obtain them, and following through on his desire by taking them.[18]

YHWH interprets the significance of Achan's actions in Joshua 7:11: "they have stolen (גָּנְבוּ), and they have deceived" (כִּחֲשׁוּ). YHWH accuses Achan of theft using גנב, which is the verb from the Eighth Word (Exod 20:11; Deut 5:17). As Joshua's order made clear (Josh 6:18–19), the spoil from Jericho belonged to YHWH, so the theft is directed against him.[19] Also, YHWH describes Achan's actions as deceitful using the term כחשׁ. Although this is not the term used in the Ninth Word, it is conceptually related to false witness and frequently used in the Hebrew Bible to describe similar actions (see Lev 5:21–22; 19:11; Hos 4:2).[20] YHWH, therefore, seems to accuse Achan of acting in violation of the Ninth Word, and this is even more probable when the direct references to the Eighth and Tenth Words in the surrounding context are considered. Joshua 7:1–26, therefore, connects the violation of the Tenth Commandment to theft and possibly false witness.[21]

Sin: Warfare and Holiness," in *Shall Not the Judge of All the Earth Do What Is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*, ed. Paul L. Redditt and David Penchansky (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 115; Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 57–59.

[18] Pressler identifies parallels between Achan's actions and the primal sin in Gen 3. Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, 58. If the Tenth Word is connected to both narratives, this parallel is unsurprising.

[19] Achan stealing from YHWH likely explains the utilization of capital punishment. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 333–35.

[20] Without question, the Ninth Word primarily forbids false witness in legal contexts; however, there is evidence in the Hebrew Bible that the prohibition was understood as forbidding all dishonesty. Baker, *The Decalogue*, 135–38. For a survey of the Ninth Word, see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 343–86. For a comprehensive treatment of lying in the Old Testament, see Martin A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem Alten Testament: ihr Begriff, ihre Bedeutung und ihre Beurteilung* (Zürich, Switzerland: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1964).

[21] Also, Josh 7:11 clarifies that the fundamental offense against YHWH is breaking covenant. Butler, *Joshua 1-12*, 411; Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, 124. Of course, the Decalogue is an expression of the covenant terms of YHWH. In general, commentators recognize that YHWH charges Israel with the specific crimes of theft and deceit. Hawk, for example, writes, "YHWH goes on to accuse the nation of theft, deceit, and unlawful possession." Hawk, *Joshua*, 117; Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, 126; Nelson, *Joshua*, 105. However, these crimes are rarely connected to the Decalogue by interpreters, and Boling even comments, "No specific treaty stipulation can be cited." Boling, *Joshua*, 225.

Achan covets something designated for YHWH, not something belonging to a neighbor, but his actions make sense against the background of the Tenth Word. As argued in previous chapters, covetousness can describe desire set on objects which YHWH has forbidden, even if those objects do not belong to a neighbor. Genesis 2–3, for example, uses the language of covetousness to describe the desire of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Also, Deuteronomy 7:25 shows that idolatrous desire can be characterized as covetousness, because it is directed toward something which YHWH has forbidden. Similarly, in Joshua 7:20–21, Achan confesses his violation of the Tenth Word, because he set his desire on an object forbidden by YHWH, even though it was the spoils of victory.[22] Achan, therefore, violates the Tenth Word by coveting what is forbidden by YHWH, even though it does not belong to a neighbor.[23]

Joshua 7 reveals that covetousness leads to violating other commands from the Decalogue. Achan is accused of taking and possessing forbidden objects (7:1, 11–15), but his confession clarifies that covetousness was the fundamental cause of his behavior (Josh 7:20–21). Joshua 7, therefore, recounts covetousness motivating Achan to commit theft and deceit.[24] Also, the narrative shows that the covetousness of Achan brings judgment and disaster on his community.[25] By violating the Tenth Word, he causes Israel to suffer a military defeat (Josh 7:4–5, 10–13) and brings the consequences of his sin on

---

[22] Achan does not desire and take idols, but his actions are a direct rejection of similar command from Moses. Hawk, *Joshua*, 122.

[23] Miller writes, "Here we do not have an act against the neighbor, but we do see an inordinate desire for money or its equivalent that leads an otherwise loyal citizen to act in a way that violates the commandment and sets the community in danger." Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 399.

[24] Miller writes, "As in other stories of coveting, Achan's avarice leads to violation of other commandments." Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 399.

[25] For diverse approaches to corporate responsibility for the sin of Achan, see Joshua A Berman, "The Making of the Sin of Achan (Joshua 7)," *BibInt* 22, no. 2 (2014): 115–31; Clements, "Achan's Sin"; Joel S. Kaminsky, "Joshua 7: A Reassessment of Israelite Conceptions of Corporate Punishment," in *The Pitcher Is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*, LHBOTS 190 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 315–36.

him and his family (Josh 7:15, 24–26).[26]

2 Samuel 11–12

Second Samuel 11:2 describes David watching a beautiful woman bathing. When he investigated her identity, he discovered that her name was Bathsheba, and she was the wife of his neighbor, Uriah (2 Sam 11:3). While the nature of David's attraction to Bathsheba is not explicitly described, the neighbor's wife is one of the listed objects in the Tenth Word. Also, David's ensuing actions show that he coveted Bathsheba.[27] He went on to take her and commit adultery with her, violating the Seventh Commandment (2 Sam 11:4).[28] In rapid succession, David sees Bathsheba, identifies her as desirable, and acts to obtain her, showing that he transgressed the Tenth Commandment.[29]

---

[26] Josh 7:1–26 has an ethical goal. Pressler writes, "The story of Ai is a cautionary tale, urging obedience lest one suffer the fate of Achan." Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, 54.

[27] Miller writes, "The Tenth Commandment is fully in view and violated as much as the commandment against adultery. It is David's inordinate desire for this beautiful woman that leads him to take her and sin against his neighbor." Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 302. Camp identifies parallels between 2 Samuel and Genesis, noticing the similarities of seeing and enticement leading to the action of taking. Philip G. Camp, "David's Fall: Reading 2 Samuel 11-14 in Light of Genesis 2-4," *Restoration Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (2011): 153–54. Tsumura also identifies parallels. David Toshio Tsumura, *The Second Book of Samuel*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2019), 176.

[28] On the violation of the Seventh Word in 2 Sam 11–12, see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 301–3; Tsumura, *The Second Book of Samuel*, 173, 178, 185. While it is possible to speculate regarding Bathsheba's emotions or intentions in the narrative, the text is silent. Robert Alter, *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999), 251. On the question of whether or not the interaction between David and Bathsheba is best described as adultery or rape, see Abasili, who argues that it is not described as rape. Alexander Izuchukwu Abasili, "Was It Rape? The David and Bathsheba Pericope Re-Examined," *VT* 61, no. 1 (2011): 1–15. Andruska, however, argues that it is. Jennifer Lynn Andruska, "'Rape' in the Syntax of 2 Samuel 11:4," *ZAW* 129, no. 1 (2017): 103–9; Jacqueline Grey, "A Prophetic Call to Repentance: David, Bathsheba and a Royal Abuse of Power," *Pneuma* 41, no. 1 (June 2019): 9–25.

[29] As Abasili notes, "There are indications that at the moment David saw Bathsheba, he became aroused and strongly desired her sexually." Abasili, "Was It Rape?," 8. Also see Steven L. McKenzie, *King David: A Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 157. Bailey, however, suggests, "The attempts to describe the events in 2 Sam 11.2-27 in terms of sexual lust gone awry and to concentrate on the psychological motivation of the characters are predicated on the reader's speculations. This is the case, since the narrator neither describes the scenes in lustful terms nor does the narrator present any indication of these emotions and motivations." Randall C. Bailey, *David in Love and War: The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10–12*, JSOTSup 75 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 83; cf. 42–44. However, this way of reading the narrative seems rather wooden. On the one hand, McCarter is correct to note that "the narrator gives us no clue to David's motives in his conduct toward Bathsheba." P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *2 Samuel*, AB, vol. 9 (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 289. But the fact that the narrative begins by describing David watching Bathsheba bathing (2 Sam 11:2) suggests sexual desire. Therefore, attributing covetousness to David, a simple and exegetically grounded observation, must be distinguished from the complex motivations traced by Anderson, for example. A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel*, WBC (Waco,

In the wake of violating the Seventh and Tenth Words, David also violates the Sixth Word by committing murder in an attempted coverup. After an initial plan fails (2 Sam 11:6–13), David orders Joab to put Uriah in a battlefield scenario in which he will be killed (2 Sam 11:14–15). After Uriah dies (2 Sam 11:16–17), David takes Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:27). In addition to murder and adultery, David engages in deception by attempting to hide his wrongdoing, and he takes Bathsheba for himself. David, therefore, may also violate the commands against stealing and false witness in a general assault against the rights of his neighbor.

Nathan confronts David in the aftermath of these events, and his accusations further clarify that David violated the Decalogue.[30] In particular, he expresses that YHWH holds David responsible for the murder of Uriah when he states, "You struck down (הִכִּיתָ) Uriah the Hittite with the sword," and by accusing, "You killed him (הָרַגְתָּ) with the sword of the Ammonites" (2 Sam 12:9). According to Nathan, while David did not wield the weapon himself which ended Uriah's life, he is directly responsible for Uriah's death.[31] In 2 Samuel 11–12, נכה (2 Sam 11:15, 12:9) and הרג (2 Sam 12:9) are used to describe David's actions toward Uriah. While the Sixth Word uses רצח (Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17), נכה and הרג are terms which the Hebrew Bible also uses to prohibit unlawful killing, and even associates with the Sixth Word. Patrick Miller observes regarding נכה, "This is the same language used in the statute having to do with the Sixth Commandment in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 21:12) and often in the detailed

---

TX: Word Books, 1989), 155–56.

[30] Nathan indicts David with fundamental discontentment with the provision of YHWH, which sheds light on the nature of his covetousness (2 Sam 12:8). Bernd Wannenwetsch, "You Shall Not Kill—What Does It Take? Why We Need the Other Commandments If We Are to Abstain from Killing," in *I Am the Lord Your God: Christian Reflections on the Ten Commandments*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Christopher R. Seitz (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 163.

[31] Alter writes, "The obliquity of working through agents at a distance, as David did in contriving the murder of Uriah, is exploded by the brutal directness of the language: it is though David himself had wielded the sword." Alter, *The David Story*, 259.

statutes having to do with killing in Numbers 35."[32] To add to this observation, הרג can also be used to refer to murderous acts in legal texts (e.g., Exod 21:14). Nathan, therefore, charges David with murder. As Nathan indicts David, it is clear that YHWH charges him with the act of taking his neighbor's wife for himself, which could be understood as an act of theft (2 Sam 12:6, 9–10).[33] As Nathan communicates, David did not simply violate a communally accepted standard of right and wrong. Nathan asks, "Why have you despised (בָּזִיתָ) the word of YHWH (אֶת־דְּבַר יְהוָה) to do what is evil in his eyes?" (2 Sam 2:9). When Nathan declares that David has violated the word of YHWH, it may be a reference to the Decalogue.[34]

Although 2 Samuel 11–12 does not explicitly mention any of the prohibitions of the Decalogue, it presents David as violating at least the Sixth, Seventh, and Tenth Words. Also, coveting is temporally and logically prior to adultery and murder in the narrative, showing that it was the precipitating factor.[35] Second Samuel 11–12, therefore, presents the violation of the Tenth Word leading to violating other commands from the second table.

Second Samuel 11–12 contributes to an understanding of the Tenth Word by showing the grave possibilities for harm when it is violated. David begins by coveting what belongs to Uriah, but Uriah shortly ends up dead. As Miller insightfully notes, "In this as in other stories, one sees how the commandments form a protective fence around the neighbor; their breach by any act may involve other violations of the neighbor's right

---

[32] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 259. For a discussion of Num 35, see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 224. For a discussion of the Sixth Word in Exod 20:22–23:19, see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 228–31.

[33] David Janzen, "The Condemnation of David's 'Taking' in 2 Samuel 12:1-14," *JBL* 131, no. 2 (2012): 209–20.

[34] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 302.

[35] Miller writes, "The eventual killing arises out of a complex of commandment violations, specifically coveting another man's wife and adultery with her." Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 259. Also see Tsumura, *The Second Book of Samuel*, 173, 178, 185.

and good."[36] Also, David experiences personal consequences of his covetousness in the death of his son (2 Sam 12:14), and the nation experiences corporate consequences of his covetousness in Absalom's rebellion (2 Sam 12:11–12).[37]

1 Kings 21

In 1 Kings 21, Ahab asks for Naboth's vineyard (1 Kgs 21:2).[38] When Naboth refuses (1 Kgs 21:3),[39] Jezebel crafts a scheme to seize the vineyard through false witness and murder (1 Kgs 21:7–10). While 1 Kings 21 does not reference the Tenth Word directly, there is reason for thinking that Ahab's desire for Naboth's vineyard is covetous. First, Deuteronomy 5:21 prohibits coveting "his field" (שָׂדֵהוּ), and Ahab desires the "vineyard" (כֶּרֶם) of Naboth. Both of these terms refer to sections of land and are linked

---

[36] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 302.

[37] "David's sin is a double crime involving both adultery and murder. His punishment is also a double one. It includes not only his loss of the throne but also the death of his newborn child, the product of the adultery." McKenzie, *King David*, 160. Also see Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 302.

[38] In scholarship on 1 Kgs 21, writers have been fascinated by the way 1 Kgs 21 may cast light on the juridical practices of ancient Israel. For an example, see Francis I. Andersen, "Socio-Juridical Background of the Naboth Incident," *JBL* 85, no. 1 (March 1966): 46–57. Also, there has been much discussion of the historical-critical questions of date and composition. Cronauer, for example, provides monograph length treatment of the stories regarding Naboth in 2 Kgs 9, but his work is entirely focused on historical critical questions regarding the redaction history of the work. Cronauer concludes that the story of Naboth's vineyard is a late parable about the threat of marriage to foreign women. Patrick T. Cronauer, *The Stories about Naboth the Jezreelite: A Source, Composition, and Redaction Investigation of 1 Kings 21 and Passages in 2 Kings 9*, LHBOTS 424 (New York: T & T Clark International, 2005); Alexander Rofé, "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story," *VT* 38, no. 1 (January 1988): 89–104. Kitz, however, argues that the actions of Ahab and Jezebel in 1 Kgs 21 parallel ancient Akkadian practices contemporary to the setting of 1 Kgs 21. Anne Marie Kitz, "Naboth's Vineyard after Mari and Amarna," *JBL* 134, no. 3 (2015): 529–45; Nadav Na'aman, "Naboth's Vineyard and the Foundation of Jezreel," *JSOT* 33, no. 2 (December 2008): 197–218; Marsha White, "Naboth's Vineyard and Jehu's Coup: The Legitimation of a Dynastic Extermination," *VT* 44, no. 1 (January 1994): 66–76.

[39] While there is diversity of perspective on the question of why Naboth refused to sell his land, Cogan articulates one view: "Priestly legislation viewed the land of Israel as YHWH's possession, and the Israelites as temporary dwellers on it; therefore, it was not theirs to sell in perpetuity or alienate from the family, and the property would revert to its owner in the jubilee year (cf. Lev 25:23-28; Num 36:7)." Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings*, AB, vol. 10 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 477. For further treatment of this question, see Joseph Fleishman, "Ahab's Criminal Request of Naboth: Why Naboth Refused (1 Kings 21:2–4)," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 21 (2015); Stephen C. Russell, "Ideologies of Attachment in the Story of Naboth's Vineyard," *BTB* 44, no. 1 (February 2014): 29–39; Marvin A. Sweeney, *1 and 2 Kings*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 249; Jerome T. Walsh, *1 Kings*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 318–19; Walter A. Maier, *1 Kings 12-22*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2019), 1563–64.

regularly in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Exod 22:4; 23:11; Lev 25:3–4). Ahab, therefore, desires something which belongs to his neighbor and is similar to one of the objects in Deuteronomy 5:21. Second, Ahab's desire for the vineyard is clearly excessive, as expressed by his pouting[40] and complicity in Jezebel's plan (1 Kgs 21:4–7).[41] Ahab, therefore, should be understood as coveting Naboth's vineyard in violation of the Tenth Word.

Jezebel's plan against Naboth involves both false witness and murder (1 Kgs 21:8–10). When it comes to the Ninth Word (Exod 20:16; Deut 20:20), she arranges for Naboth to be eliminated as a result of fabricated charges.[42] As Miller notes, the use of two witnesses and the resulting capital punishment closely ties the narrative to Deuteronomic law regarding witnesses and should be seen as an intentional attempt to circumvent it (Deut 17:6; 19:15).[43] Additionally, when Elijah confronts Ahab, he describes Ahab's actions as murder (1 Kgs 21:19), using the same term, רצח, as the Decalogue (Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17).[44] Therefore, violating the Tenth Commandment is directly connected to false witness and murder in 1 Kings 21. Additionally, since Ahab appropriates the vineyard of Naboth after his murder, the prohibition against stealing may also be violated.[45]

---

[40] Maier writes, "He let the issue build into something way out of proportion to its real importance; he coveted the property." Maier, *1 Kings 12-22*, 1565. Walsh rightly observes that the description implies "that Ahab does not resign himself to Naboth's decision but continues to desire the vineyard." Walsh, *1 Kings*, 319.

[41] Fleishman argues that Ahab's initial request was a violation of Israelite law, which further shows that Ahab was acting out of covetousness. Fleishman, "Ahab's Criminal Request of Naboth."

[42] F. Rachel Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse of Royal Authority in the Divine Courtroom and the Incident of Naboth's Vineyard," in *The Divine Courtroom in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Ari Mermelstein and Shalom E. Holtz (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 212–13.

[43] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 371.

[44] Commenting on these words, Cogan notes "an echo of YHWH's commandments at Sinai that enjoined against murder, coveting a neighbor's property, and bearing false witness." Cogan, *1 Kings*, 485.

[45] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 370–71; Walsh, *1 Kings*, 322–23. Russell explores the basis for Ahab taking possession of the vineyard of Naboth after his death, arguing that the various parts of

While Jezebel is the architect of the false testimony leading to the murder of Naboth, Ahab is clearly complicit.[46] After Ahab takes Naboth's vineyard, YHWH commands Elijah to confront him, and he prophesies regarding the consequences of Ahab's sin (1 Kgs 21:17–24),[47] declaring that YHWH will bring utter destruction on Ahab and his family (1 Kgs 21:20–24).[48] When YHWH commands Elijah to confront Ahab, he specifies that the murder of Naboth and appropriation of his vineyard is the reason for the judgment (1 Kgs 21:19). Also, Elijah is directed to confront Ahab in the vineyard of Naboth, so the location of the prophetic indictment vividly portrays the reason for the judgment. In this way, 1 Kings 21 shows that covetousness results in harm to a neighbor, which results in judgment on both the perpetrator and the community.

Conclusion

In Joshua 7, violating the Tenth Word leads to stealing and deceit. In 2 Samuel 11–12, covetousness results in adultery and murder. In 1 Kings 21, disregard for the Tenth Commandment ends in false witness and murder. In the Hebrew Bible, therefore, multiple narratives show how covetousness leads to murder, adultery, stealing, and false witness.[49] In light of this pattern, the authors of the Hebrew Bible seem to have identified

---

Jezebel's plan were necessary for Ahab to have the rights to the land under ancient Near Eastern customs. Stephen C. Russell, "The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth's Vineyard," *JSOT* 38, no. 4 (June 2014): 453–69. Russell helpfully shows that the entire plot was orchestrated with the goal of appropriation.

[46] "Though he is depicted as a passive bystander to the plot against Naboth, Ahab was implicated by Jezebel's use of his name and his authority in carrying out her design." Cogan, *1 Kings*, 478. Paynter argues that Ahab is satirized as emasculated in 1 Kgs 21 as Jezebel seizes control and acts in his name. Helen Paynter, "Ahab—Heedless Father, Sullen Son: Humour and Intertextuality in 1 Kings 21," *JSOT* 41, no. 4 (2017): 451–74. Also see Walsh, *1 Kings*, 321.

[47] On the sentence and its execution, see Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 224–34.

[48] First Kgs 22 and 2 Kgs 9–10 are important texts which show the unfolding of YHWH's judgment against Ahab. On the fulfillment of the prophecy, see Benjamin Foreman, "The Blood of Ahab: Reevaluating Ahab's Death and Elijah's Prophecy," *JETS* 58, no. 2 (June 2015): 249–64.

[49] In addition to the texts I have surveyed, Bartholomew argues that Proverbs demonstrates a common view with the Tenth Commandment of the centrality of desire in keeping the commandments. Craig G. Bartholomew, "The Tenth Commandment, René Girard, And the Good Neighborhood of Hebrew Wisdom," *Canon and Culture* 9, no. 2 (2015): 253–74.

the Tenth Word as leading to the violation of the other prohibitions of the second table of the Decalogue. As David Noel Freedman writes, "The tenth commandment is a supplement to the previous commandments. It presents the motivations behind the crimes, especially for violations of commandments six through nine."[50]

However, as Bernd Wannenwetsch observes, "We must resist the temptation to construe the unity of the Decalogue by way of a psychological account of the unity of sin as in a chain reaction model. The unity that binds the Ten Words together lies not on psychological but on theological grounds."[51] In the Hebrew Bible, murder, adultery, stealing, and false witness are presented as potential consequences of covetousness, not as inevitable. So, the Hebrew Bible does not flatten the second table into covetousness. Instead, covetousness is an ethical precipitating factor which can lead to the violation of the other commands.

Additionally, while the consequences of covetousness are broad and multiple actors contribute to the unfolding transgressions (e.g., Joab[52] and Jezebel[53]), one individual is held ultimately responsible in each narrative, showing that the fault ultimately lies with the covetous individual (i.e., Achan, David, Ahab). Also, the cascading consequences of covetousness show that the violation of the Tenth Word results in violating the rights of a neighbor at the community and individual level.

---

[50] David Noel Freedman, Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, and Michael M. Homan, *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering a Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Astrid B. Beck (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 155. Freedman also writes, "Moreover, just as David's sin violated two commandments (adultery and murder), and Ahab and Jezebel's crime broke two (false witness and murder), so the tenth commandment is directly involved in all four of the preceding regulations. Thus, the tenth commandment does not find a specific violation, because it is not like the previous nine. It provides the underlying motivation for each of the criminal violations in numbers six through nine" (156).

[51] Wannenwetsch, "You Shall Not Kill," 163.

[52] As Alter observes, Joab may adjust his orders in a way that cleverly masks Uriah's murder but also results in losing more troops. If this is the case, it highlights the cold complicity of Joab in the crime. Alter, *The David Story*, 254.

[53] Magdalene draws attention to the complicity of the wider society in the scheme against Naboth. Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 213–15.

Additionally, these narratives vividly show how violating the Tenth Word leads to profound harm and suffering for the victim, the perpetrator, and the wider community. In the Hebrew Bible, therefore, covetousness results in a slew of death and tragedy.[54]

Early Jewish Literature

In early Jewish literature, covetousness was identified as a malicious evil leading to a variety of sins. Also, the Tenth Commandment was specifically connected to various vices, including those prohibited by the Decalogue.

Philo claims that the Tenth Word results in a litany of additional wrongs, asserting that the Tenth Word "blocks that fount of injustice, desire (ἐπιθυμίαν), from which flow the most iniquitous actions" (*Decalogue* 173; cf. *Decalogue* 151–53). Notably, he also asserts that the Tenth Word prohibits ἐπιθυμία, because it leads to violating specific prohibitions of the Decalogue. While expositing the Tenth Commandment in *On the Special Laws* he writes,

> So great then and transcendent an evil is desire (ἐπιθυμία), or rather it may be truly said, the fountain of all evils. For plunderings and robberies and repudiations of debts and false accusations and outrages, also seductions, adulteries (μοιχεῖαι), murders (ἀνδροφονίαι) and all wrongful actions, whether private or public, whether in things sacred or things profane, from what other source do they flow? (*Spec. Laws* 4.84)

Philo, therefore, in addition to identifying covetousness as the source of a variety of evil, specifically isolates violations of the second table of the Decalogue—adultery and murder—as a consequence of ἐπιθυμία.

Philo is not the only early Jewish writer to suggest that greedy desire results in violating the second table of the Decalogue. Pseudo-Phocylides[55] makes a similarly expansive assertion in 42–47: "The love of money is the mother of every evil. Gold and

---

[54] Baker, *The Decalogue*, 150.

[55] For introduction to Pseudo-Phocylides, see Walter T. Wilson, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, CEJL (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 3–41.

silver are always a delusion for people. Gold, you source of evils, life-destroyer, crushing everything, would that you were not to mortals such a desirable disaster! On your account there are fights and robberies and murders, and children are enemies to their parents, and brothers to their kinfolk."[56] While Pseudo-Phocylides does not explicitly reference the Decalogue, this passage functions as evidence of the general association between avarice and a variety of evils, including murder, theft, and familial strife,[57] which are prohibited by the second table of the Decalogue.[58]

Sibylline Oracles provides two additional passages which reinforce this pattern. Sibylline Oracles 2.111–18[59] states,

> The love of money is mother of all evil. (Have no desire for gold or silver. Also in these there will be double-edged iron which destroys the spirit.) Gold and silver are always a deception of men. Life-destroying gold, originator of evils, crushing all things, would that you were not a desired affliction for men, for because of you are battles, plunderings, murders, children hostile to their parents and brothers to their kindred.[60]

Similarly, Sibylline Oracles 3.234–36[61] praises the virtue of the Jews by claiming that

---

[56] For a discussion of other possible backgrounds, see Wilson, *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, 107–9.

[57] In the division exemplified by Philo and Josephus, the Fifth Word is part of the first table of the Decalogue.

[58] However, the author of Pseudo-Phocylides does demonstrate the influence of the Decalogue on his thought in Pseudo-Phocylides 3–8. J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 45–51; Wilson, *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, 73–76. Perhaps, therefore, the Decalogue is an influence on their association of greed with murder, theft, and familial strife.

[59] For the translation of Sibylline Oracles 2, I have used *OTP*. While the extant version of Sibylline Oracles 2 is a Christian document, many argue that the original composition was Jewish. On Sibylline Oracles 2, see Olaf Wassmuth, "Sibylline Oracles 1–2," in *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (London: T & T Clark, 2020), 1:493–95.

[60] Wassmuth shows that this section of Sibylline Oracles 2 may be dependent on Pseudo-Phocylides. Olaf Wassmuth, *Sibyllinische Orakel 1-2: Studien Und Kommentar*, AGJU 76 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2011), 310–11.

[61] For the translation of Sibylline Oracles 3, I have used Rieuwerd Buitenwerf, *Book 3 of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003). For a succinct introduction to Sibylline Oracles 3, see Rieuwerd Buitenwerf, "Sibylline Oracles 3," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:495–96. Buitenwerf summarizes, "The book sheds light on Jewish identity in Asia Minor during the 1st Century BCE." Buitenwerf, "Sibylline Oracles 3," 496.

they "care for righteousness and virtue and not for avarice, which causes untold misery for mortal people, such as war and endless famine."[62] In these two passages, avarice is connected to a host of evils, including murder and familial strife which are prohibited by the Decalogue.

Testament of Judah 17:1 states, "I command you, therefore, my children, not to love money nor to gaze upon the beauty of women, because also for the sake of money and beauty I was led astray to Bath-shua the Canaanite" (cf. T. Jud. 13:3–7, 18.2, 6).[63] While Testament of Judah does not directly reference the Decalogue, it establishes a link between greed and sexual immorality. Since sexual immorality can be connected to the Seventh Word, this passage associates a violation of the second table of the Decalogue with avarice.

Apocalypse of Abraham 24.9[64] states, "And I saw there desire, and in her hand (was) the head of every kind of lawlessness" (Apoc. Ab. 24:9).[65] In the preceding context, Apocalypse of Abraham describes murder (24.5), sexual transgression (24:6), and theft (24:7). While Apocalypse of Abraham does not directly reference the Decalogue, the connecting of murder, sexual immorality, and theft fits the pattern being traced in this section.

Josephus charges Cain with having an evil desire for more leading to the

---

[62] After this statement about the consequences of avarice, a variety of unjust practices which do not characterize the Jews are listed. In this catalogue is the following statement: "they do not rob each other at night" (Sib. Or. 3.238). Buitenwerf observes, "The author is using a Gaeco-Roman commonplace: avarice is the source of many evils." Buitenwerf, *Book 3 of Sibylline Oracles*, 200. Buitenwerf also observes, however, regarding 3.218–247 that it has "examples which show that the Jews behave in a morally excellent manner, based on their obedience to God's law (by which the Mosaic law appears to be intended)." Buitenwerf, *Book 3 of Sibylline Oracles*, 197–98. Therefore, it seems that a choice between a Hellenistic and Jewish background is unnecessary in this case.

[63] For the translation of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, I have used Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP 8 (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1985).

[64] For an introduction to Apocalypse of Abraham, see Alexander Kulik, "Apocalypse of Abraham," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:93–94.

[65] For the translation of Apocalypse of Abraham, I have used *OTP*.

murder of Abel. Josephus claims that the name Cain means "acquisition" (κτῆσιν; *Ant.* 1.52) and that he "had an eye only to gain" (*Ant.* 1.53). Then, as Josephus describes the downward spiral of violence among Cain's descendants, he repeatedly attributes it to greed (*Ant.* 1.60–66).[66] While Josephus does not mention the Decalogue, his portrayal of the first murder as stemming from greed further develops a general theme in early Jewish thought connecting covetous desire to murder, sexual immorality, and more.[67]

Josephus also describes how greedy desire leads to murder, particularly by militaries. In *Jewish War* 2, Josephus describes the way the troops of Florus violently plundered and attributes their behavior to "lust for booty" (ἐπιθυμίᾳ κέρδους; *J. W.* 2.305). Florus is also described as a greedy individual, using πλεονεξία (*J. W.* 2.279, 331). As Josephus describes their actions, he repeatedly uses the term φόνος to do it (*J. W.* 2.306, 311, 342).

Fourth Maccabees 2:1–5 describes how Joseph resisted the temptation to commit adultery and cites the Tenth Word as an explanation for how Torah restricts the passions. When the author of 4 Maccabees quotes the Tenth Commandment in 4 Maccabees 2:5, he writes, "Therefore, the law (ὁ νόμος) says, 'Do not covet (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) your neighbor's wife (τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου), nor anything that is your neighbor's" (οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν). Almost certainly, the author of 4 Maccabees explicitly mentioned the wife because of his contextual reference to Joseph resisting the temptation of illicit sex (4 Macc 2:1–4).[68] Fourth Maccabees presents a different and more positive perspective than many of the texts previously surveyed: when

---

[66] Josephus describes the descendants of Cain as πλεονεκτῶν in *Ant*. 1.66

[67] On the envy of Cain in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, see Miriam von Nordheim-Diehl, "Der Neid Gottes, des Teufels und der Menschen - eine motivgeschichtliche Skizze," in *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 437–39.

[68] David Arthur deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2006), 95.

the Tenth Commandment is kept, adultery will not be committed.

Finally, Susanna[69] is an early Jewish narrative which shows how the violation of the Tenth Commandment (Sus 8–14) is connected to attempted adultery and murder (Sus 19–20, 53) and false witness (Sus 21, 43, 61).[70] By doing so in narrative form, Susanna parallels the narratives discussed above in the Hebrew Bible (2 Sam 11–12; 1 Kgs 21).

The primary antagonists in the story, the two elders, lusted after Susanna, who was their neighbor's wife, which places them in violation of the Tenth Word (7–14). Eventually, they confess their lust to Susanna and ask her to commit adultery with them. Furthermore, they threaten to bear false witness against her if she does not go along with their plan (19–21). Susanna refuses, and the elders enact their scheme. After the elders accuse her (34–41), Susanna explicitly states that they "have borne false witness against me" (43). Similarly, Daniel identifies it as false witness (49).[71] After Daniel cross examines the two witnesses, they are identified as "false witnesses" (ψευδομάρτυρας; 62). In light of this, Susanna seems to present covetousness as leading to murder, adultery, and false witness. While the Decalogue is not specifically mentioned, Susanna is presented as virtuous because she feared the Lord and had been taught the law of Moses (2–3). Also, she identifies the elders' request for adultery as sinful against God (23). Finally, the conflict is resolved when the assembly executes the elders in keeping with the law of Moses (62). Since the narrative takes place against the background of the Mosaic law, interpreting the actions of the elders against the background of the Decalogue is appropriate. In Susanna, therefore, the elders are responsible for a litany of sins, but it

---

[69] For introduction on the Additions to Daniel, see Tim Meadowcroft, "Additions to Daniel," in Gurtner and Stuckenbruck, *Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 1:146–49.

[70] On the parallels between Susanna and 1 Kgs 21, see Rofé, "The Vineyard of Naboth," 104.

[71] Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, 350, 372.

begins with lust.[72] Therefore, in a way strikingly parallel to 2 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21, the violation of the Tenth Commandment is portrayed as leading to the violation of the Sixth, Seventh, and Ninth Commandments.

Conclusion

In early Jewish literature, greed is broadly connected to murder, sexual immorality, and other violations of the Decalogue. Also, the Tenth Commandment is connected to violating the second table of the Decalogue in Philo and Susanna. Therefore, the interpretive trajectory present in the Hebrew Bible is also apparent in early Jewish literature: the violation of the Tenth Word leads to the violation of the other commands from the second table. This suggests that ancient readers of the Hebrew Bible observed this pattern, and it influenced their thought.

Early Christian Literature Other than Paul

In early Christian texts, there is evidence that covetousness was connected to the violation of the commandments of the second table of the Decalogue. James 4:1–2 states, "You desire (ἐπιθυμεῖτε), and you do not have, so you murder (φονεύετε). And you are jealous (ζηλοῦτε), and you are not able to obtain, you fight and quarrel."[73] Also, Jesus affirmed that the vices prohibited by the Decalogue proceeded from the inner person: "For from the heart (ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας) comes out evil thoughts (διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί), murders (φόνοι), adulteries (μοιχεῖαι), sexual immoralities (πορνεῖαι), thefts (κλοπαί), false witnesses (ψευδομαρτυρίαι), and blasphemies" (βλασφημίαι; Matt 15:19). Jesus asserts that violations of the second table of the Decalogue (in addition to the first), come from within a person, which resonates with the idea that covetousness leads to other violations

[72] Ellen Spolsky and Eleonore Stump, eds., "Susanna and the Elders: Wisdom and Folly," in *The Judgment of Susanna: Authority and Witness*, EJL 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 97–98.

[73] On the translation of this verse, see Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 182–83.

of the Decalogue. In light of the pattern surveyed in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature above, this is unsurprising. Turning to the Pauline corpus, there is also evidence that Paul held this view.

Paul: Romans 13:8–10

In Romans 13:8–10, Paul cites the Tenth Word alongside three other injunctions from the second table of the Decalogue:

> Owe nothing to anyone, except to love one another. For the one who loves the other has fulfilled the law. For, "Do not commit adultery (Οὐ μοιχεύσεις), do not murder (Οὐ φονεύσεις), do not steal (Οὐ κλέψεις), do not covet (Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις)," and any other commandment, is summed up in this word, "Love your neighbor as yourself" (Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν). Love does not work evil against a neighbor. Therefore, love is the fulfillment of the law.

Paul cites the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Tenth Commandments, which suggests that he saw them as connected.[74] Of course, this could be simply explained by their common place in the Decalogue, but there are indicators that something more is at play. For one, it is striking that Paul only cites from the second half of the Decalogue. Perhaps, Paul subscribed to the common view among his contemporaries that the Sixth through Tenth Words were the second table of the Decalogue. Paul does not cite the Ninth Commandment, but brevity is the most likely explanation.[75] Thus, despite this omission,

---

[74] Kujanpää concludes that Paul is citing from Deuteronomy, as opposed to Exodus, due to the order of the commandments. Katja Kujanpää, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*, NovTSup 172 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2019), 318. Also see David Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*, WUNT 2 284 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 123–24. The order of Paul's citation has attracted interest from interpreters who wish to identify the ordering of the Decalogue popular in Diaspora Judaism. For example, see Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter to the Romans*, 2nd ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 815n31; Michael P. Middendorf, *Romans 9-16*, Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia, 2016), 1328–29. As Cranfield notes, "The order in which Paul gives these commandments differs from that of the MT of Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, but is that in which they are given in the B text of Deuteronomy 5 LXX, in the Nash Papyrus, in Lk 18.20, in Jas 2.11, and also in Philo, *De Decalogo*." C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, vol. 2, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1998), 677n2. For a detailed study of the ordering of the Decalogue in New Testament documents, see Gregory R. Lanier, "Scriptural Inspiration and the Authorial 'Original' amid Textual Complexity: The Sequences of the Murder-Adultery-Steal Commands as a Case Study," *JETS* 61, no. 1 (March 2018): 47–81.

[75] Apparently, ancient scribes found Paul's choice mystifying, as many witnesses, including א, testify to the later addition of the Ninth Commandment. On the question of why Paul may have omitted the Ninth Word, see Frank Thielman, *Romans*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 613. Jewett proposes an explanation for this omission: the Ninth Commandment was irrelevant for Roman Christians,

Paul seems to have identified the Sixth through Tenth Commandments as a group, whether or not he subscribed to a formal view of the second table of the Decalogue.[76] To explain this, he may have simply grouped them together, because he recognized that they were the commands which most directly regulated communal behavior. Yet, beyond citing them as a group, Paul asserts that the injunctions are fulfilled in the command of Leviticus 19:18, which indicates that he views them as ethically related. If each commandment is fulfilled in love, the positive of each commandment is identical, establishing a moral relationship between the prohibitions.[77]

---

since the majority of the group would not have had the social standing to appear in court. He concludes, "The four commandments that Paul selects would have been particularly relevant for life in the urban environment of Rome." Robert Jewett, *Romans*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 810–12. While Jewett's proposal is interesting, it is also speculative. Furthermore, it unhelpfully fixates on a rationale for omission, rather than the representative nature of the included stipulations.

[76] While Paul only cites from the second half of the Decalogue, he apparently intended to provide a representative sampling of commands, with the intention of evoking the law as a whole. After he cites the Decalogue, Paul writes "and any other commandment (καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή)." When Paul references νόμος, he is referring to the Mosaic law, of which the Ten Words are representative (cf. 2:21–22; 7:7). Jewett, however, argues the referent of νόμος in 13:8 and 13:10 is broader than the Mosaic Law. "The scope of Paul's argument," he claims, "moves beyond the Torah, however, because νόμος is used here without the article, and should be translated 'law' in the generic sense." Jewett, *Romans*, 809. Therefore, for Jewett, the referent of ἐντολή in 13:9 includes "any commandment stressed by any group of believers in Rome, even a law coming from outside of Scripture." Jewett, *Romans*, 812. Rom 7:1 (γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ), however, is an important counterexample. An anarthrous accusative form of νόμος is used, similar to 13:8, and in context it is clearly a reference to Torah. Therefore, Jewett's claim that an anarthrous form of νόμος has a more generic sense is false. Also, a clear pattern in Paul's use of the term νόμος is already discernable by 13:8–10. Since Paul has already used the term νόμος to refer to the Decalogue twice (2:21–22; 7:7), and the term ἐντολή to refer to a commandment from the Ten Commandments once (7:7), it is more likely Paul is doing something similar in this context, especially when the four citations from the Ten Words in Rom 13:9 are factored into the equation. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, 2nd ed., BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 691–92.

[77] Paul, of course, goes on to state, "and any other commandment" (καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή; Rom 13:9) after citing the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Tenth Commandments. While the remaining commands of the Decalogue are the most direct referent of ἐντολή (cf. 7:7), it refers to any precept of the Mosaic law by extension. Schreiner, *Romans*, 691–92; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 501. Fitzmyer suggests that the Decalogue "is the immediate sense of the additional phrase, but Paul's typically rhetorical generalization has a more remote sense, which extends what he says about love to any legal system, Roman, ecclesiastical, civil, etc." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB, vol. 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 679. Fitzmyer correctly observes that the Decalogue is the most direct referent; however, Paul gives no indication that any law is in view other than the Mosaic law. Schreiner, *Romans*, 674n8. Philo, *Decalogue* 1.36 creates an interesting comparison: "Moses considered it fitting to declare each one of the Ten Words (τῶν δέκα λογίων) as not to the many but as to one. Saying, 'Do not commit adultery (οὐ μοιχεύσεις). Do not murder (οὐ φονεύσεις). Do not steal (οὐ κλέψεις).' And the others likewise" (καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ταύτῃ). When Philo writes, "And the others likewise" (καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ταύτῃ) after citing the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Commandments, it is similar to Paul writing "and any other commandment" (καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή; Rom 13:9) after citing the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Tenth Commandments.

Paul likely connected the second table of the Decalogue to Leviticus 19:18 for two reasons. First, he was almost certainly influenced by the teaching of Jesus. Jesus cites Leviticus 19:18 repeatedly (e.g., Matt 22:39; Mark 12:31) and quotes it alongside prohibitions from the Decalogue (Matt 19:19). Also, it appears in James 2:8, and Paul cites it elsewhere in Galatians 5:14. Leviticus 19:18, therefore, held clear prominence in early Christian communities, and the most likely explanation is its use in the teaching of Jesus. Paul, therefore, is most likely influenced by the teaching of Jesus in Romans 13:8–10.[78]

Second, Paul likely saw a link between the use of πλησίον in Leviticus 19:18 and the Tenth Word, which may show the particular influence of the Tenth Word on his ethical instruction. Paul abbreviates his citation of the Tenth Word, but the full command uses the term πλησίον repeatedly.[79] In fact, in the second table of the Decalogue, πλησίον only occurs in the Ninth and Tenth Words, and it is repeated several times in the Tenth.[80] Since Paul cites the Tenth Word, but not the Ninth Word, in Romans 13:8–10, he may have been thinking of the Tenth Word specifically in connecting the Decalogue to Leviticus 19:18.[81] In view of this, there is warrant for concluding that Paul was reflecting

---

[78] Moo, *Letter to the Romans*, 828; Schreiner, *Romans*, 673–74; Thielman, *Romans*, 613; Craig L. Blomberg, "Quotations, Allusions, and Echoes of Jesus in Paul," in *Studies in the Pauline Epistles: Essays in Honor of Douglas J. Moo*, ed. Dane Calvin Ortlund and Jay E. Smith (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 135; A. J. Wedderburn and Nikolaus Walter, eds., "Paul and the Early Christian Jesus-Tradition," in *Paul and Jesus: Collected Essays*, JSOTSup 37 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989), 72–74. Schreiber, however, argues against Paul directly taking up a tradition of the teaching of Jesus from Mark 12:28–34, concluding instead, "What the two texts have in common is the significance of Lev. 19.18 in early Christian ethics." Stefan Schreiber, "Law and Love in Romans 13.8-10," in *The Torah in the Ethics of Paul*, ed. Martin Meiser, LNTS 473 (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 113. However, Schreiber does not posit an explanation for "the significance of Lev. 19:18 in early Christian ethics," and I would suggest that the most reasonable one is the teaching of Jesus, whether Paul is referencing a specific gospel tradition or simply operating under the influence of a pattern across multiple traditions.

[79] Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ *πλησίον* σου. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ *πλησίον* σου οὔτε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ βοὸς αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ ὑποζυγίου αὐτοῦ οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ οὔτε ὅσα τῷ *πλησίον* σού ἐστιν (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21).

[80] Brueggemann repeatedly asserts that the Tenth Word contains the first reference to the neighbor in the Decalogue. Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, 17, 24. While this would be significant, if it were the case, the equivalent term occurs in both Exod 20:16 and Deut 5:20 in both the MT and the LXX.

[81] While the verbal link between Lev 19:18 and Deut 5:21 has been observed, the significance

deeply on the ethical logic of the Decalogue, and the Tenth Word specifically when he composed Romans 13:8–10.

To explore this reading further, Paul also states, "Love does not work evil against a neighbor" (ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται; 13:10). As I have traced in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, covetousness results in grave offenses against the neighbor, which makes it possible that Paul reached this conclusion partly under the influence of these traditions. Additionally, while murder, adultery and stealing are external actions, covetousness is internal, which means that it contrasts with love in particularly sharp fashion. When Paul, therefore, uses an internal attitude—love—to describe the fulfillment of the Decalogue, it is likely that the Tenth Word influenced him in making this connection. The Tenth Word, therefore, may have exerted a particular influence on Paul as he composed Romans 13:8–10.

Furthermore, when Paul suggests that the Tenth Word, along with other commands of the second table, is fulfilled by Leviticus 19:18, he offers a subtle pointer that the Tenth Word is connected to the violation of the other commands of the second table. As I traced earlier in the chapter, the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature evidence the negative perspective that violating the Tenth Word leads to violating the other commands of the second table. But Paul presents a positive counterpart to this idea. Namely, love which is an internal disposition, as is covetousness, results in keeping the commandments, not violating them.

Romans 13:9 is particularly significant in the broader argument of this project, because it contains the second of two explicit citations of the Tenth Word in the Pauline corpus (see Rom 7:7 for the other). Also, Paul uses the Decalogue in a distinctively positive sense in Romans 13:8–10, which can be contrasted with Romans 2:21–24, where

---

of it occurring in the Tenth Word specifically has not been emphasized. For example, see Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 319; Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 126.

Paul primarily uses the Decalogue for the rhetorical purpose of indicting his conversation partner for hypocrisy, and Romans 7:7, where Paul uses the Tenth Commandment as part of a vivid illustration of the goodness, but impotence, of the law and the evil of sin.

However, in contrast to this interpretation, some claim that Paul intends to marginalize the Decalogue with his citation of Leviticus 19:18. Philip F. Esler, for example, claims that Paul is suggesting that "in the new era in Christ, the law is irrelevant to the moral dimensions of the life of those who have faith in him."[82] Striking a more moderate position, Douglas J. Moo suggests that Paul believes that "Christians who love others have satisfied the demands of the law *en toto*; and they need therefore not worry about any other commandment."[83]

However, as noted above, Paul notes a lexical link between Leviticus 19:18 and the Decalogue, and this observation militates against the idea that Paul intends to marginalize the law. As David Lincicum suggests, the presence of the term πλησίον in both Leviticus 19:18 and the Decalogue implies that Paul "apparently sees Lev 19:18 as offering a pithy encapsulation or an inner logic of Deuteronomy's demand, and not as

---

[82] Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 334. Esler holds that Paul is engaging in ingroup/outgroup differentiation throughout the latter part of Romans. He suggests, "The love characteristic of the in-group is contrasted with the law characterizing the Judean outgroup. This is a passage forged in the flames of intergroup group differentiation, not out of any irenic attitude on Paul's part toward the Mosaic law." Philip E. Esler, "Social Identity, the Virtues, and the Good Life: A New Approach to Romans 12:1–15:13," *BTB* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 60. M. Wolter entirely divorces the law, including Lev 19:18, from providing any normative guidance for Christians when he writes, "An keiner einzigen Stelle wird jedoch die Liebesforderung aus dem Liebesgebot der Tora abgeletet. Eher ist das Umgekehrte der Fall, insofern es zuallererst das Liebesgebot von Lev 19,18 ist, das eine Integration der Tora auch in die christliche Ehtik ermöglicht. In diesem Zusammenhang lässt mindestens Gal 5,14 . . . erkennen (vgl. aber auch Röm 13,8-10), dass das Liebesgebot die Tora adelt und nicht umgekehrt die Tora die Liebesforderung autorisiert." M. Wolter, "Die ethische Identität christlicher Gemeinden in neutestamentlicher Zeit," in *Woran orientiert sich Ethik?*, ed. Wilfried Härle, Marburger Jahrbuch Theologie 13 (Marburg, Germany: Elwert, 2001), 74.

[83] Moo, *The Letter to the Romans*, 831–33. While Moo strikes a moderating position: on the one hand, he concludes that "the commandments of the old covenant do not provide direct guidance for new covenant believers" (831). However, he also suggests, "As long as our love remains incomplete, we may very well require other commandments both to chastise and guide us" (832). Ultimately, he suggests that the love command is closer to replacing the Decalogue than focusing or concentrating it (833). For similar views, see Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016), 980–81; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 677–80.

somehow negating or relativizing it."[84] Paul, therefore, seems to be reflecting deeply on the ethical implications of the Decalogue, and the Tenth Word specifically, which makes it unlikely that he intended to relegate it to irrelevancy.[85] However, Paul does establish a clear hierarchy where the command of Leviticus 19:18 is superior to the Decalogue. J. Cornelis de Vos writes, ""Die hierarchische Ordnung ist damit auch gleich deutlich: Derjenige, der dem Prinzip der Liebe folgt, hat auch alle sozialen Einzelgebote erfüllt, weil ihr Prinzip die Liebe zum Nächsten ist."[86] Similarly, Katja Kujanpää argues that "the quotation of the Decalogue is thus subordinate to the quotation of the love command: the 10 commandments are not relativized nor is the tone polemical, but the commandment of love is clearly superior to them."[87] Paul likely thought that Leviticus 19:18 fulfilled the Decalogue as a positive and broad counterpart to it. Paul, therefore, is suggesting that the Decalogue, and the Mosaic law, continues to be relevant for Christian communities, but it is positively defined and described by Leviticus 19:18.[88] For Paul, the Decalogue is not irrelevant for Christian living, because it concretizes the command to love.[89] Or, as

---

[84] Lincicum, *Paul and Early Jewish Encounter*, 126.

[85] Yet, this conclusion could be taken too far, Schreiber claims regarding the implications of the teaching of Rom 13:8–10 on the law, "Its validity is not questioned in any way: the Torah remains the authority." Schreiber, "Law and Love in Romans 13.8-10," 118. Schreiber concludes, "Pauline ethics in the Letter to the Romans are Torah-ethics. The Torah is the authority, providing material orientation, and there is a common ground here with the rest of Judaism" (117). Schreiber, however, seems to underemphasize the way that Paul takes a different view of the law from his early Jewish contemporaries throughout his writings.

[86] de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung*, 225.

[87] Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 321.

[88] Rosner suggests, "The four commandments are cited as examples of what love looks like as a minimum." Brian S. Rosner, *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2013), 194–96. Also see Schreiner, *Romans*, 672–75; Gottfried Nebe, "The Decalogue in Paul, Especially in His Letter to the Romans," in *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, LHBOTS 509 (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 83, 86.

[89] As Sänger observes, "So verstanden bilden sie für Paulus auch weiterhin die schriftgemäße Basis ethischen Verhaltens." Dieter Sänger, "Tora für die Völker – Weisungen der Liebe: Zur Rezeption des Dekalogs im frühen Judentum und Neuen Testament," in *Von der Bestimmtheit des Anfangs: Studien zu Jesus, Paulus und zum frühchristlichen Schriftverständnis* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener, 2007), 299.

Eduard Lohse observes, "Love attains concrete form as it is guided by the will of God expressed in the individual commandments, with the result that the law is fulfilled."[90]

Paul expresses that the Decalogue is morally relevant for Christian communities and this is because it expresses love for neighbor as exemplified by the life and teaching of Jesus. As Thomas R. Schreiner writes, "The self-giving life of Jesus manifested particularly in his death on the cross becomes the paradigm for the lives of believers."[91] The Ten Words, therefore, continue to speak today to the extent that they express the paradigmatic ethic of Jesus Christ. The Decalogue's moral authority is not direct or unmediated but refracted through the prism of the cross.

In summary, the Tenth Word is one of the factors exerting an influence on Paul's ethics in Romans 13:8–10. When Paul asserts that the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Tenth Words are fulfilled in the love command (Lev 19:18), his assertion makes best sense as a positive affirmation that the commands of the second table of the Decalogue are related. Covetousness is a linchpin to this interpretation since it is an internal attitude which leads to the violation of the other prohibitions. Paul, therefore, gives an indicator in Romans 13:8–10 that his moral instruction arises in part out of deep reflection on the Decalogue in general, and the Tenth Word specifically.

Paul: 1 Corinthians 10:6–8

As I have argued in chapter 4, Paul connects the Tenth Word to the Second Word in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7. In this chapter, I claim that he also evokes the Seventh Word in 1 Corinthians 10:8, suggesting that he views evil desire as leading to adultery.[92]

---

[90] Eduard Lohse, *Theological Ethics of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 164.

[91] Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 655.

[92] Prior to 1 Cor 10:8, Paul may hint at sexual immorality in 1 Cor 10:7 through his citation of Exod 32:6. "And do not be idolaters (εἰδωλολάτραι), just as some of them. As it as written, 'The people sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up to play'" (παίζειν). As many have observed, Paul may use παίζω to

In 1 Corinthians 10:8, Paul writes, "Neither let us be sexually immoral (πορνεύωμεν), just as some of them were sexually immoral (ἐπόρνευσαν), and twenty-three thousand fell in one day." In this exhortation, Paul likely evokes the Seventh Word by using the term πορνεύω. Since, however, μοιχεύω (Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17) is the term used in the Seventh Word, the claim that πορνεύω can evoke the Seventh Word needs to be substantiated.

In the LXX, πορνεύω[93] is used to refer to sexually promiscuous behavior, especially prostitution, but it is almost exclusively used metaphorically to refer to idolatry (Jer 3:7–8; Ezek 6:9; 16:15, 34; 23:19).[94] Μοιχεύω[95] is used in the Seventh Word (Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17), related prohibitions of adultery (Lev 20:10), and to describe literal adulterous behavior (Hos 7:4). Also, it is used to refer to cultic sexual behavior (Hos 4:13–14), and metaphorically to refer to spiritual infidelity (Jer 3:9; Ezek 23:43). Therefore, the terms are used similarly in the LXX, although πορνεύω tends to be used metaphorically while μοιχεύω tends to be used literally. In a couple of cases the terms

---

make a veiled reference to sexual debauchery in conjunction with idolatry. As Ciampa and Rosner helpfully summarize, παίζω "has been associated with idolatry and sexual debauchery since antiquity." Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 456; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014), 502; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 461; Trent A. Rogers, *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8–10*, WUNT 2 427 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 192; Michael Li-Tak Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*, StBibLit 83 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 65; Paul Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 434. According to some, the Hebrew term which renders παίζω, צָחַק, denoted sexual immorality in Exod 32:6 MT. In Exod 32:6, Childs interprets it to mean "A religious orgy has begun." Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 566. Stuart, however, expresses caution about this interpretation. Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus*, NAC, vol. 2 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 666–67. Also see Duane A. Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus*, Kregel Exegetical Library (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2014), 619. If παίζω does connotate sexual activity, the explicit reference to sexual immorality in 1 Cor 10:8 is foreshadowed in 1 Cor 10:7. Either way, while Paul likely makes an oblique reference to the connection between evil desire and sexual licentiousness in his reference to Exod 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7, he directly makes this connection in 1 Cor 10:8.

[93] For general lexical data on πορνεύω, see Moisés Silva, ed., "Πορνεύω, Πορνεία, Πόρνη, Πόρνος, Ἐκπορνεύω," *NIDNTTE* 4:109–16.

[94] First Enoch 8:2 is the lone exception where πορνεύω is used literally to refer to sexual behavior which evil angels taught humanity.

[95] For general lexical data on μοιχεύω, see Moisés Silva, ed., "Μοιχεύω, Μοιχάω, Μοιχεία, Μοιχός, Μοιχαλίς," *NIDNTTE* 3:329–32.

appear to be used interchangeably. In Jeremiah 3:7–8, πορνεύω refers to the same behavior as μοιχεύω. Also, Sirach 23:23 states, "She committed adultery in sexual immorality" (ἐν πορνείᾳ ἐμοιχεύθη), showing the close relationship between the terms. Therefore, πορνεύω is a term closely related to μοιχεύω in meaning and usage, which suggests it could be an apt term for evoking the Seventh Word.

In the New Testament, πορνεύω and μοιχεύω are used to refer to the same actions in Revelation 2:20–22. Significantly, Jesus lists the nominal πορνεία alongside other vices prohibited by the Decalogue, including μοιχεία: "For from the heart (ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας) come out evil thoughts (διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί), murders (φόνοι), adulteries (μοιχεῖαι), sexual immoralities (πορνεῖαι), thefts (κλοπαί), false witnesses (ψευδομαρτυρίαι), and blasphemies" (βλασφημίαι; Matt 15:19). By listing πορνεία alongside μοιχεία, Jesus shows that the terms are closely related. Also, since the vices listed in Matthew 15:19 have a significant amount of overlap with the Decalogue, πορνεία may have also been associated with the Ten Words.

Therefore, when Paul uses the term πορνεύω, he uses a term which is closely related to the Seventh Word. In light of the additional connections to the Decalogue in the preceding context (1 Cor 10:6–7), it is best to understand 1 Corinthians 10:8 against the background of the Decalogue. That is, Paul is linking the Seventh Word to the Tenth Word.[96]

---

[96] Garland, however, concludes that Paul is using πορνεύω metaphorically to reference spiritual unfaithfulness. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 462. If this was the case, it would undermine the idea that Paul is evoking the Seventh Word, because πορνεύω would be a reference to idolatry, not illicit sexual behavior. However, Paul has already referenced literal sexual misconduct among the Corinthians, so he is probably warning against literal sexual immorality in this context also. Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 435. Of course, it is possible to speculate regarding the precise nature of the sexual immorality against which Paul is warning. Fee suggests that Paul is suggesting sexual misbehavior in conjunction with cultic activity. Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 503; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 738–39. Similarly, according to Fotopoulos, Paul "is explicitly exhorting against sexual immorality in the context of dining rather than offering a general exhortation against sexual immorality." John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*, WUNT 2 151 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 231.

Numbers 25

To further support and explore the connections between 1 Corinthians 10:6–8 and the Tenth and Seventh Words, Paul connects his exhortation in 1 Corinthians 10:8 to Numbers 25, which describes how Israelite men became sexually involved with Moabite women, leading to idolatry (Num 25:1–3).[97] Paul likely chose to reference Numbers 25, because this narrative establishes a causal link between the sexual involvement of Israelite men with Midianite women and idolatrous activity.[98]

Significantly, when Paul uses Numbers 25 to warn against sexual immorality leading to idolatry, it further suggests that he may have the Decalogue in view. To see this, a brief survey of early Jewish interpretation of Numbers 25 will be helpful, because there is evidence that Numbers 25 was interpreted as a narrative about the danger of evil desire and adultery. In early Jewish literature, Philo (*Mos*. 1.295–304), Josephus (*Ant*. 4.126–55),[99] and Pseudo-Philo 18.13–14 all imaginatively retold Numbers 25. In each

---

[97] To briefly substantiate this connection, Paul is warning against sexual immorality in conjunction with a broader discussion of idolatry, so this narrative is an apt choice for Paul to illustrate his point because it describes how illicit sexual behavior may result in idolatrous activity. Additionally, when Paul states, "and twenty-three thousand (εἴκοσι τρεῖς χιλιάδες) fell in one day," he closely parallels Num 23:9 LXX, which states, "And the ones dying in the plague were twenty-four thousand" (τέσσαρες καὶ εἴκοσι χιλιάδες). On the question of the numerical discrepancy between 1 Cor 10:8 and Num 25:9, see Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 435n30; Fee, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 503–4; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 460–61; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 386; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 462–63; Thiselton, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 739–40; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 168. Additionally, Paul referenced Num 11 in 1 Cor 10:6, so another narrative from Numbers coheres with the context. Rogers, *God and the Idols*, 193; Fee, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 502–4; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 459; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 386; Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1–11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*, LNTS 299 (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 162–64; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 462–63; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 739; Charles Perrot, "Les exemples du désert (1 Co. 10.6-11)," *NTS* 29, no. 4 (October 1983): 437–52; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 168. However, Koet argues that Paul intentionally alludes to Exod 32:28 by referencing the deaths of 23,000 Israelites, instead of 24,000, as recorded in Num 25:9. Bart J. Koet, "The Old Testament Background to 1 Cor 10,7-8," in *The Corinthian Correspondence*, ed. R. Bieringer, BETL 125 (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1996), 607–15. Also see Rohintan Mody, "'The Case of the Missing Thousand': Paul's Use of the Old Testament in 1 Corinthians 10:8—A New Proposal," *Churchman* 121, no. 1 (2007): 61–79. Koet, however, concludes that Paul is "deliberately mixing Ex 32,28 and Num 25,9." So, even if Paul is referencing Exod 32 in 1 Cor 10:8, Num 25 is being evoked also. Koet, "OT Background to 1 Cor 10,7-8," 614. For an assessment of Koet's argument, see Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 460–61.

[98] R. Dennis Cole, *Numbers*, NAC, vol. 3B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 435–36; Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1993), 516–17.

[99] For an overview of Philo's and Josephus' readings of Num 25, see Anthony Rees, *[Re]Reading Again: A Mosaic Reading of Numbers 25*, LHBOTS 589 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 20–27.

case, the authors seem to be influenced by Numbers 31:16, which records that Balaam had a role to play in the seduction of Israelite men by Midianite women.[100]

Philo describes the events of Numbers 25 by suggesting that Balaam orchestrated the entire affair as a scheme against Israel (*Mos*. 1.295–304).[101] In doing so, he uses a variety of terms, including ἐπιθυμία (*Mos.* 1.297), to show that the primary purpose of the plan was to use sexual lust and the temptation of erotic pleasure as a weapon against Israel. Also, Philo suggests that the king of Midian went ahead with this plan by "ignoring the law against adultery (τὸν κατὰ μοιχῶν νόμον), and annulling those which prohibited seduction and fornication (πορνείᾳ) as though they had never been enacted at all" (*Mos*. 1.300 [LCL, Colson]).[102] Philo, therefore, interprets the events recorded in Numbers 25 as an example of desire leading to adultery and sexual immorality, using ἐπιθυμία and πορνεία. Similarly, while Josephus primarily emphasizes the role of Moses as a leader in the narrative, he also sees ἐπιθυμία at play (*Ant*. 4.130, 132). Apparently, for early Jewish authors, Numbers 25 was a narrative about desire leading to sexual immorality leading to idolatry.

Pseudo-Philo 44:6–7[103] connects the Tenth Word to idolatry by suggesting that lusting after foreign women is idolatrous.[104] Pseudo-Philo 18:13–14 imaginatively

---

[100] On the portrayal of Balaam in the Hebrew Bible, see Ed Noort, "Balaam the Villain: The History of Reception of the Balaam Narrative in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets," in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*, ed. George H. van Kooten and Jacques van Ruiten, TBN 11 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 3–23. On Num 31:16, see Cole, *Numbers*, 498–99; Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, 595; Martin Noth, *Numbers*, trans. James D. Martin, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 196.

[101] As Rogers observes, Hellenistic Jews interpreted Num 25 as an attempt by Midian to undercut Israel by convincing them to be unfaithful to God. Rogers, *God and the Idols*, 193.

[102] Philo tends to universalize the Mosaic law (e.g., *Decalogue* 32), so he may be suggesting that the Midianites were flouting it with their behavior. If so, it would increase the likelihood that he was referring to Mosaic prohibitions against sexual immorality and possibly the Seventh Commandment.

[103] For detailed discussion of this issues in this significant passage, see chaps. 2 and 4 of this dissertation.

[104] Pseudo-Philo 44:7 describes the violation of each of the Ten Words, connecting each one to idolatry. When it comes to the Tenth Word, the corresponding violation is that they "have lusted after strange women" (*et concupierunt mulieres alienas*).

rewrites the narrative of Numbers 25 by describing Balaam creating a scheme to seduce Israelite men using Midianite women. In light of Pseudo-Philo 18:13–14, the indictment of desiring foreign women in Pseudo-Philo 44:7 may reference the events of Numbers 25 specifically. In particular, the association of lusting after foreign women with idolatrous behavior fits the events of Number 25 well and makes it likely that Pseudo-Philo 44:7 may be referencing this specific occurrence. If so, it would be an example in early Jewish literature of a direct connection being made between Numbers 25 and the Tenth Word.

Therefore, early Jewish readers connected the events of Numbers 25 to evil desire and may have even connected them to the Tenth Word. In light of the reference to Numbers 25 in 1 Corinthians 10:6–8, seeing the references to evil desire, idolatry, and adultery in this text against the background of the Decalogue is historically plausible.

Ethical Implications

To this point, I have argued that it is reasonable to read 1 Corinthians 10:6–8 against the background of the Seventh and Tenth Commandments. Having established this connection, what does 1 Corinthians 10:6–8 reveal about the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul's moral instruction?

In 1 Corinthians 10:6–8, Paul presents sexual immorality as an outworking of evil desire. As demonstrated in chapter 3, the warning against covetousness in 1 Corinthians 10:6 forms a heading for the ensuing instruction.[105] In making this connection, Paul was likely influenced by the teaching of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish tradition in linking the violation of the Tenth Word to the violation of the other commandments of the second table. Paul stood in a tradition which held that

---

[105] Of course, Paul is clearly connecting idolatry to sexual immorality. On the connection between idol food, sex, and idolatry, see Stephen C. Barton, "Food Rules, Sex Rules and the Prohibition of Idolatry. What's the Connection?," in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. Stephen C. Barton, T & T Clark Theology (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 141–62. Num 25 describes the violation of the First and Second Words of the Decalogue. Cole, *Numbers*, 437. While it would be possible to conclude that Paul is connecting idolatry to sexual immorality and not evil desire to immorality, this is a false choice.

covetousness could lead to idolatry, so it makes sense that he would place them together in his moral instruction. Also, as many have observed, there are practical reasons why Paul would have connected sexual immorality, idolatry, and evil desire. Ciampa and Rosner, for example, hypothesize that Paul "is suggesting that idolatry tends to follow from (among other things) a lack of self-restraint with respect to the appetites of the stomach and libido."[106] Additionally, Paul connects evil desire, idolatry, and sexual immorality in his ongoing discussion of mimetic ethics in 1 Corinthians 10:6–8.[107] In referencing Numbers 25, Paul intends to present Israel as a negative moral example to be avoided by his congregations.

Paul: 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8

Paul seems to connect the violation of the Tenth Word to the violation of the Seventh Word in 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8. He warns his readers against both πορνεία (1 Thess 4:3) and "lustful passion" (πάθει ἐπιθυμίας; 1 Thess 4:5), then instructs, "one must not sin and wrong (πλεονεκτεῖν) his brother (ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ) in this matter" (1 Thess 4:6). Paul, therefore, warns against adultery in the context of a discussion of sexual morality, which is reasonably understood against the background of the Seventh Word. Also, he references lustful desire and covetous actions in the same discussion, which suggests he may be linking the Tenth Word to the Seventh Word.

The Tenth Commandment likely influenced Paul's instruction in 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8 for a few reasons. First, Paul uses the term πλεονεκτέω (1 Thess 4:6) to describe adulterous actions, which connotes images of greed and illegitimate taking

---

[106] Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to Corinthians*, 460. Shen suggests that Paul is warning against sexual immorality, because it is idolatrous in rejecting the plan of God for his creation. Shen, *Canaan to Corinth*, 67–68.

[107] Ruben Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love: Discovering Paul's "Implicit Ethics" through 1 Corinthians*, trans. Dieter T. Roth (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018), 168–69.

(see 2 Cor 7:2; 12:17–18).[108] Paul, therefore, describes adultery as fraudulent and greedy. In doing so, he may have been formed by the way the Tenth Word forbids desiring a variety of things which belong to another person, including one's wife. Additionally, as argued in chapter 4, Paul uses πλεονεξία (Col 3:5) and πλεονέκτης (Eph 5:5) to refer to covetous desire and those who exemplify it. Paul, therefore, may be using the related verb in a similar way.

Second, Paul references πορνεία (1 Thess 4:3) and "lustful passion" (πάθει ἐπιθυμίας; 1 Thess 4:5).[109] In this way, Paul further connects his discussion to the type of sexual behavior prohibited by the Seventh Word.[110] Of course, ἐπιθυμία is a term that Paul uses to refer to the Tenth Word directly (e.g., Rom 7:7–8). Therefore, Paul is most likely operating under the assumption that adulterous behavior is traceable to evil desire.[111] In the Hebrew Bible, covetous desire is connected to adultery and other forms

---

[108] In some cases, interpreters have argued that πλεονεκτέω is best understood as referring to commercial fraud in 1 Thess 4:6. Earl Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians*, Sacra Pagina 11 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 188, 200–202. Weima, however, argues that πλεονεκτέω should be taken as referring to illicit sexual behavior for several reasons. First, there is no explicit marker of a change in subject. Second, 1 Thess 4:3–6a is a single sentence. Third, 1 Thess 4:3–8 coheres through repeated terminology like ἁγιασμός (1 Thess 4:3, 7). Fourth, Paul uses the term ἀκαθαρσία in 1 Thess 4:7, which suggests that his focus is still sexual immorality. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 274–76. See also M. Eugene Boring, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 147; Silva, *NIDNTTE* 3:780–81; Gary Steven Shogren, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 165; Fee, *First and Second Letters to Thessalonians*, 150–51; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, AB, vol. 32B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 231–33; Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 123–24; Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 154–55; O. Larry Yarbrough, *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul*, SBLDS 80 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 73–76; Raymond F. Collins, *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1984), 317–19, 334–35.

[109] According to Frederickson, Paul is condemning sexual passion itself. David E. Fredrickson, "Passionless Sex in 1 Thessalonians 4:4-5," *Word and World* 23, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 23–30. Ellis, however, shows that Paul would have not been understood to be condemning sexual desire itself in an ancient context. J. E. Ellis, *Paul and Ancient Views of Sexual Desire: Paul's Sexual Ethics in 1 Thessalonians 4, 1 Corinthians 7 and Romans 1*, LNTS 354 (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 96–146.

[110] See the discussion of 1 Cor 10:8 above for a full argument of this point.

[111] Malherbe argues that Paul was influenced by the Stoics in his rejection of sexual desire. Abraham J. Malherbe, "Ethics in Context: The Thessalonians and Their Neighbors," *Restoration Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (2012): 212–14. Thompson, however, notes some key ways that the comparison between Paul and the Stoics does not hold up. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 77–79. Schlier observes that Paul is referring to self-centered sexual desire. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Apostel und seine Gemeinde: Auslegung des ersten Briefes an die Thessalonicher*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder,

of sexual immorality, so the instruction of Paul makes sense under the influence of this ethical tradition.

Third, in 1 Thessalonians 4:5, Paul exhorts his congregations to live differently than the Gentiles: "not in the passion of lust (πάθει ἐπιθυμίας) like the Gentiles who do not know God" (1 Thess 4:6). By framing his exhortation in this way, Paul is accomplishing several goals, but one is that he associates his instruction with the morality of the Hebrew Bible.[112] Paul, therefore, is likely exhorting his audience to live in a way consistent with the Jewish Scriptures, and this means that reading his instructions against the background of the Hebrew Bible is reasonable.[113]

Fourth, Paul specifies "his brother" (ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ; 1 Thess 4:6) as the potential object of harm, which is analogous to "your neighbor" (πλησίον σου; Exod 20:17 LXX; Deut 5:21) in the Tenth Word.[114] Although ἀδελφός and πλησίον are different terms, they both denote close communal relationships. In 1 Thessalonians 4:6, therefore, Paul warns his readers against wronging a member of their own community through adultery,[115] which is strikingly parallel to the way the Tenth Word forbids desiring the

---

1973), 66. Also see Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 190–92.

[112] Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 78–79. Yarbrough emphasizes that Paul's intention is to motivate his audience by contrasting their way of life with the Gentiles. Yarbrough, *Not Like the Gentiles*, 84–85. Of course, this is compatible with emphasizing the Jewish origin of Paul's ethical thought. Yarbrough goes on to conclude, "It is the Jewish tradition which determined Paul's formulation of the precepts on marriage and sexual morality." Yarbrough, *Not Like the Gentiles*, 86.

[113] Reinmuth shows that condemnations of greed and sexual immorality frequently appear together in early Jewish thought. Eckart Reinmuth, *Geist und Gesetz: Studien zu Voraussetzungen und Inhalt der paulinischen Paränese*, Theologische Arbeiten 44 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985).

[114] On family relationships in Pauline ethics, see Reidar Aasgaard, *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!" Christian Siblingship in Paul*, JSNTSup 265 (London: T & T Clark International, 2004); Aasgaard, "'Role Ethics' in Paul: The Significance of the Sibling Role for Paul's Ethical Thinking," *NTS* 48, no. 4 (2002): 513–30.

[115] According to some, Paul is referencing any fellow human being. Boring, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 147; Morris, *First and Second Epistles to Thessalonians*, 123n28. However, others take it to refer to members of the Christian community. Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 276; Fee, *First and Second Letters to Thessalonians*, 151; Malherbe, *Letters to the Thessalonians*, 232; Wanamaker, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 155. Whichever view is correct, Paul is still using a communal term, which fits well with the influence of the Tenth Word.

wife of a fellow Israelite.[116] In the Tenth Word, a core idea is that desiring what rightfully belongs to another person is forbidden, and the same idea is communicated by Paul in 1 Thessalonians 4:6.

Fifth, Paul emphasizes the consequences arising from such actions. Paul solemnly warns, "Because the Lord is the avenger (ἔκδικος) concerning all these things" (1 Thess 4:6).[117] By warning against divine judgment, Paul evokes narratives such as 2 Samuel 11–12 where covetousness leads to adultery, resulting in judgment on David, his family, and Israel. As Paul cautions, whether or not the offended husband is able to seek justice, God will avenge. Of course, Paul intends to motivate his audience to heed his instruction with this warning.[118]

In light of the reasons above, Paul's exhortation in 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8 makes sense against the background of the Decalogue, and he seems to suggest that the violation of the Seventh Word is traceable to the violation of the Tenth Word. James W. Thompson writes,

> Those who avoid 'the passion of lust' will not focus their lust on the wife of another. 'Take advantage (*pleonektein*) of the brother' is parallel to 'desire the wife (*epithymēseis tēn gynaika*) of the neighbor' in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:17). Thus Paul elaborates on the nature of *porneia* by paraphrasing two commandments of the Decalogue.[119]

Paul, therefore, exhorts his readers in a way consistent with the use of the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature by suggesting that adulterous behavior is greedy and fraudulent, evil desire leads to it, it results in harm to the community, and that

---

[116] Thompson observes that greed and sexual immorality frequently appear together in early Christian and early Jewish ethical instruction, but the two are distinct ideas Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 75–76.

[117] Paul may be alluding to Ps 94:1 (93:1 LXX). Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 277; Fee, *First and Second Letters to Thessalonians*, 151; Malherbe, *Letters to the Thessalonians*, 233; Wanamaker, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 156.

[118] Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 277.

[119] Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul*, 76. To my knowledge, Thompson is the only writer to note this connection.

the covetous bring disaster on themselves in the form of divine judgment.

Conclusion

In Romans 13:8–10, Paul connects the Tenth Word to the other commandments of the second table, and he directly connects covetousness to adultery in 1 Corinthians 10:6–8 and 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8. Paul, therefore, seems to have held the view that that violation of the Tenth Word leads to the violation of other commandments from the second table of the Decalogue, and he instructs his congregations accordingly. As charted in this chapter, early Jewish interpretation of the Decalogue shows that this conclusion regarding Pauline ethics is historically plausible. Also, the narrative portrayals of the outworkings of covetousness in the Hebrew Bible (Josh 7; 2 Sam 11–12; 1 Kgs 21) may have formed Pauline ethical instruction.

Making this observation regarding Pauline ethics creates the opportunity for ethical reflection. René Girard writes,

> If the Decalogue devotes its final commandment to prohibiting desire for whatever belongs to the neighbor, it is because it lucidly recognizes in that desire the key to the violence prohibited in the four commandments that precede it. If we ceased to desire the goods of our neighbor, we would never commit murder or adultery or theft or false witness. If we respected the tenth commandment, the four commandments that precede it would be superfluous.[120]

Also, Bernd Wannenwetsch refers to the "perichoretic" nature of the Decalogue, by which he means the interpenetrating nature of its commands.[121] As he writes, "We kill since we do not know how to abstain from coveting."[122] As this chapter

---

[120] René Girard, *I See Satan Fall like Lightning*, trans. James G. Williams (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001), 11–12. Girard also writes, "Rather than beginning with the cause and pursuing then the consequences, like a philosophical account, the Decalogue follows the reverse order, tackling the most urgent matter first: in order to avoid violence it forbids violent acts. It turns then to the cause and uncovers the desire that the neighbor inspires" (12). Girard understands the Tenth Word as a prohibition of mimetic desire. "The principal source of violence between human beings is mimetic rivalry, the rivalry resulting from imitation of a model who becomes a rival or of a rival who becomes a model" (11).

[121] Wannenwetsch, "You Shall Not Kill."

[122] Wannenwetsch, "You Shall Not Kill," 164.

shows, the ethical instruction of Paul supports these ambitious claims. Paul, under the influence of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish thought, recognized that evil desire, as prohibited by the Tenth Word, led to violating the other commandments of the second table. When the Tenth Commandment is broken, evil ensues, and disaster falls on the perpetrator.

CHAPTER 6

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT AND FAITHFUL MINISTRY

In this chapter, I claim that Paul presents covetousness as a test of faithful or unfaithful ministry. In the Hebrew Bible, the Tenth Commandment is particularly violated by the elite, and early Jewish literature reflects similar patterns. In Acts 20:33, Luke records Paul defending his ministry by asserting his freedom from covetousness. In light of this evidence, the following patterns in the Pauline corpus may reveal the influence of the Tenth Word: Paul describes and defends his ministry as free from covetousness (2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–10); also, he instructs that leaders in Christian communities must not be motivated by greed (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:9–10; Titus 1:7); lastly, when he accuses his opponents, he directly accuses them of improper motivation (2 Cor 2:17; Titus 1:11). Paul, therefore, seems to be influenced by the Tenth Word in his ethical instruction by presenting covetousness as a test of faithful or unfaithful ministry.

The Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible, the Tenth Commandment is particularly violated by those with political, economic, and religious power (1 Kgs 21; 1 Sam 11; Mic 2:1–2). This dynamic is understandable, even expected. The Tenth Commandment prohibits desiring something in a way in which to take it, and the elite would be most likely to act on their covetous desires because they have the power to do it.

In separate studies, Raymond Westbrook[1] and F. Rachel Magdalene[2] have demonstrated that abuse of power was a prominent concern of the biblical writers and considered an actionable crime.[3] When Samuel, for example, gives his farewell address to Israel, he maintains his innocence in economic affairs (1 Sam 12:3–5).[4] He claims that he has not oppressed anyone, using the term עשׁק, which is often used to refer to abuse of authority (e.g., Deut 24:14; Jer 7:6).[5] This implies that abusing a position of religious and political power for personal economic gain was a recognized phenomenon. Also, in the Hebrew Bible, there are regularly prohibitions of and warnings against oppressing the poor and weak for personal gain (e.g., Deut 27:25; Prov 1:10–19; 13:10–11; 22:22–23).[6] Ezekiel, for example, condemns prophets, priests, and princes for a litany of crimes, including taking advantage of the weak for profit (Ezek 22:25–29).[7] Also, Jeremiah 22:11–17 condemns a king for oppressing his subjects for his own economic advantage.[8]

So far, I have observed that abuse of power was condemned in the Hebrew Bible and that there is an observable pattern of prohibitions and warnings against the

---

[1] Raymond Westbrook, *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*, CahRB 26 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1988), 15–38.

[2] F. Rachel Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse of Royal Authority in the Divine Courtroom and the Incident of Naboth's Vineyard," in *The Divine Courtroom in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Ari Mermelstein and Shalom E. Holtz (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 167–45.

[3] Westbrook suggests that גזל and עשׁק are technical terms for abuse of power in biblical Hebrew. Westbrook, *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*. Magdalene builds on the conclusions of Westbrook by arguing that רצץ and דכא are used as technical terms to refer to abuse of authority and that לקח and בצע can be used to refer to it in some cases. Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 195–99.

[4] Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 195.

[5] Westbrook, *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*, 15–38.

[6] For a general treatment of economics and the poor in the ethics of the Hebrew Bible, see Christopher J. H. Wright, *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004), 146–81.

[7] Mic 3:9–11 also shows that the religious elite are implicated in injustice for personal economic gain.

[8] Deut 17:16–17 warns against a king accumulating possessions, highlighting the danger of the elite oppressing those under their control. For additional texts, see Walter Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 139–62.

strong oppressing the weak for economic gain. Next, I intend to show that the Hebrew Bible emphasizes the violation of the Tenth Word by those with political and economic power.

Exodus 34:24 implies that weakness makes a person particularly vulnerable to the covetousness of others: "No one will covet your land (וְלֹא־יַחְמֹד אִישׁ אֶת־אַרְצֶךָ) when you go to appear before the YHWH your God three times in the year." This text uses the vocabulary of the Tenth Word, חמד, and an expected object of covetousness, אֶרֶץ.[9] Most likely, therefore, it should be read in light of the Tenth Word.[10] In this case, the implied subject is an opportunist who might try to appropriate unattended property.[11] While the purpose of this text is to reassure those who will participate in covenant feasts, it reveals that the covetousness of others is a particular concern for the vulnerable. In this case, the vulnerability is vacated land. Since Exodus 34:24 does not give any information regarding who the opportunist might be, there is no indication as to whether the opportunist would be a particularly powerful individual. But the concern being addressed is that unattended land creates an opportunity for the covetous, because it places a property owner in a vulnerable position.[12] Exodus 34:24, therefore, is an indicator within the Hebrew Bible that the weak are particularly vulnerable to the covetousness of others.

---

[9] In reference to the use of חמד in Exod 34:24, Hamilton concludes that the term "may convey more than simply desire or intention. The verse does not intend to say that nobody will find the land of the absent worshipers desirable. Rather, the Lord promises that no individuals will make plans to invade the property even though it is defenseless and attractive prey to others." Victor P. Hamilton, *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 582. While this is likely true, I would simply clarify that the connection between covetousness and action is logical but not lexical. See discussion in chap. 2.

[10] In Exodus, חמד occurs three times—twice in the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17) and once in Exod 34:24.

[11] John I. Durham, *Exodus*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 461.

[12] In light of Exod 34:24, Lang argues that the Tenth Word specifically protects the property of those who have to be away from their homes for extended periods of time. Bernhard Lang, "'Du sollst nicht nach der Frau eines anderen verlangen': Eine neue Deutung des 9. und 10. Gebots," *ZAW* 93, no. 2 (1981): 216–24. Although Lang rightly observes an application of the Tenth Commandment, he unhelpfully restricts the scope of the injunction by limiting its intention to one application.

As I argued in the previous chapter, 2 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21 portray the violation of the Tenth Word.[13] In this chapter, a specific detail of these narratives deserves attention: the covetous individuals are monarchs who use their power to secure the object of their desire. David, for example, uses royal messengers to communicate with Bathsheba and bring her to him in order to commit adultery with her. Also, he uses his military authority to ensure the death of Uriah, committing murder by proxy.[14] David, therefore, takes advantage of his powerful position to perpetrate crimes arising out of his covetousness. "David abused his royal authority," Magdalene writes, "to make it likely that Uriah would be killed. This was done for his own selfish purposes, that is, to avoid any suspicion that he had committed adultery and to gain the pregnant Bathsheba for himself."[15] Since the duty of the king was to provide a remedy for abuse of authority by protecting the weak, the actions of David are particularly heinous. As P. Kyle McCarter Jr. observes, Nathan's parable and indictment (2 Sam 12:1–15) exposes that "as king, David is expected to administer justice; as rich oppressor, however, he subverts justice."[16] Or, as Robert Alter observes, "As king, his first obligation is to protect his subjects and to dispense justice, especially to the disadvantaged. In the affair of Bathsheba and Uriah, he has done precisely the opposite."[17] David, therefore, engaged in a reversal of his

---

[13] In the previous chapter, I argued that 1 Sam 11–12 and 1 Kgs 21 portray the violation of the Tenth Word leading to the violation of other commands from the second table of the Decalogue. In this chapter, I will not recapitulate the arguments for the Tenth Word being significant in these narratives.

[14] For additional observations on the abuse of power in 2 Sam 11–12, see David Toshio Tsumura, *The Second Book of Samuel*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2019), 180, 187; Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 199–202.

[15] Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 200.

[16] P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *2 Samuel*, AB, vol. 9 (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 305.

[17] Robert Alter, *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999), 257. Alter imaginatively comments on David sending Uriah with the letter ordering his own death (2 Sam 11:14): "David is counting on the fact that Uriah as a loyal soldier will not dream of opening the letter. If he does not know of the adultery, he has in any case no personal motive to look at the letter. If he does know, he is accepting his fate with grim resignation, bitterly conscious that his wife has betrayed him and that the king is too powerful for him to contend with" (253). While Alter is clearly going beyond the narrative, he poignantly exposes the reality that David has utterly abused his

responsibility as king, motivated by his covetousness, and it is precisely his power as king that enables him to follow through on his desire.[18]

When it comes to 1 Kings 21, Ahab covets Naboth's field, and Jezebel takes advantage of royal authority to get it for him through false witness and murder. In addition to the actions of Ahab, other powerful characters in the narrative abuse their power. Jezebel uses her political power, acting in the name of Ahab, to accomplish her plan of false witness and murder, so her husband can have the field he covets.[19] Also, the unnamed elders, who are in positions of powerful and influence, follow the unjust directives of Jezebel.[20] As Magdalene convincingly argues, YHWH intervening to judge Ahab shows that royal abuse of authority is at play in the narrative.[21] She concludes, "YHWH strikes down Jezebel, Ahab, and their descendants because Jezebel and Ahab abused their royal authority by bringing a false charge of blasphemy against Naboth in order to take his ancestral lands."[22] The covetousness of Ahab, therefore, results in a plot which abuses the hierarchies of political and social power to secure the object of his

---

power differential in relating to Uriah.

[18] Westbrook explores how David abuses his power in 2 Sam 11–12. In particular, she focuses on the way that Bathsheba and Uriah are victimized and pushes back against the idea that Bathsheba was a willing participant. April D. Westbrook, *"And He Will Take Your Daughters . . . .": Woman Story and the Ethical Evaluation of Monarchy in the David Narrative*, LHBOTS 610 (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 113–41.

[19] Ahab's position as king may have presented him with the opportunity to take the land of those executed under his rule. See Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings*, AB, vol. 10 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 481. Cogan concludes, "From the Naboth case, however, it does seem that the property of convicted criminals (or perhaps only the property of criminals guilty of *lèse-majesté*) was transferable to the crown" (486). If this is correct, it further illustrates how the powerful position of Ahab made the scheme against Naboth possible.

[20] Walsh emphasizes the complicity of the wider society in the murder of Naboth. Jerome T. Walsh, *1 Kings*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 326–27.

[21] Magdalene shows that abuse of power was a concern in ancient Mesopotamia and is paralleled in the Hebrew Bible. As she notes, there was a common belief that the divine court would intervene and bring justice when human courts were incapable of doings so or unwilling to do so. In the case of 1 Kgs 21, YHWH intervening and judging Ahab, Jezebel, and his descendants is a clear indication that abuse of authority is at play. Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 168.

[22] Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 168.

desire.

In both 2 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21, therefore, the Tenth Commandment is violated by a monarch who uses his power to eliminate opposition and secure the object of his covetousness. Also, in both narratives, divine judgment is levied against the monarch to hold him accountable for abuse of power.[23]

Also, Micah 2:1–2 indicts the powerful for violating the Tenth Word. Micah 2:1–2 states, "Woe to those who plan mischief and evil deeds on their beds. In the morning light, they do it, because the power is in their hands (כִּי יֶשׁ־לְאֵל יָדָם). They covet (וְחָמְדוּ) fields (שָׂדוֹת) and seize them. They take houses and oppress a man and his house and the inheritance of a man." To substantiate a link between the Decalogue and this text, Micah uses the same verb (חמד) as the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21).[24] Also, the object of the verb (שָׂדֶה) is one of the objects found in the Tenth Word (Deut 5:21).[25] Micah, therefore, seems to be using the language of the Tenth Word to prophetically indict his contemporaries.

Micah 2:1 makes it clear that the ones breaking the Tenth Word and appropriating are the powerful by stating that they accomplish their plans "because the power is in their hands" (כִּי יֶשׁ־לְאֵל יָדָם).[26] As James Luther Mays writes, "The men

---

[23] As Magdalene notes, there are clear parallels between 1 Kgs 21 and 1 Sam 11–12. Magdalene, "Trying the Crime of Abuse," 199–202, 224.

[24] Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, *Micah*, OTL (Louisville: Westminister John Knox Press, 2015), 83; Bruce K. Waltke, *A Commentary on Micah* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 95; Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah*, AB, vol. 24E (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 270–72; Hans Walter Wolff, *Micah*, trans. Gary Stansell (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 78; Delbert R. Hillers, *Micah*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 33; James Luther Mays, *Micah*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 63; Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1976), 288–89.

[25] While בַּיִת (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21) also appears in Mic 2:2, it is the object of גזל, not חמד. Therefore, while the presence of this lexeme gives indirect support that similar concepts to the Tenth Word are in view, it is not a direct parallel.

[26] For a discussion of how to translate this phrase, see Andersen and Freedman, *Micah*, 267–68.

addressed by the 'woe' are members of the power structure in Judah's society."[27] While Micah does not precisely define what makes them powerful, it is safe to conclude that they possessed some combination of political, economic, or religious authority.[28] Westbrook suggests that there are two technical terms for abuse of power in biblical Hebrew: גזל and עשׁק. In Micah 2:2, both of these terms make an appearance.[29] Thus, when Micah 2:1–2 is read alongside the narratives of 2 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21, it fits the pattern of the elite acting out of covetousness to secure the object of their desire.[30]

Summary

The Hebrew Bible, therefore, emphasizes the violation of the Tenth Word by the political, economic, and religious elite. Exodus 34:24 implies that weakness creates a particular vulnerability to covetousness. Also, 1 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21 describe monarchs abusing their authority to secure the object of their covetousness. Micah 2:1–2 uses the vocabulary of the Tenth Word to describe the way that the powerful oppress the weak. As Miller summarizes, "Where one encounters instances of coveting in the Old Testament, they are largely *acts of royalty and the wealthy*."[31] Also, these examples should be placed within the context of the general pattern in the Hebrew Bible where the political, economic, and religious elite are condemned for their unjust and greedy

---

[27] Mays, *Micah*, 63; also see Smith-Christopher, *Micah*, 81–83; Hillers, *Micah*, 33; Allen, *Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, 287–88.

[28] Isa 5:8 likely describes analogous practices of predatory land accumulation.

[29] Westbrook, *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*, 15–38.

[30] Skralovnik observes this and concludes that the Tenth Commandment is specifically designed for the rich and powerful. Samo Skralovnik, "The Meaning and Interpretation of Desire in the Tenth Commandment (Exod 20,17): The Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* Word Field," *BN* 171 (2016): 21–23. While Skralovnik overclaims by making the activity of the rich and powerful intrinsic to covetousness, he does identify a legitimate pattern where the authors of the Hebrew Bible identify covetousness in the elite.

[31] Patrick D. Miller, *The Ten Commandments*, Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 396. He also writes, "The large problem in the way this commandment plays out in the biblical texts is the acquisitiveness of the rich and powerful and the development of means, legal and illegal, to appropriate the property of others" (398).

oppression of the weak and poor. To clarify, however, covetousness is not limited to the elite, as if they are predisposed in some way toward a certain type of desire.[32] Instead, the covetousness of the powerful receives specific attention, perhaps because they are in a position to act on their covetousness. While everyone covets, not everyone is a king or wealthy landowner who can acquire their desire.

Early Jewish Literature

In early Jewish literature, similar interpretive patterns are observable to those of the Hebrew Bible on the subjects of power, greed, and oppression. Philo, for example, describes how some people covet the goods of others but do not have the power to act on their desires. Conversely, those with power may steal in dramatic ways:

> The third commandment in the second five forbids stealing, for he who gapes after what belongs to others is the common enemy of the State, willing to rob all, but able only to filch from some, because, while his covetousness (πλεονεξίαν) extends indefinitely, his feebler capacity cannot keep pace with it but restricted to a small compass reaches only to a few. So all thieves who have acquired the strength rob whole cities, careless of punishment because their high distinction seems to set them above the laws. These are oligarchic ally-minded persons, ambitious for despotism or domination, who perpetrate thefts on a great scale, disguising the real fact of robbery under the grand-sounding names of government and leadership. (Philo, *Decalogue* 135–37)

Philo is commenting on the Eighth Word, but he references covetousness (πλεονεξία) as the motivation of thieves (Philo, *Decalogue* 135). Also, this passage shows the distinction he makes between the ability of those with power to act on their desires and the inability of those without it. While he acknowledges and condemns the reality of petty theft, he emphasizes that some disguise their theft under the auspices of "government and leadership" (Philo, *Decalogue* 137). Also, he notes how the powerful act on their

---

[32] Achan, for example, clearly coveted, but there is no indication in the narrative that he abused his power in doing so. To clarify, he could be seen as a privileged individual with some degree of influence. As Pressler suggests, "Achan is an insider par excellence, a Judahite man from a prominent family." Carolyn Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, WBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 57; L. Daniel Hawk, *Joshua*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 111; Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 103. However, there is no indication in the narrative that Achan capitalized on any influence, power, or wealth to accomplish his crime. Thus, the story of Achan helpfully shows that covetousness is not necessarily limited to the elite in biblical narrative.

covetousness, because they can avoid accountability to the law. As Philo puts it, they are "careless of punishment because their high distinction seems to set them above the laws" (Philo, *Decalogue* 136). Philo, therefore, seems to suggest that covetousness stretches across the spectrum of power, but potency is the key factor in acting upon it. Due to this, the covetous elite pose a particular threat. In this way, Philo's description meshes with the pattern established in the Hebrew Bible regarding the Tenth Word.

Similarly, in *On Rewards and Punishments* 154–55, Philo writes,

> On men they have laid a heavy burden, the stronger (δυνατώτεροι) oppressing the weaker (ἀσθενεστέρους), by making the tasks which they impose continuous and unbroken: on the fields, by ever pursuing unjust gains in the coveteousness (πλεονεξιῶν) of their hearts, lust (ἐπιθυμίαις) at the base and on it impulses to action unjust and unrestrained, which never can be satisfied. (LCL, Colson)

Contextually, Philo is describing the behavior and motivations of those who reject the commands to give rest to both land and people on the seventh day and in the seventh year (*Rewards* 153–56). He identifies this as an example of oppression of the weak by the strong and attributes it to πλεονεξία and ἐπιθυμία. Philo, therefore, shows an awareness of the way that covetous desire motivates the strong to oppress the weak for personal gain. While he does not directly tie these dynamics to the Tenth Word, there is a conceptual resonance with the patterns observed in the Hebrew Bible.

Josephus records Agrippa giving a speech in which he advocated against war with Rome (*J. W.* 2.345–401). Toward the beginning of the speech, Agrippa speculates regarding the motives of the hawkish Jews and asserts that some were driven by "avarice (πλεονεξία) and the prospect of enriching themselves (κέρδος) at the expense of the weak (τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων) in the event of a general convulsion" (*J. W.* 2.346). Notably, Agrippa relates exploitation in wartime to greed and singles out the weak as the victims of it. While the words of Agrippa may or may not reflect the actual opinion of Josephus regarding the motivations of some of the Jewish rebels,[33] it expresses what would have

[33] On the interpretive issues related to this speech, and the speeches recorded by Josephus in

been a well-known sentiment: in times of war, opportunists would exploit the weak for profit. In addition, Josephus describes concrete instances of oppression for profit during wartime (e.g., *J. W.* 4.335, 357, 379; 6.202–3). As Steve Mason observes, the reference by Agrippa anticipates "the frequently described rebel leaders' exploitation by brute force of weaker fellow-Judeans, once the central government is removed."[34] Josephus also attributes this to the Roman troops. When he describes the way the troops of Florus violently plundered, he attributes their behavior to "lust for booty" (ἐπιθυμία κέρδους; *J. W.* 2.305). In fact, Florus is described as a thoroughly greedy individual, using πλεονεξία (*J. W.* 2.279, 331). Josephus, therefore, adds to the evidence that the greedy oppression of the weak for financial gain was a widely recognized phenomenon in early Jewish thought.

The author of 4 Maccabees presents a positive perspective by claiming that Torah enables the greedy to act justly. Fourth Maccabees 2:8 states, "Therefore, conducting one's life by the Law, even if one is a lover of money (φιλάργυρός), a person is immediately constrained in regard to his or her way of life, lending without interest to those who ask and reducing the debt when the seventh year comes around" (cf. 4 Macc 1:26).[35] As David A. DeSilva traces, the author is most likely drawing on Exodus 22:24 and Deuteronomy 15:1,[36] and "both of these commands invoked in 2:8 are understood by the author as remedies against the human tendency toward greed, toward putting the accumulation of wealth ahead of the well-being of one's fellow human beings and

---

general, see Josephus, *Judean War 2*, ed. and trans. Steve Mason, FJTC, IB (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 265–68.

[34] Josephus, *Judean War 2*, 270n2179.

[35] Translation from David Arthur deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2006).

[36] deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, 97–98.

ensuring their enjoyment of God's gifts, meant for all."[37] While implicit, the dynamic of those with economic power oppressing the weaker is assumed, because the lender inevitably has a degree of economic power over the borrower. The author of 4 Maccabees, therefore, implicitly notes the connection between greed and economic oppression, while explicitly affirming that Torah can enable the greedy to overcome it.[38] Also, this affirmation occurs in the immediate context of a direct citation of the Tenth Word (4 Macc 2:5–6). While the author of 4 Maccabees is most likely not expounding on the Tenth Word in 4 Maccabees 2:8,[39] the proximity of the citation of it makes it possible that the author relates the ideas of greed and economic oppression to the Tenth Word.[40]

Also, there is evidence that early Jews viewed excessive desire as a particular temptation for the powerful. In Letter of Aristeas 211,[41] the king asks one of his Jewish guests, "What is the measure of kingship?" In response, the guest states,

> To rule oneself well and not be carried away by wealth and fame to desire (ἐπιθυμῆσαι) anything arrogant and unseemly, if you would reason well. For you have everything that you need, but God is one who needs nothing and is equitable. And you think in the manner that a human being does. Do not grasp (ὀρέγου) at many things, except for those things sufficient for kingship.

---

[37] deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, 98.

[38] deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, 98.

[39] As deSilva notes, there seems to be a transition after the discussion of the Tenth Word: "2:6b–7 provides a transition from discussing how people who follow Torah preserve self-control to exploring how they attain a just way of life by the same means." deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, 96. Also, Exod 22:24 and Deut 15:1 would be the direct commands from Torah which would be in view.

[40] Also, 4 Macc 2:7 describes gluttony, and Philo believed the Tenth Commandment was kept through self-control, and one of the important purposes of the dietary laws in Mosaic legislation was to give an opportunity for the cultivation of this self-control in order to keep the Tenth Commandment. Rhodes writes, "According to Philo, Moses introduced laws pertaining to food and drink precisely to bridle the passion incited by desire." James N. Rhodes, "Diet and Desire: The Logic of the Dietary Laws According to Philo," *ETL* 79, no. 1 (April 2003): 123. The fact that the author of 4 Maccabees discusses gluttony, an issue connected to the Tenth Word by other early Jewish writers, raises the possibility that a variety of issues related to the Tenth Word are being discussed.

[41] For the translation of Letter of Aristeas, I have used Benjamin G. Wright III, *Letter of Aristeas*, CEJL (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015). For the text of Letter of Aristeas, I have used André Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate,* Sources chrétiennes 89 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962). For introduction to Letter of Aristeas, see Wright III, *Letter of Aristeas*, 6–74.

As the guest expresses, kings may have an excessive desire for unnecessary things.[42] In other early Jewish writings, the concern that the rich and powerful would become greedy is expressed as well (cf. LAB 29.1; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.158–59).

According to some in the Qumran community, their religious nemeses were driven by greed.[43] In particular, Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) ascribes this greed to the Wicked Priest. 1QpHab 8:8–12 states,

> Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who was called loyal at the start of his office. However, when he ruled over Israel his heart became proud, he deserted God and betrayed the laws for the sake of riches. And he robbed and hoarded wealth from the violent men who had rebelled against God. And he seized public money, incurring additional serious sin. (cf. 1QpHab 6:1)[44]

That is, the Wicked Priest used his powerful religious and political position to act on his own greed. Pesher Habakkuk, therefore, describes how a person of power abused it for personal economic gain, motivated by greed.

4Q390[45] expresses a similar concern:

> What I do not like they have chosen: domineering for money, for advantage [and for violence. And each] will steal what belongs to one's neigh[bour] and they will oppress one another; they will defile my temple, [they will defile my sabbaths, and] they will f[orget] my [fest]ivals and with the sons of [foreigners they will de]base their offs[pring;] their priests will act violently. (4Q390, II, 8–10)

While 4Q390 seems to be indicting broad patterns of injustice, priests are explicitly referenced. Also, the author references the priests earlier in the document (4Q390, I, 3),

---

[42] Wright notes how this passage fits into the argument of Letter of Aristeas as a whole: "Ps.-Aristeas maintains the distinction between the king and God as he has from the beginning of the symposia. The king is human and thinks as a human. The implication seems to be that the king, because he is human, might crave things that he does not need. The respondent warns against this way of behaving. The king should need only those things sufficient for kingship." Wright, *Letter of Aristeas*, 361–62.

[43] For a general treatment of wealth in Qumranic texts, see Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002).

[44] For the DSS, I have taken the text and translation from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997).

[45] While 4Q390 is not technically Qumranic, it displays certain affinities with Qumranic thought. For a fuller discussion of this and other introductory issues, see Balázs Tamási, "Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics Against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship Behind the Fragments?," *Henoch* 31 (2009): 325–41.

so their misbehavior seems to be of particular concern to the author.[46] In the quoted passage, 4Q390 particularly highlights economic injustice and seems to suggest that the priests are partly to blame for it. In this way, 4Q390 fits the pattern of the religious elite engaging in abuse of power for economic gain.

In a remarkable passage, the Temple Scroll (11Q19) appears to make a direct connection between the Tenth Word and instructions regarding abuse of power by a monarch. In a discussion on kingship, the Temple Scroll states, "And he shall not crave (לוא יחמוד) a field (שדה), a vineyard (וכרם), any wealth, a house (ובית) or any valuable thing in Israel and seize" (וגזל; 11Q19, LVII, 20-21). In context, this statement occurs in a paraphrase and expansion of Deuteronomy 17:14–17, which is legal material on the subject of the requirements on a monarch.[47]

Two observations are possible based on this passage from the Temple Scroll. First, the author seems to paraphrase the Tenth Word in a section on kingship, which seems to imply that the composer may have been thinking that the king could be particularly likely to covet. To substantiate the connection to the Tenth Word, the Temple Scroll uses the same verb (חמד) as the Tenth Word (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21). Also, two of the objects of the verb, שדה (Deut 5:21) and ובית (Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21), are found in the Tenth Word. These parallels suggest that it is very likely that the author of the Temple Scroll intentionally used the verbiage of the Tenth Word. Second, the composer of this document may have actually had Ahab in mind when adding a vineyard (כרם) as a possible object of coveting, because this is the same term used repeatedly in 1 Kings 21

---

[46] Tamási notes that the general perspective of 4Q390 is skewed against the priesthood. Tamási, "Prophesized History of Postexilic Period,"325–41.

[47] As Borchardt summarizes, "The scroll, which covers sixty-seven columns, contains legal/instructional material both directly equivalent to that found in the books of Exodus through Deuteronomy and separately composed or external material that has been adopted into this new context." Francis Borchardt, "The Temple Scroll in the Context of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Scholarly Texts," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 108, no. 2 (Spring 2018): 139–40. When it comes to LVII–LIX specifically, Borchardt writes, "These additional instructions seem to take Dt 17.14–18 as their starting point in column LVI but then go on to introduce material without any other obvious parallel in column LVII" (153).

to describe the property of Naboth. So, the composer of the Temple Scroll may have been influenced by 1 Kings 21 in adding this particular object. The Temple Scroll, therefore, seems to provide direct evidence that early Jewish thinkers identified the violation of the Tenth Word as a particular temptation for the powerful. Also, it provides early evidence which may confirm the interpretation of 1 Kings 21 that is presented above: that Ahab is an example of abusing political authority in violating the Tenth Word.

To note an additional text, I argued in the previous chapter that Susanna connects the violation of the Tenth Commandment (Sus 8–14) to attempted adultery (Sus 19–20), false witness (Sus 21, 43, 61), and attempted murder (Sus 53). At this point, it is pertinent to observe that the violators of the command are leaders in the community. Elma Cornelius shows that the elders are individuals with social, legal, and political power in their community, but Susanna is essentially powerless. In the narrative, Susanna is vindicated, because God intervenes, through Daniel.[48] Thus, Susanna shows remarkable affinities with 2 Samuel 11–12 and 1 Kings 21 where individuals with political and legal power abuse their authority in an attempt to seize the object of their covetousness.

Summary

This survey of evidence from early Jewish material demonstrates that early Jewish writers shared a concern that the religious, economic, and political elite would abuse, or were abusing, their power, motivated by greed, and take advantage of weaker persons (Philo, *Decalogue* 135–37; *Spec*. *Laws* 4.158–59; *J.W.* 2.346; 4 Macc 2:8; Let. Arist. 211; 4Q390, II, 8–10; 1QpHab 8:8–12; LAB 29.1). The survey also shows that the violation of the Tenth Word is directly connected to the abuse of power by the elite in two

[48] Elma Cornelius, "What Kind of Power Can Build Society? A Remarkable Power Play in Susanna," *HvTSt* 75, no. 3 (July 2019): 1–5. Also see Elma Cornelius, "The Woman in 'Susanna': An Understanding of the Rhetoric of 'Susanna,'" *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 19, no. 1 (2008): 103.

key texts (11Q19, LVII, 20-21; Susanna). In light of this evidence, there seems to be good reason for concluding that the interpretive trajectory observed in the Hebrew Bible is sustained in early Jewish literature.

Paul According to Acts 20:33

The New Testament frequently portrays those with religious, political, and economic power as greedy, corrupt, and oppressive (e.g., Luke 16:14; Acts 24:26; Jas 2:6; 5:1–6), which is consistent with the interpretive trajectories of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature.[49] In the Pauline corpus, however, a specific pattern manifests: covetousness is a test of a faithful ministry. Before turning to the Pauline corpus, I will consider a related emphasis in the presentation of Paul in Acts.[50]

Luke records Paul giving a speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus in Acts 20:17–38.[51] In this address, he concludes by defending his conduct in matters of finance and work and puts himself forward as a model for imitation (Acts 20:33–35).[52] He

---

[49] To clarify, the presentation of the religious, political, and economic elite as greedy, corrupt, and oppressive most likely reflects historical experiences. Thus, I am suggesting that this observation is consistent with the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, but it is not exhaustively explained by these backgrounds.

[50] As a clarification, I am not engaging in a detailed treatment of the financial policy of Paul. Instead, I am focusing specifically on texts which engage with the issue of greed and ministry. For broader treatments of the approach of Paul to finances in ministry, see David E. Briones, *Paul's Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach*, LNTS 494 (Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013); Verlyn D. Verbrugge and Keith R. Krell, *Paul and Money: A Biblical and Theological Analysis of the Apostle's Teachings and Practices* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015); Wilhelm Pratscher, "Der Verzicht des Paulus auf finanziellen Unterhalt durch seine Gemeinden: ein Aspekt seiner Missionsweise," *NTS* 25, no. 3 (April 1979): 284–98.

[51] McGee argues that Acts 20:18–38 is a farewell address by genre. While the farewell address was a common phenomenon in the Hellenistic world, McGee particularly points to Jewish backgrounds like the farewell addresses of Moses (Deut 31–34) and Samuel (1 Sam 12). McGee argues that the primary purpose of the use of the genre is to communicate the transition of authority in the narrative. Zane B. McGee, "Transitioning Authority and Paul's Farewell Address: Examining the Narrative Function of Acts 20," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 203–14. On the structure of the speech, see John J. Kilgallen, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders: Its Structure," *ETL* 70, no. 1 (1994): 112–21.

[52] While there have been entire monographs dedicated to the Miletus speech, I am drawing attention simply to one element of it for the purposes of this argument. For a survey of some of the scholarship on the Miletus speech, see Andreas Lindemann, "Paulus und die Rede in Milet (Apg 20,17–38)," in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, ed. Daniel Marguerat, BETL 229 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009), 175n1.

asserts, "I desired (ἐπεθύμησα) the gold, silver, or clothing of no one" (Acts 20:33). While the echo of the Tenth Word is faint, Paul uses ἐπιθυμέω[53] (Exod 20:17 LXX; Deut 5:21 LXX) with expected objects of covetousness (cf. Deut 7:25; Josh 7:21). Additionally, since Paul gives the Tenth Word prominence in his writings (Rom 7:7; 13:9),[54] it is reasonable to identify the influence of the Tenth Word on a speech attributed to him in Acts.[55] While additional backgrounds are also possible, the Tenth Word seems to be exerting an influence on Acts 20:33.[56] After making this statement, Paul offers evidence

---

[53] Interestingly, this is the only occurrence of ἐπιθυμέω in Acts. Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 89n169. If the lens is broadened to Luke-Acts, it occurs four times in Luke where it refers to hunger (Luke 15:16; 16:21) and desiring a future event (Luke 17:22; 22:15). Acts 20:33, therefore, is the only occurrence of ἐπιθυμέω in Luke-Acts referring to greedy desire.

[54] Of course, the question of whether the Pauline corpus should impact the interpretation of Acts, or vice-versa, is debated, but it seems reasonable to simply observe that the presence of the Tenth Word in the mouth of Paul in Acts is consistent with its prominence in the Pauline corpus.

[55] As Johnson writes, "The use of *epithymeō* is particularly striking not only because it recalls the commandment 'Do not covet' (*ouk epithymēseis*, Exod 20:17 LXX), but also because it is the commandment of God singled out by Paul himself for special consideration in Rom 7:7; 1 Cor 10:6; Gal 5:17." Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Sacra Pagina 5 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 364–65. Also see Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 625. Of course, I have also argued that Paul is influenced by the Tenth Word in passages where it is not directly quoted (1 Cor 10:6–10; Eph 5:5; Col 3:5; 1 Thess 4:3–8). In light of the claims of my project, a reference to the Tenth Commandment is even more likely in Acts 20:33. For other writers who observe the possible influence of the Tenth Word on Acts 20:33, see David M. Miller, "Reading Law as Prophecy: Torah Ethics in Acts," in *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, ed. Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016), 90; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 632. In contrast, some writers do not mention the possible influence of the Tenth Word. F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 3rd rev. and enlarged ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 436; Carl R. Holladay, *Acts*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016); Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle*; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 2, ICC 41 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 982; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, AB, vol. 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 681.

[56] In addition to the Tenth Word, the farewell speech of Samuel (1 Sam 12) may be a helpful background against which to understand Paul's farewell speech to the Miletus elders. 1 Sam 12:3–6 describes how Samuel addressed Israel and maintained his innocence when it came to greed. Lindemann, "Paulus und die Rede in Milet," 197–98; Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle*, 89; Holladay, *Acts*; Witherington, *Acts of the Apostles*, 625; Barrett, *Acts of the Apostles*, 2:982; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB, vol. 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 681; Johnson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 364–65; Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 436. While Samuel's farewell speech forms a background for the Miletus speech in genre and concept, it does not have the same verbal resonance as the Tenth Word; therefore, the two backgrounds are complementary, not mutually exclusive. Also, Paul shows certain parallels with Greco-Roman ideas. As Johnson writes, "Disavowing the vice of *philargyria* ('love of money') was also a standard element in the apologia of the authentic philosopher (see Philostratus, *Live of Apollonius of Tyana* 1:34; Dio Chysostom, *Oration* 32:9, 11; 1 Thess 2:5)." Johnson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 364–65. Plümacher argues that Paul is directly dependent on Thucydides in Acts 20:33–35; however, to make this argument, he denies that Luke records an authentic saying of Jesus and sidesteps the clear Jewish backgrounds which provide a ready explanation for the statements of Paul. Eckhard Plümacher, "Eine Thukydidesreminiszenz in der Apostelgeschichte (Act 20,33–35 – Thuk. II 97,3f.)," *ZNW* 83, no. 3–4 (1992): 270–75. MacDonald also

that he has not been covetous by pointing to his habit of working to provide for himself and his companions (Acts 20:34). Also, in Acts 20:35, Paul states, "I showed (ὑπέδειξα) you in all things that by working hard in this way it is necessary to help the weak and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'."[57] Paul, therefore, intended to embody the instruction of Jesus with the goal of giving a moral example for the Ephesian elders to follow.[58] The Tenth Word, therefore, is one explanation for the ethical instruction of Paul regarding ministry and finance as recorded by Luke in Acts 20:33–35. While the influence of the Tenth Word is most clearly seen in the direct denial of Paul (Acts 20:33), it may also have influenced the work habits of Paul (Acts 20:34) and his intention of giving a moral example for the leaders of his congregations (Acts 20:35).[59]

The Lukan Paul or the Epistolary Paul?

Acts 20:33–35 hints at the influence of the Tenth Word, and I intend to suggest that this observation is relevant for interpreting the Pauline corpus. Of course, some

---

attempts to read the Pauline farewell speech against the background of Hellenistic literature, but he reads it against the background of the farewell speech of Hector to Andromache in Homer's *Iliad*. Dennis R. MacDonald, "Paul's Farewell to the Ephesian Elders and Hector's Farewell to Andromache: A Strategic Imitation of Homer's Iliad," in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium 20 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 189–203.

[57] When Paul quotes this saying of Jesus, it demonstrates that the Tenth Word is not the only influence on his thought. Of course, however, Paul may be influenced by multiple complementary ethical norms. See "Methodology" in chap. 1.

[58] Kurz writes, "The narrative thus appeals to two authoritative guides for how Christian leaders are to act: to the example of Paul and to the words of Jesus." William S. Kurz, "Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 175. Kurz draws attention to the prominence of the use of personal examples in moral instruction in the Hellenistic world and suggests that the Miletus speech is one of the clear examples of the use of moral exempla in Luke-Acts. Kurz, "Narrative Models for Imitation," 174–75. Phillips also emphasizes the normative function of the example of Paul in the Miletus speech. Thomas E. Phillips, "Paul as a Role Model in Acts," in *Acts and Ethics*, ed. Thomas E. Phillips, New Testament Monographs 9 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), 61.

[59] Miller addresses Acts 20:33 in the context of an argument regarding how Luke presents Torah in Acts. He writes, "Although the Torah is not cited directly as an authority in Gentile contexts, it is not far from view—Paul's claim that he did not 'covet' echoes the tenth commandment—and it still informs gentile ethical practice, but it does so indirectly." Miller, "Reading Law as Prophecy," 90.

might object that data from Acts should not inform conclusions regarding Pauline ethics. So, what bearing should evidence from Acts have on reading the Pauline corpus? While some have sharply contrasted the Lukan Paul with the Epistolary Paul,[60] recent scholarship has moved toward emphasizing continuity. Odile Flichy, for example, surveys the history of research on Paul in Acts and observes that "the Paul of Acts is no longer suspected of betraying the Paul of the letters."[61] While the scholarly conversation regarding the relationship between the presentation of Paul in Acts and the Pauline corpus will continue on a host of specific issues,[62] Acts 20:33–35 meshes well, as will be demonstrated, with the self-portrait of Paul in his letters. This suggests that it should not be prevented from informing the study of the Pauline corpus.[63]

---

[60] Vielhauer argues that the author of Acts "presents no specifically Pauline idea." Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Marty (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 48. Porter, however, is one example of a writer who has directly challenged this idea and suggests that the Paul of Acts is not significantly different than the Paul of the letters. Stanley E. Porter, "Was Paulinism a Thing When Luke-Acts Was Written?," in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, ed. Daniel Marguerat, BETL 229 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009), 1–13.

[61] Flichy does emphasize, of course, that a scholarly consensus is elusive. Odile Flichy, "The Paul of Luke. A Survey of Research," in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*, ed. David P. Moessner et al., trans. James D. Ernest, LNTS 452 (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 34. Similarly, Jipp notes that there has been "a reevaluation of the portrait of Paul in Acts and the so-called historical Paul (or perhaps better, epistolary Paul)." Joshua W. Jipp, "The Acts of the Apostles," in *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. Scot McKnight and Nijak K. Gupta (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 354. To give a final example, Oliver argues that there is theological coherence between Paul in Romans and Paul as presented by Acts. Isaac W. Oliver, "The 'Historical Paul' and the Paul of Acts," in *Paul the Jew: Rereading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Carlos A. Segovia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 51–80.

[62] Büllesbach, for example, explores the way the end of Paul's life is presented in Acts and the Pauline corpus. Claudia Büllesbach, "Das Verhältnis der Acta Pauli zur Apostelgeschichte des Lukas: Darstellung und Kritik der Forschungsgeschichte," in *Das Ende des Paulus: Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 215–37.

[63] Gaventa notes that what Paul says in Acts 20:33–35 coheres with what he says in his other letters, but it is also very Lukan. Gaventa points to Acts 1:18, 3:6, 5:1–11, 8:14–24, and 16:16–24, concluding, "Put succinctly, the Paul who takes leave of the Ephesian elders offers himself less as the church's hero, a model to be emulated for his own behavior, than as an instantiation of God's own will." Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Theology and Ecclesiology in the Miletus Speech: Reflections on Content and Context," *NTS* 50, no. 1 (January 2004): 46. Gaventa is concerned, rightly, to show that Paul does not present himself as a model to be imitated in a way that is separate from the Lukan portrait of Christian ministry or from Jesus Christ. Taking a different vantage point, Scheffler compares the way caring for the poor is presented in Luke and Acts and notes that Paul appeals to a saying of Jesus and presents himself as free from covetousness, which coheres with Jesus' teaching in Luke 12:15. Scheffler, however, suggests that Paul presents himself as different than Jesus by being self-sufficient, because Jesus allowed himself to be supported by others (Luke 8:1–3). Eben Scheffler, "Caring for the Needy in the Acts of the Apostles,"

I propose, therefore, that Acts 20:33–35 is relevant to the interpretation of the Pauline corpus.[64] To be specific, Luke may have recorded the actual words of a speech that Paul spoke to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. If so, Acts 20:33–35 is a direct witness to Pauline ethical instruction. Or, Luke may have been an early interpreter of the Pauline corpus. If so, his presentation of the Miletus speech may reflect early interpretive traditions.[65] If this is the case, the Miletus speech provides early evidence of how ancient readers reflected on the writings of Paul. Of course, these possibilities are complementary. In my view, the Miletus speech is an accurate witness to the ethical instruction of the historical Paul, and Luke was likely familiar with Pauline thought as represented in his writings. However, even for those who are not prepared to agree with this position, there is good reason for allowing Acts 20:33–35 to influence the study of the Pauline corpus.

Neotestamentica 50, no. 3 (2016): 138. While evaluating the ethics of money and possessions in two works as long and complex as Luke-Acts is difficult, Tannehill draws attention to the basic continuity, although he sees some nuanced differences, between Luke and Acts on the subject of possessions. Robert C. Tannehill, "Do the Ethics of Acts Include the Ethical Teaching in Luke?," in Phillips, *Acts and Ethics*, 116–21.

[64] Of course, this conclusion is rather uncontroversial in scholarship which proceeds from a confessional stance, such as my own. I have attempted to show, however, that my methodology is reasonable even from the perspective of critical scholarship.

[65] Aejmelaeus argues that Luke consulted the Pauline corpus when writing the farewell address. Aejmelaeus engages in redaction criticism in an attempt to separate redaction from tradition in the Miletus speech. Lars Aejmelaeus, *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18–35)*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Finnicæ B 232 (Helsinki, Finland: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987). Walton, however, critiques Aejmelaeus and suggests that Luke knew Pauline material independently of the Pauline corpus. Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle*, 212. Pervo suggests that Luke was familiar with the Pauline corpus more broadly. Richard I. Pervo, "The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke As an Interpreter of the Corpus Paulinum," in Marguerat, *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*, 141–55. Also, when it comes to the Miletus speech in particular, Ballhorn surveys it with the question in view of whether or not Luke wrote it in knowing the circumstances of the death of Paul. Ballhorn concludes that Luke presupposed the death of Paul in writing it. Geeske Ballhorn, "Die Miletrede – ein Literaturbericht," in *Das Ende des Paulus: historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 37–47. Thus, the view that Luke was familiar with material from the Pauline corpus and information regarding the historical Paul is wide-spread and well-supported. Of course, these theories intersect with the questions of the dating of Acts and the compilation of the Pauline corpus. However, for the purposes of this project, it is sufficient to note that there are a variety of positions which acknowledge the influence of either Pauline writings or historical information about Paul independent of his writings on the Miletus speech.

Paul: A Ministry Free from Covetousness

Acts 20:33–35 records Paul asserting his freedom from covetousness, using language reminiscent of the Tenth Word, and presenting himself as an exemplar. In light of this evidence, an investigation of the Pauline corpus focused on the question of whether the Tenth Word impacted how Paul presented his ministry is warranted. To accomplish this, I briefly survey relevant texts from the Pauline corpus in canonical order before summarizing my findings and drawing conclusions.

In 2 Corinthians 2:17,[66] Paul contrasts his approach to ministry with the approach of others: "For we are not like the many who peddle (καπηλεύοντες) the word of God, but as from sincerity (εἰλικρινείας), but as from God, we speak before God in Christ." In this first reference to his opponents in 2 Corinthians, [67] Paul directly contrasts his ministry with theirs at the point of motivation.[68] He charges his opponents with financial motivations by using the term καπηλεύω.[69] While this term only occurs here in the New Testament, it is a commercial term which communicates financial motivation.[70]

---

[66] For a comprehensive discussion of 2 Cor 2:17, see Scott J. Hafemann, *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit: Paul's Defense of His Ministry in 2 Corinthians 2:14–3:3* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 98–179. Second Cor 2:17 occurs in a section which has received significant scholarly attention. For example, see T. Novick, "Peddling Scents: Merchandise and Meaning in 2 Corinthians 2:14–17," *JBL* 130, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 543–49; Roger David Aus, *Imagery of Triumph and Rebellion in 2 Corinthians 2:14-17 and Elsewhere in the Epistle: An Example of the Combination Greco-Roman and Judaic Traditions in the Apostle Paul*, Studies in Judaism (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005); Harold W. Attridge, "Making Scents of Paul: The Background and Sense of 2 Cor 2:14–17," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, NovTSup 110 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 71–88.

[67] Victor Paul Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, AB, vol. 32A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 191; Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1997), 156.

[68] George H. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 178–81.

[69] "Paul points to the dark shadow of inappropriate motives hanging over the heads of the Corinthian interlopers." Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 179; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 2nd ed., WBC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 189–90; Mark A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014), 93–94; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 253–54. When Paul criticizes his opponents for being financially motivated, there are parallels in Graeco-Roman sources. Harris, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, 254; Barnett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 157n51; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 178.

[70] For a detailed treatment of this verb, see Hafemann, *Suffering and Ministry in Spirit*, 101–

While this verb does not occur in the LXX, its cognate noun κάπηλος occurs in Isaiah 1:22,[71] and Sirach 26:29,[72] where it refers to merchants and has a negative connotation.[73] In both instances, κάπηλος seems to refer to those who are engaging in duplicitous business practices. Paul, therefore, is identifying his opponents as money-hungry and accusing them of using their message for personal gain. In contrast, Paul describes his ministry using εἰλικρίνεια (cf. 1:12; 1 Cor 5:8), which is an assertion of pure motives. Contextually, Paul is denying that he is motivated by financial gain. Paul, therefore, contrasts his ministry with the ministries of his opponents, and the specific point of contrast is whether or not the motivation for ministry is financial.

In 2 Corinthians 7:2, Paul declares, "We have defrauded (ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν) no one." Paul uses πλεονεκτέω, a term which he uses twice in 2 Corinthians 12:17–18 when defending himself against any charge of greedy motivation. Most likely, therefore, the term also refers to a charge of avarice in 2 Corinthians 7:2.[74] In the LXX, πλεονεκτέω is used twice. Habakkuk 2:9 states, "Woe to the one defrauding for evil gain (ὁ πλεονεκτῶν πλεονεξίαν κακὴν) for his house." Ezekiel 22:27 LXX states, "Her rulers in her midst are like ravenous tearing prey so that they might shed blood, so they might defraud for unjust

---

25.

[71] Isa 1:22 states, "Your merchants (κάπηλοί) mix wine with water."

[72] Sir 26:29 states, "A merchant (ἔμπορος) will hardly keep himself from trespass, and a peddler (κάπηλος) will not be justified from sin."

[73] Plato used καπηλεύω when critiquing the Sophists (Plato, *Prot.* 313D [LCL])

[74] While there is little contextual information to inform the interpretation of πλεονεκτέω in 2 Cor 7:2, Paul uses the same term twice in his defense in 2 Cor 12:17–18 and discusses finances in 2 Cor 12:13–16, which would seem to confirm that Paul is using the term to refer to financial fraud. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 362; Moisés Silva, ed., "Πλεονεξία, Πλεονέκτης, Πλεονεκτέω," *NIDNTTE* 3:780–81; Harris, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, 517; Barnett, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, 360–61; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 369. Martin, however, suggests the term denotes a broader idea than financial manipulation in 2 Corinthians. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 383–84. However, while πλεονεκτέω can denote fraudulent behavior in more than finances (see 1 Thess 4:6), the clear contextual references to finances in 2 Cor 12:13–16 make the financial interpretation more likely.

gain" (πλεονεξίᾳ πλεονεκτῶσιν).[75] In the LXX, therefore, πλεονεκτέω is used to describe oppression motivated by greed, and in Ezekiel 22:27 LXX it refers to the behavior of the powerful. In 2 Corinthians 7:2, therefore, Paul is most likely defending himself against the idea that he took advantage of his influence for personal financial gain.

In 2 Corinthians 12:11–18, Paul gives an impassioned defense of his conduct toward the Corinthians. He clarifies why he did not financially burden them and insists that his deputies did not defraud them (2 Cor 12:17–18). As Paul denies any accusation of financial wrongdoing, he uses the term πλεονεκτέω.[76] Paul was most likely defending himself against a specific charge: that he took advantage of a monetary collection for his personal benefit.[77] Thus, the denials of Paul are occasioned by the specific circumstances of his relationship with the Corinthian churches. In this occasional correspondence, however, basic ethical convictions are evident. Paul asserts that motivation for financial gain is antithetical to his ministry, and that it is exemplified by his opponents in their false ministries.

In 1 Thessalonians, Paul describes his ministry in Thessalonica at length (1 Thess 2:1–12).[78] He states that his ministry was not done with "greedy motives" (ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας; 1 Thess 2:5).[79] Positively, Paul affirms that his ministry team

---

[75] Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 614–15.

[76] Again, πλεονεκτέω almost certainly refers to defrauding someone for financial gain in this context. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 614–15; Silva, *NIDNTTE* 3:780–81; Harris, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, 889–91.

[77] Harris, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, 889–91; Barnett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 587–90; Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 564–66.

[78] As Weima summarizes, interpreters are divided on whether Paul is primarily defending himself against specific charges in 1 Thess 2:1–16 or whether he is simply presenting himself as a model. However, although readers are divided on the question of whether Paul is defending himself, there is widespread agreement that Paul intends to present himself as a model for emulation. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 120–25. Paul may or may not be defending himself against direct charges in 2 Thess 2:5, but his writings suggest that he was accused of greed at some point in his ministry (see 2 Cor 9:5; 12:17–18). Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 140; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, AB, vol. 32B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 142–43.

[79] When Paul uses the term πλεονεξία, he is almost certainly referring to greed for monetary gain. Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC

worked tirelessly so that they would not need to be financially supported by the community (1 Thess 2:9). While Paul may have had multiple motivations for implementing this practice, one of them was that he intended to avoid the impression that his team was motivated by greed.[80] Similarly, Paul affirms in 2 Thessalonians 3:7–9 that his work habit was intended to be an example to the community.[81] Paul does not directly reference greed, but he discusses his goal of not being a burden to the community. Paul uses the term ἐπιβαρέω (2 Thess 3:8),[82] which parallels 1 Thessalonians 2:9, suggesting that a similar set of motivations are present in both passages.[83] In light of the Thessalonian correspondence, Paul presents his behavior as having varied motivations. For one, he intended to avoid the charge of greed. Also, he wanted to avoid being a burden by providing for himself. Additionally, he intended to be an example. As a clarification, therefore, Paul likely had multiple reasons for his approach to finances in

---

(Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), 97. Morris, however, argues for a more expansive meaning. Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 65. While πλεονεξία most likely refers specifically to financial greed, it certainly does not mean less than financial greed, even if a more expansive understanding is appropriate. While πλεονεξία already communicates that desire is in view, πρόφασις refers to motive or pretext, highlighting that Paul is defending himself against a charge of inward motivation. On whether πρόφασις should be translated "motive" or "pretext," see Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 140; Wanamaker, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 97; Morris, *First and Second Epistles to Thessalonians*, 65. Also, when Paul calls God as his witness, it shows that he is calling God to judge something which only he can detect (1 Thess 2:5). Morris, *First and Second Epistles to Thessalonians*, 65–66.

[80] Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 149–51; Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 63; Malherbe, *Letters to the Thessalonians*, 148–49; Earl Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians*, Sacra Pagina 11 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 102.

[81] Interpreters differ as to whether Paul is critiquing opponents or providing positive moral instruction for congregants. Boring, for example, suggests that Paul is implicitly critiquing his opponents. M. Eugene Boring, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015), 302–3. Malherbe, however, argues that the section is addressed directly to congregants and not opponents. Malherbe, *Letters to the Thessalonians*, 450–57.

[82] In addition to 1 Thess 2:9 and 2 Thess 3:8, Paul also uses ἐπιβαρέω in 2 Cor 2:5. In 2 Thess 2:9 and 2 Thess 3:8, the term refers to "material support such as the provision of food, lodging, and financial renumeration." Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 611.

[83] Weima, *1-2 Thessalonians*, 606–14; Morris, *First and Second Epistles to Thessalonians*, 254–56; Wanamaker, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 283–85. Fee discusses how the motivations of not being a burden and setting an example are complementary. Fee, *First and Second Letters to Thessalonians*, 331–32.

ministry. As Eckhard J. Schnabel summarizes, "He does not want to be a burden to anyone (1 Thess 2:9; 2 Cor 11:9), he wants to avoid any appearance of flattery and greed (1 Thess 2:5), he does not want to be mistaken for an itinerant philosopher, and he does not want to fall prey to the accusations of opponents in the churches (1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 11:12)."[84] In his study of Pauline financial policy, David E. Briones traces several possible explanations for it, and I am emphasizing what he classifies as "the moral/ethical approach."[85]

Turning to the Pastoral Epistles,[86] in 1 Timothy 3:3, Paul warns that "the elder" should be "free from loving money" (ἀφιλάργυρον; cf. Heb 13:5).[87] In 1 Timothy 3:8, Paul commands that deacons should be "not greedy for dishonest gain" (μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς). In these similar passages, Paul expresses that financial motivation is a fundamental disqualifier for faithful ministry. In 1 Timothy 6:5, Paul indicts those who are "thinking godliness (τὴν εὐσέβειαν) to be a means of gain" (πορισμὸν).[88] Paul is most likely targeting those whom he identifies as false ministers with this description.[89]

---

[84] Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission*, vol. 2 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 1449–50. Also see Paul Barnett, "Tentmaking," in *DPL*, 925–27.

[85] Briones, *Paul's Financial Policy*, 5–9. Briones, however, correctly observes, "On its own, [the moral/ethical approach] fails to account for every factor of his financial policy and therefore cannot provide a comprehensive answer to the question of why Paul refuses monetary aid" (8). Acknowledging this caveat, however, Briones goes on to conclude regarding Paul's financial policy, "Socially, it serves to distinguish Paul's gospel ministry from Sophists or itinerant philosophers and teachers who strive for personal, financial gain" (219). While more can be said about Paul's approach to finance, therefore, I have drawn attention to a particularly prominent element of it.

[86] For a discussion of my methodology in including the Pastoral Epistles, see chap. 1.

[87] For a treatment of money in the Pastoral Epistles, see Brueggemann, *Money and Possessions*, 239–47. As Brueggemann summarizes, a key assertion of the Pastoral Epistles is that "a Christian congregation and its leaders must not be seduced or defined by money, because attraction to money is a powerful impediment to the work of ministry" (240).

[88] First Tim 6:6 uses πορισμός metaphorically to refer to spiritual benefit, but it is most likely literal in 1 Tim 6:5. For the literal use, see Wis 13:19; 14:2 where πορισμός refers to financial gain.

[89] Robert W. Yarbrough, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018), 312; Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 396–97; Raymond F. Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 155–56; George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1992), 252–53. Also, Paul famously identifies the love of money as the root of all kinds of evil (1 Tim 6:9–10). While Paul does not explicitly

Similarly, in Titus 1:7, Paul instructs that "the overseer" (τὸν ἐπίσκοπον) should be "not greedy for dishonest gain" (μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ).[90] In contrast, in Titus 1:10–11, Paul directly charges his opponents with being motivated by financial gain: "For many are rebellious, empty talkers, and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision (οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς), whom it is necessary to silence, who ruin whole households by teaching what they should not for the sake of dishonest gain" (αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν).[91] In this way, the indictment of his opponents (Titus 1:11) creates a contrast with his instruction regarding proper conduct for an elder (Titus 1:7).[92]

To summarize, when Paul describes or defends his ministry, he frequently presents it as free from covetousness (2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–9). He also instructs that leaders in Christian communities must not be motivated by greed (1 Tim 3:3, 8; Titus 1:7). When he accuses his opponents, he directly accuses them of improper motivation (2 Cor 2:17; 1 Tim 6:5; Titus 1:11).[93] Lastly, he affirms that his behavior is a model for his congregations to follow (2 Thess 3:7–9).[94] In light of this

---

target those whom he identifies as false teachers in these texts, they certainly apply to them. Additionally, Timothy is engaged in ministry, and the warning is directed to him. Therefore, 1 Tim 6:9–10 further develops the same patterns being traced in this section. Yarbrough, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 316–20.

[90] Goodrich examines the lists of qualifications for overseers in the Pastoral Epistles against the background of Hellenistic thought concerning stewards. According to Goodrich, the qualifications, including the warning against greed, make sense within the framework of stewardship. John K. Goodrich, "Overseers as Stewards and the Qualifications for Leadership in the Pastoral Epistles," *ZNW* 104, no. 1 (January 2013): 90–91.

[91] Dio Chrysostom raises the possibility that some of his contemporaries may be acting with greedy duplicity: "in the guise of philosophers they do these things with a view to their own profit and reputation" (κέρδους ἕνεκεν καὶ δόξης τῆς ἑαυτῶν; *Oration* 32.10 [LCL, Crosby]). Also see Socrates, *Epistle 1*, 1–5. As Philip H. Towner observes, the critique of Paul lines up with ancient stereotypes of Cretans. Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 699n90; Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*; Yarbrough, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 485. Polybius for example describes the prominence of "sordid love of gain and lust for wealth" (τὴν αἰσχροκέρδειαν καὶ πλεονεξίαν) among the Cretans (6.46.3 [LCL, Paton]).

[92] Madsen rightly identifies that contentment, as opposed to greed, is a primary ethical emphasis in the Pastoral Epistles. Thorvald B. Madsen II, "The Ethics of the Pastoral Epistles," in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*, ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2010), 230–31.

[93] Verbrugge and Krell provide a helpful survey of these themes in the Pauline corpus. Verbrugge and Krell, *Paul and Money*, 247–53.

[94] Yarbrough offers a helpful discussion of the centrality of the theme of work in the Pastoral

pattern, which stretches across the Pauline corpus, it seems that Paul elevated the absence or presence of greed to a test of Christian leadership.[95]

The Tenth Word as a Test of Faithful or Unfaithful Ministry

While I have identified a broad Pauline pattern of ethical instruction regarding finances and ministry, the question remains of how the Tenth Word explains it. First, Acts 20:33–35 provides important evidence that the Tenth Word influenced Pauline moral instruction on similar topics to the ones discussed in his letters. To compare Acts 20:33–35 to the Pauline corpus, Paul defends himself from the charge of greed (cf. 2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–9) and appeals to his habit of working to provide for himself as an example for others (cf. 2 Thess 3:7–9). Thus, there is a broad thematic coherence between Acts 20:33–35 and the ethical instruction contained in the Pauline corpus.[96] Since, therefore, an echo of the Tenth Word is discernible in Acts 20:33,

---

Epistles. Yarbrough, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 28–46. In light of the prominence of this theme, although Paul does not explicitly present himself as a model to follow in avoiding greed in the Pastoral Epistles in the same way as he does in 2 Thess 3:7–9, his work ethic creates an implicit contrast with the self-motivated ministries of others and a model for the qualified minister.

[95] I have not addressed some Pauline texts which could be interpreted as critiquing the opponents of Paul for being greedy: Rom 16:17–18 may do so, but it is unclear. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, 2nd ed., BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 776–78. Paul also critiques the motivations of his ministry opponents, and contrasts them with those of others, in Phil 1:15–17. In this case, however, Paul does not reference financial motivation. For discussions of this text, see John Reumann, *Philippians*, AB, vol. 33B (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 177–83, 202–7. More promisingly, in 2 Tim 3:2, Paul warns "For men will be lovers of self, lovers of money" (φιλάργυροι) before continuing to list their qualities. Contextually, Paul warns against false teachers (2 Tim 3:6–9). However, while these may further confirm the pattern in the Pauline corpus, the texts I have surveyed adequately demonstrate it.

[96] Of course, there is the question of whether what Paul says about his approach to work and finances in Acts 20:33–35 is consistent with the portrait in his letters. Redalié traces the way that Acts 20:33 coheres with the remainder of the Pauline epistles, focusing on 1 Tim 5:17 and 2 Thess 3:7–10. According to him, the model of Paul working with his own hands "functions in various and almost opposite ways." Yann Redalié, "'Working with One's Hands': One Model, Many Applications (Acts 20.33; 1 Timothy 5:17; 2 Thessalonians 3.7-10)," in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*, ed. David P. Moessner et al., trans. Michael D. Thomas, Alexandre Thiltges, and Theresa Varney Kennedy, LNTS 452 (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 289. While Redalié rightly identifies diversity in the exhortations of Paul related to work and finance, he could do more to synthesize them. In his monograph treatment of the relationship between the Miletus speech and 1 Thessalonians, Walton highlights the consistency between the two, which is a more reasonable position in my view. Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle*, 140–85.

it may also be one of the formative factors on the ethical instruction in the Pauline corpus regarding faithful ministry.

Second, Paul uses vocabulary, πλεονεκτέω (2 Cor 7:2; 12:17–18) and πλεονεξία (1 Thess 2:5) to describe his approach to ministry and to critique his opponents. In the Pauline corpus, these terms are connected to the Tenth Word (see Eph 5:5; Col 3:5; 1 Thess 4:6). While this lexical evidence is not conclusive, it is certainly consistent with the theory that the Tenth Word influences Pauline thought on the subject of finance and ministry.

Third, the pattern in the Hebrew Bible of the Tenth Word being particularly violated by the elite provides a reasonable background for the thought of Paul. In early Christian communities, apostles, elders, and itinerant ministers had significant influence in congregations, which means that their ministries would raise the specter of abuse of power. In particular, there would be the danger that they would exploit their authority for financial gain. Further, early Jewish literature demonstrates that this was an ongoing concern in the period around the writing of the New Testament. So, interpreting the Tenth Word as influencing Pauline ethical instruction toward leaders and those with influence is consistent with interpretive tendencies and trajectories in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature regarding the Tenth Word.

To raise a possible objection, Paul does not identify the false teachers as individuals with power, so the question could be raised of whether or not this Pauline pattern is actually consistent with the way the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature presents the violation of the Tenth Word. However, Paul is describing those who attempt to achieve influence through positions of religious authority. Josephus, for example, describes how four Jewish scoundrels posed as rabbis and convinced a prominent Roman socialite to send gifts to the Jerusalem temple. The pretenders, however, embezzled the gifts (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.81–84). In this example, duplicitous individuals were able to take advantage of the appearance of religious influence to satisfy their own greed. In one

sense, this example does not fit the pattern charted above, which highlights how those with actual influence oppress the weak. However, this example shows how opportunists can exploit the appearance of influence to establish authority. Paul seems to be describing something analogous in the case of his opponents.

In summary, these three reasons suggest that the Tenth Word was one of the formative factors for the ethical instruction in the Pauline corpus regarding finances in ministry.[97] That is, Paul associated faithfulness in ministry with freedom from covetousness.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that Paul presents covetousness as a test of faithful or unfaithful ministry. In the Hebrew Bible, the Tenth Commandment is particularly violated by the elite, and early Jewish literature reflects similar patterns. In Acts 20:33, Luke records Paul defending his ministry by asserting his freedom from covetousness. In light of these dynamics, the following patterns in the Pauline corpus seem to suggest the influence of the Tenth Word. When Paul describes or defends his ministry, he frequently presents it as free from covetousness (2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–10). Also, Paul instructs that leaders in Christian communities must not be motivated by greed (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:9–10; Titus 1:7). When Paul accuses his opponents, he directly accuses them of improper motivation (2 Cor 2:17; Titus 1:11). Lastly, he affirms that his behavior is a model for his congregations to follow (2 Thess 3:7–9).[98] Paul, therefore, seems to be influenced by the Tenth Word in his ethical

---

[97] It is worth noting that Paul was not the only early Christian writer concerned with these issues related to finance and ministry. First Pet 5:2 and 2 Pet 2:3, 14–15 betray similar concerns. Also, Polycarp, *Philippians* 11.1–2 discusses a presbyter named Valens who was apparently removed from his position and warns against love of money.

[98] Paul, therefore, is engaging in mimetic ethics. For a discussion of mimetic ethics and a survey of it in 1 Corinthians, see Ruben Zimmermann, *The Logic of Love: Discovering Paul's "Implicit Ethics" through 1 Corinthians*, trans. Dieter T. Roth (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018), 70–72, 168–73.

instruction by presenting covetousness as a test of faithful or unfaithful ministry.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

In this project, I have undertaken an exegetical, historical, and canonical investigation to answer the question of whether the Tenth Commandment, as a moral norm, influences Paul's ethical teaching. Over the course of this study, an affirmative answer has emerged: the Tenth Word does play a formative role in Pauline moral instruction. To conclude, I summarize the preceding chapters, synthesize my conclusions, provide answers to outstanding questions, make suggestions for future research, and briefly reflect on the significance of my findings.

Summary of Chapters

In chapter 2, I examined the Tenth Word in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature to answer two vital questions: what is the Tenth Commandment, and how would Paul have encountered it? I drew several conclusions, including that Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are best treated as a unified prohibition (i.e., the Tenth Word) for the study of Paul. Also, I showed that the Tenth Commandment forbids unrestrained desire for what belongs to another, and, by extension, prohibits any ensuing actions or schemes for appropriation. Additionally, the use of the Tenth Word in early Jewish literature shows that it was significant for Paul's contemporaries and that it was cited, interpreted, and applied in various ways.

In chapter 3, I traced how the Tenth Commandment is linked to two significant narratives within the Hebrew Bible: Genesis 2–3 and Numbers 11. In Second Temple Jewish literature, there is significant evidence that both these stories were read as recounting the dangers of illicit desire analogous to what the Tenth Word prohibits. There

is also at least one example of a direct connection being made between these narratives and the Tenth Commandment. Paul displays a similar interpretive move in Romans 7, where he cites the Tenth Word and evokes Genesis 2–3, giving insight into his ethical instruction. I argued that this use of the Tenth Word shows that Paul affirms the goodness of the Tenth Word, suggests that it continues to be binding for his churches, denies that it can affect obedience, and uses it to suggest that desire is the root of sin. I also argued that 1 Corinthians 10:6 shows the influence of the Tenth Word, mediated through Numbers 11:4–35. This being the case, the Tenth Word influences Paul as he engages in a discussion of mimetic ethics, presenting evil desire, as defined and described by the Tenth Word, as fundamental to sin.

In chapter 4, I observed that the Hebrew Bible connects the violation of the Tenth Word to idolatry. Also, early Jewish literature links greed, generally, to idolatry and describes the violation of the Tenth Word, specifically, as leading to idolatry. Paul displays a similar line of thought by connecting covetous desire to idolatry in Ephesians 5:5, Colossians 3:5, and 1 Corinthians 10:7. I argued that the best explanation of these Pauline texts is the influence of the Tenth Commandment. Paul, therefore, seems to have connected the first word(s) of the Decalogue to its final word, teaching his congregations that illicit desire both is idolatry and leads to idolatry.

In chapter 5, I drew attention to the ways that the Hebrew Bible connects covetousness to the violation of the other prohibitions of the Decalogue's second table. In early Jewish literature, there seems to be a similar pattern—breaking the Tenth Word leads to a variety of other vices, including what is prohibited by the second table. Paul suggests that he also held this view when quoting the majority of the second table in Romans 13:8–10. Also, there are subtle indicators in this passage, such as the lexical link between the Tenth Word and Leviticus 19:18, which suggest that Paul may have been reflecting on the Tenth Word specifically when making this connection. In 1 Corinthians 10:6–8 and 1 Thessalonians 4:3–8, Paul connects covetousness to adultery, and therefore,

the Seventh Commandment (adultery). Paul, under the influence of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish thought, seems to have recognized that evil desire, as prohibited by the Tenth Word, led to violating the other commandments of the second table.

In chapter 6, I showed that in the Hebrew Bible the Tenth Commandment is particularly violated by the elite and that early Jewish literature reflects a similar concern. In Acts 20:33, Luke records Paul defending his ministry by asserting his freedom from covetousness. Against these backgrounds, the following patterns in the Pauline corpus seem to suggest the influence of the Tenth Word. When Paul describes or defends his ministry, he frequently presents it as free from covetousness (2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18; 1 Thess 2:1–12; 2 Thess 3:7–10). Also, he instructs that leaders in Christian communities must not be motivated by greed (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:9–10; Titus 1:7), and when he accuses his opponents, he accuses them of being motivated by greed (2 Cor 2:17; Titus 1:11). Additionally, he affirms that his behavior is a model for his congregations to follow (2 Thess 3:7–9). Paul, therefore, seems to be influenced by the Tenth Word in his ethical instruction by presenting covetousness as a test of faithful or unfaithful ministry.

The Formative Influence of the Tenth Word on Pauline Ethics

In this project, I claim that the Tenth Word was formative for Pauline ethical instruction. By "formative," I mean that the Tenth Commandment influenced and shaped Paul's moral teaching in multiple discernable ways. To show that this thesis has been sustained, it seems in order to synthesize my conclusions.

Paul seems to have been influenced by the Tenth Word in his understanding and presentation of sin. He suggests that desire is fundamental to sin (Rom 7:7; 1 Cor 10:6), covetousness is idolatry and leads to idolatry (1 Cor 10:7; Eph 5:5; Col 3:5), and covetousness leads to breaking the other commandments of the second table of the Decalogue (Rom 13:8–10; 1 Cor 10:8; 1 Thess 4:3–8). Paul, therefore, seems to have reflected deeply on the ethical significance of the Tenth Word.

Also, Paul is influenced by the Tenth Word in his use of moral examples in at least two different ways. In 1 Corinthians 10:6–8, Paul presents Israel as a negative role model whose evil desire led to idolatry and sexual immorality. In 2 Thessalonians 3:7–9, he presents himself as a positive role model who practices ministry free from covetousness. So, Paul seems to have been influenced by the Tenth Word in his use of both positive and negative ethical models.

Additionally, Paul is influenced by the Tenth Word in his moral instruction on a variety of issues, including financial practices in ministry (e.g., 2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18) and relational standards within his congregations (e.g., 1 Thess 4:3–8). It can be concluded, therefore, that the Tenth Word influenced the moral instruction of Paul on a range of issues.

Furthermore, the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul is apparent beyond his direct citations of it. Paul directly cites the Tenth Word twice (Rom 7:7; 13:9), but I have argued that the influence of the Tenth Word is detectable in a variety of other texts across the Pauline corpus, appearing in Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1–2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, and Titus.

Paul, therefore, reflected deeply on the significance of the Tenth Word, made use of moral examples informed by it, applied it to a variety of issues, and showed its influence in both direct and indirect ways. In light of these findings, the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul would seem to warrant the description "formative."

Outstanding Questions

While I believe that I have sustained my thesis, I acknowledge that questions regarding my argument may remain. I will mention three of these questions and comment briefly regarding each.

First, what does the influence of the Tenth Word on Paul reveal about the law in Pauline ethics? While I have not attempted to resolve the question of Paul and the

Mosaic law, the findings of this project do intersect with it. Paul clearly advocated that the Mosaic covenant is no longer binding for Christian communities (e.g., Gal 3:19–25; Eph 4:14–15). Therefore, he must have held that the Ten Commandments, and therefore the Tenth Word, no longer bound his congregations as a covenant document. However, I have shown in this project that Paul clearly viewed the Tenth Commandment as authoritative for his churches. He saw the Tenth Word as an abiding witness to the character of God and the danger of unrestrained human desire. And he saw the narrative pattern of the Hebrew Bible as instructive for Christian congregations, and the Tenth Word contributed to defining and describing that history. Thus, while Paul did not seem to think that the Tenth Commandment is binding for Christians as a term of the Mosaic covenant, he believed that the Tenth Word continued to be authoritative.

In light of this nuanced conclusion, it is appropriate to observe that my findings do fit with some current positions regarding Paul and the law. Brian S. Rosner, for example, has argued that Paul repudiates, replaces, and reappropriates the law as wisdom for living in his writings.[1] One way to understand the findings of my project is that Paul reappropriates the Tenth Word as ethical wisdom for his congregations. Therefore, while the findings of this project do not provide an answer to the question of Paul and the law, they are consistent with some recent research, and therefore, provide a contribution to that discussion.

Second, would Paul not have directly cited the Tenth Word more regularly in his writings if it formatively influenced him? Paul only cites the Tenth Word twice (Rom 7:7; 13:9), and he does not offer a lengthy exposition of the Tenth Word, as Philo does.

---

[1] Brian S. Rosner, *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013), esp. 207–22. Also, Wenham has shown that the Psalms appropriate the law, including the Decalogue, as wisdom. Gordon J. Wenham, *Psalms as Torah: Reading Biblical Song Ethically*, STI (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012). Schnabel has also observed that there is evidence that the Decalogue was appropriated as wisdom in Second Temple literature. Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*, WUNT 16 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1985).

However, the argument of this project builds a cumulative case that the Tenth Word exerted a significant influence on Paul. While it is undoubtedly true that Paul does not have a delimited and extended discussion of the Tenth Word, a focused study of Pauline texts has shown the influence of it on a variety of passages in his corpus. Additionally, only focusing on explicit citations may give a misleading picture of the influence of a text. For example, Paul cites Habakkuk 2:4, an undeniably formative text, twice in his corpus (Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11).

Lastly, are there more obvious influences on Paul's ethical thought than the Tenth Word? Paul's understanding of desire was undoubtedly influenced by his Greco-Roman context, for example. However, as I articulated at the outset of this project, I am not attempting to put forward the Tenth Word as the exclusive or solitary background for Pauline thought on desire. Paul must have been formed by a wide array of influences, all of which should be considered. At the same time, however, I would suggest that very few things are more obvious influences on a Second Temple Jew than the Decalogue.[2]

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of this dissertation, there are several possible avenues for further research. Most directly, this study further confirms the importance of focused work on the way that the Hebrew Bible, mediated through Second Temple literature, impacts New Testament ethical teaching and should encourage further work on this subject.[3] In particular, this study builds on the dissertation of William Andrew Williamson, and suggests that further studies on the influence of specific Decalogue

---

[2] Rosner addresses eight objections to seeing the Hebrew Bible as an important source for Paul's ethics, and some of those objections parallel what I have raised in this section. Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*, AGJU 22 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994), 181–91.

[3] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics*; James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

commands on the New Testament are warranted.[4] Williamson accomplished a study of the Sixth Word (murder) in Paul, and I have contributed a study of the Tenth Word in Paul, so studies of the Eighth (stealing) and Ninth (false witness) Words in Paul would be particularly helpful. Additionally, work on the influence of the Tenth Word, or other Decalogue commands, on the New Testament beyond the Pauline corpus would be welcome.[5]

Also, further study of the influence of the Decalogue on the vices in Paul would be welcome.[6] In particular, a focused study of envy (φθόνος) in the New Testament would be helpful, and addressing the relationship between envy (φθόνος) and desire (ἐπιθυμία) in the New Testament would bear fruit. Also, a study of the virtuous counterparts to the Decalogue vices could yield helpful results.

Implications of the Tenth Word in Pauline Ethical Instruction

Paul recognized the dangerous potential of unbounded craving and confronted it through targeted moral instruction. Of course, the Pauline view of desire is hardly monolithic. There are multiple references to good desires in Paul (e.g., Gal 5:17; 1 Tim 3:1). However, Paul gives particular attention to the destructive potential of desire run amok. While Pauline ethical teaching regarding desire could be caricatured as repressive or fearful, it was the product of deep ethical reflection on the Hebrew Bible.

While I have focused on the Tenth Word, the findings in this project reflect on

---

[4] William Andrew Williamson, "The Influence of You Shall Not Murder on Paul's Ethics in Romans and 1 Corinthians" (Phd diss., University of Western Sydney, 2007).

[5] In contrast to this approach, de Vos, for example, only treats explicit citations of the Decalogue in Paul. J. Cornelis de Vos, *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*, AGJU 95 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 265. To be clear, survey studies, like de Vos', are essential; however, more focused studies, like this project, are also necessary.

[6] While there is more work to be done, Frederick has made a helpful contribution on this subject in reference to Colossians. John Frederick, *The Ethics of the Enactment and Reception of Cruciform Love: A Comparative Lexical, Conceptual, Exegetical, and Theological Study of Colossians 3:1–17*, WUNT 2 487 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

the Decalogue as a whole. I proposed in my introduction that the study of a single command from the Decalogue could be similar to how a jeweler might extract one gem from a precious piece to assess its value. In a similar way, the reader of Paul can study the effect of one of the Ten Commandments on Paul's moral teaching. By taking this approach, it is possible to engage closely with the complexities and nuances of the question while still getting at the influence of the whole, as assessing the value of one gem in a precious piece sheds light on the value of entire piece. For those who intend to reflect on the role of the Decalogue in its entirety in Paul, it will be necessary to place this gem back in its setting and consider what the part reveals regarding the whole.

Additionally, when it comes to the practice of New Testament ethics, the descriptive exegetical task must precede other essential steps when attempting to state how communities of faith should live today.[7] In this dissertation, I have engaged in that work, and I hope that the findings will aid those who seek to enact the ethical teaching of the New Testament in Christian communities.

[7] Hays suggests that the descriptive task is followed by the synthetic and hermeneutical tasks which are also essential. Richard B. Hays, "Scripture-Shaped Community: The Problem of Method in New Testament Ethics," *Interpretation* 44, no. 1 (January 1990): 42–46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aasgaard, Reidar. *"My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!" Christian Siblingship in Paul*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 265. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

_____. "'Role Ethics' in Paul: The Significance of the Sibling Role for Paul's Ethical Thinking." *New Testament Studies* 48, no. 4 (2002): 513–30.

Abasili, Alexander Izuchukwu. "Was It Rape? The David and Bathsheba Pericope Re-Examined." *Vetus Testamentum* 61, no. 1 (2011): 1–15.

Aejmelaeus, Lars. *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18–35)*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Finnicæ B 232. Helsinki, Finland: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Aletti, Jean Noël. *Saint Paul, Epître aux Colossiens: introduction, traduction et commentaire*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993.

Allen, David. "The Use of Criteria: The State of the Question." In *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, edited by David Allen and Steve Smith, 129–41. Library of New Testament Studies 597. New York: T & T Clark, 2020.

Allen, David, and Steve Smith, eds. *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*. Library of New Testament Studies 597. New York: T & T Clark, 2020.

Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1976.

Alter, Robert. *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.

Andersen, Francis I. "Socio-Juridical Background of the Naboth Incident." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85, no. 1 (March 1966): 46–57.

Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Micah*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 24E. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1989.

Anderson, Gary A. "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve." In *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*, edited by Gary A. Anderson, Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp, 3–42. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000.

Anderson, Gary A., Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds. *Literature on Adam and*

Eve: Collected Essays. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000.

Andruska, Jennifer Lynn. "'Rape' in the Syntax of 2 Samuel 11:4." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 129, no. 1 (2017): 103–9.

Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.

Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1993.

Attridge, Harold W. "Making Scents of Paul: The Background and Sense of 2 Cor 2:14–17." In *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, 71–88. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 110. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.

Augustine. *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*. Translated by Joseph T. Lienhard and Sean Doyle. In *Writings on the Old Testament*, edited by Boniface Ramsey, 1–476. *Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*. Vol. 1. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2016.

Aune, David C. "Mastery of the Passions: Philo, 4 Maccabees and the Earliest Christianity." In *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Wendy E. Helleman, 125–58. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.

Aus, Roger David. *Imagery of Triumph and Rebellion in 2 Corinthians 2:14-17 and Elsewhere in the Epistle: An Example of the Combination Greco-Roman and Judaic Traditions in the Apostle Paul*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005.

Bailey, Randall C. *David in Love and War: The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10–12*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 75. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Baker, David L. *The Decalogue: Living as the People of God*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017.

_____. "The Finger of God and the Forming of a Nation: The Origin and Purpose of the Decalogue." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56, no. 1 (2005): 1–24.

_____. "Last but Not Least: The Tenth Commandment." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 27, no. 1 (June 2005): 3–24.

_____. "Ten Commandments, Two Tablets: The Shape of the Decalogue." *Themelios* 30, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 6–22.

Ballhorn, Geeske. "Die Miletrede – ein Literaturbericht." In *Das Ende des Paulus: historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, 37–47. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Barker, Paul A. “Contemporary Theological Interpretation of Deuteronomy.” In *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, edited by David G. Firth and Philip Johnston, 60–90. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.

Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1997.

_____. “Tentmaking.” In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid, 925–27. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Barrett, C. K. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Vol. 2. International Critical Commentary 41. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Bartholomew, Craig G. “The Tenth Commandment, René Girard, and the Good Neighborhood of Hebrew Wisdom.” *Canon and Culture* 9, no. 2 (2015): 253–74.

Barton, Stephen C. “Food Rules, Sex Rules and the Prohibition of Idolatry. What’s the Connection?” In *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, 141–62. T & T Clark Theology. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

_____, ed. *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*. T & T Clark Theology. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Bates, Matthew W. “The Old Testament in the New Testament.” In *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Nijak K. Gupta, 83–102. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Beale, G. K. *Colossians and Philemon*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

_____. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

_____. *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.

Beckwith, Roger T. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. Biblical Interpretation 96. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008.

Begg, C. T. “Two Ancient Rewritings of Numbers 11.” *Revista catalana de teología* 32, no. 2 (2007): 299–317.

Ben-Amos, Dan. “Five Tales of Punishment in the Book of Numbers.” In *Text and Tradition: The Hebrew Bible and Folklore*, edited by Susan Niditch, 35–45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Berman, Joshua A. “The Making of the Sin of Achan (Joshua 7).” *Biblical Interpretation* 22, no. 2 (2014): 115–31.

Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. International Critical

Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Bevere, Allan R. *Sharing in the Inheritance: Identity and the Moral Life in Colossians*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 226. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Birch, Bruce C. "Scripture in Ethics: Methodological Issues." In *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, edited by Joel B. Green, Jacqueline E. Lapsley, Rebekah Miles, and Allen Verhey, 27–34. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 1–39*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 19. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

_____. *Isaiah 40–55*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 19A. New York: Doubleday, 2002.

Block, Daniel I. "The Decalogue in the Hebrew Scriptures." In *The Decalogue through the Centuries: From the Hebrew Scriptures to Benedict XVI*, edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman and Timothy Larsen. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

_____. *The Gospel According to Moses: Theological and Ethical Reflections on the Book of Deuteronomy*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012.

_____. "'You Shall Not Covet Your Neighbor's Wife': A Study in Deuteronomic Domestic Ideology." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53, no. 3 (2010): 449–74.

Blomberg, Craig L. "Quotations, Allusions, and Echoes of Jesus in Paul." In *Studies in the Pauline Epistles: Essays in Honor of Douglas J. Moo*, edited by Dane Calvin Ortlund and Jay E. Smith, 129–43. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Blum, Erhard. "The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch." In *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, 299–301. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Bohlinger, Tavis Asaph. "The Akeda in Pseudo-Philo: A Paradigm of Divine-Human Reciprocity." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 25, no. 3 (March 2016): 189–227.

Boling, Robert G. *Joshua*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.

Booth, A. Peter. "The Voice of the Serpent: Philo's Epicureanism." In *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Wendy E. Helleman, 159–72. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.

Borchardt, Francis. “The Temple Scroll in the Context of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Scholarly Texts.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 108, no. 2 (Spring 2018): 139–58.

Boring, M. Eugene. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.

Botica, Aurelian. *The Concept of Intention in the Old Testament, Philo of Alexandria and the Early Rabbinic Literature: A Study in Human Intentionality in the Area of Criminal, Cultic and Religious and Ethical Law*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 9. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2011.

_____. “The Tenth Commandment and the Concept of ‘Inward Liability.’” In *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*, edited by Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, and John H. Walton, 51–66. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974– 2006.

Bourke, Vernon J. *History of Ethics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.

Bowden, Andrew. “‘And the Mixed among Them Desired a Desire’: The Reception of Desire in Numbers 11 LXX in Greek Texts, Ending with the Apostle Paul.” In *Testing and Temptation in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, edited by Daniel L. Smith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 93–115. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 519. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

_____. “‘A Delight to the Eyes and Desirous to Make One Wise’: The Hellenistic Reception of Desire in Genesis 3.” Paper presented at the 21st International Congress of the International Organization for the Old Testament. Munich, Germany, 25 August 2013.

_____. *Desire in Paul’s Undisputed Epistles: Semantic Observations on the Use of epithymeō, ho epithymētēs, and epithymía in Roman Imperial Texts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 539. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming.

_____. “A Semantic Investigation of Desire in 4 Maccabees and Its Bearing on Romans 7:7.” In *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Munich, 2013*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Meiser. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

_____. “Sklaverei, Gesetz, und Erkenntenis der Sünde. Die Rolle der Begierde in Röm 7,7–8.” In *Perspektiven auf Römer 7*, edited by Stefan Krauter, 17–47. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Theologie, 2016.

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

Briones, David E. *Paul’s Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach*. Library of New Testament Studies 494. Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.

Brooks, Roger. *The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990.

Brown, William P. *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd rev. and enlarged ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

_____. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Money and Possessions*. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.

Buchanan, George Wesley. "Spiritual Commandment." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 36, no. 2 (June 1968): 126–27.

Budd, Philip J. *Numbers*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984.

Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd. *Book 3 of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.

_____. "Sibylline Oracles 3." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:495–96. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Büllesbach, Claudia. "Das Verhältnis der Acta Pauli zur Apostelgeschichte des Lukas: Darstellung und Kritik der Forschungsgeschichte." In *Das Ende des Paulus: Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, 215–37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Burton, Keith A. *Rhetoric, Law, and the Mystery of Salvation in Romans 7:1–6*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Busch, Austin. "The Figure of Eve in Romans 7:5-25." *Biblical Interpretation* 12, no. 1 (January 2004): 1–36.

Butler, Trent C. *Joshua 1-12*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2014.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Vol. 1. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1961.

Camp, Philip G. "David's Fall: Reading 2 Samuel 11-14 in Light of Genesis 2-4." *Restoration Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (2011): 149–58.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.

Carmichael, Calum M. *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Chaney, Marvin L. “The Tenth Commandment: ‘Coveting Your Neighbor’s House’ in Social Context.” In *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*, edited by William P. Brown, 301–17. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

_____. “Reflections on the Canon, Its Origins, and New Testament Interpretation.” In *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*, edited by Andrew Brian McGowan and Kent Harold Richards, 505–30. Resources for Biblical Study 67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Chesnutt, Randall D. “Wisdom of Solomon.” In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:507–10. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

_____. *Isaiah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010.

Clements, R. E. “Achan’s Sin: Warfare and Holiness.” In *Shall Not the Judge of All the Earth Do What Is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*, edited by Paul L. Redditt and David Penchansky, 113–26. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Clines, David J. A. *Job 21–37*. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006.

Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 10. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Cole, R. Dennis. *Numbers*. New American Commentary, vol. 3B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000.

Collier, G. D. “‘That We Might Not Crave Evil’: The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10.1-13.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 55 (January 1995): 55–75.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.

Collins, Raymond F. *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

_____. *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1984.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Cornelius, Elma. "What Kind of Power Can Build Society? A Remarkable Power Play in Susanna." *Hervormde teologiese studies* 75, no. 3 (July 2019): 1–5.

_____. "The Woman in 'Susanna': An Understanding of the Rhetoric of 'Susanna.'" *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 19, no. 1 (2008): 97–109.

Countryman, Louis William. *Dirt, Greed, and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 1. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 1980.

_____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 2. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1998.

Cronauer, Patrick T. *The Stories about Naboth the Jezreelite: A Source, Composition, and Redaction Investigation of 1 Kings 21 and Passages in 2 Kings 9*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 424. New York: T & T Clark International, 2005.

Culley, Robert C. "Five Tales of Punishment in the Book of Numbers." In *Text and Tradition: The Hebrew Bible and Folklore*, edited by Susan Niditch, 25–34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Darko, Daniel K. *No Longer Living as the Gentiles: Differentiation and Shared Ethical Values in Ephesians 4.17–6.9*. Library of New Testament Studies 375. London: T & T Clark, 2008.

Davidson, Richard M. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical ΤΥΠΟΣ Structures*. Vol. 2. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.

Davila, James R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 105. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005.

Derby, Josiah. "The Two Tablets of the Covenant." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (April 1993): 73–79.

DeRouchie, Jason Shane. "A Call to Covenant Love: Text Grammar and Literary Structure in Deuteronomy 5–11." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.

_____. "Counting the Ten: An Investigation into the Numbering of the Decalogue." In *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*, edited by Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner, 93–125. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

_____. "Making the Ten Count: Reflections on the Lasting Message of the

Decalogue." In *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*, edited by Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner, 415–40. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

deSilva, David Arthur. *4 Maccabees*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

_____. *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2006.

_____. "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.

Díaz Araujo, Magdalena. "The Satan's Disguise: The Exoneration of Eve in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve 17:1–2." *Judaïsme Ancien* 5 (2017): 159–82.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses*. Translated by J. W. Cahoon and H. Lamar Crosby. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932–1955.

Docherty, Susan. "Crossing Testamentary Borders: Methodological Insights for OT/NT Study from Contemporary Hebrew Bible Scholarship." In *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, edited by David Allen and Steve Smith, 11–22. Library of New Testament Studies 597. New York: T & T Clark, 2020.

Dochhorn, Jan. *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

_____. "Röm 7,7 und das zehnte Gebot. Ein Beitrag zur Schriftauslegung und zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des Paulus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 100, no. 1 (2009): 59–77.

Dohmen, Christoph. "Decalogue." In *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, 193–219. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 164. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014.

Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3rd ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.

Dunn, James D. G., ed. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1996.

_____. *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2001.

_____. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988.

Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

Elliot, Matthew A. *Faithful Feelings: Rethinking Emotion in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2006.

Ellis, J. E. *Paul and Ancient Views of Sexual Desire: Paul's Sexual Ethics in 1*

Thessalonians 4, 1 Corinthians 7 and Romans 1. Library of New Testament Studies 354. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Emadi, Samuel. "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading." *Currents in Biblical Research* 14, no. 1 (October 2015): 8–23.

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

_____. "Social Identity, the Virtues, and the Good Life: A New Approach to Romans 12:1–15:13." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 51–63.

Evans, Craig A. "The Decalogue in the New Testament." In *The Decalogue through the Centuries: From the Hebrew Scriptures to Benedict XVI*, edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman and Timothy Larsen, 29–46. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Fabricius, Steffi. *Pauline Hamartiology: Conceptualisation and Transferences: Positioning Cognitive Semantic Theory and Method within Theology*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen Zur Theologie 74. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014.

_____. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Acts*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

_____. *First Corinthians*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 32. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

_____. *Romans*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Fleishman, Joseph. "Ahab's Criminal Request of Naboth: Why Naboth Refused (1 Kings 21:2–4)." *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 21 (2015).

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. "Humanity and the Idols of the Gods in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities." In *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, 58–72. T & T Clark Theology. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Flichy, Odile. "The Paul of Luke. A Survey of Research." In *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*, edited by David P. Moessner, Daniel Marguerat, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Michael Wolter, translated by James D. Ernest, 18–34. Library of New Testament Studies 452. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Flusser, David. "The Ten Commandments and the New Testament." In *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, edited by Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon

Levi, translated by Gershon Levi, 219–46. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

Foreman, Benjamin. “The Blood of Ahab: Reevaluating Ahab’s Death and Elijah’s Prophecy.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 58, no. 2 (June 2015): 249–64.

Fotopoulos, John. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 151. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Fowl, Stephen E. *Idolatry*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019.

_____.“Methodology: New Testament.” In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Ethics*, edited by Robert L. Brawley, 2:39–45. Oxford Encyclopedias of the Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

_____. “The New Testament, Theology, and Ethics.” In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, edited by Joel B. Green, 397–413. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010.

France, Richard T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Frederick, John. *The Ethics of the Enactment and Reception of Cruciform Love: A Comparative Lexical, Conceptual, Exegetical, and Theological Study of Colossians 3:1–17*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 487. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Fredrickson, David E. “Passionless Sex in 1 Thessalonians 4:4-5.” *Word and World* 23, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 23–30.

Freedman, David Noel, Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, and Michael M. Homan. *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering a Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Freund, Richard A. “Decalogue.” In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 2:196–97. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Fuhrmann, Justin. “Deuteronomy 6–8 and the History of Interpretation: An Exposition on the First Two Commandments.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53, no. 1 (March 2010): 37–63.

Fuller, Reginald H. “The Decalogue in the New Testament.” In *The Ten Commandments: The Reciprocity of Faithfulness*, edited by William P. Brown, 33–44. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *2 Corinthians*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 32A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

_____. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Gaca, Kathy L. *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek*

Philosophy and Early Christianity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Gardner, Paul. *1 Corinthians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

Garrett, Duane A. *A Commentary on Exodus*. Kregel Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2014.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Theology and Ecclesiology in the Miletus Speech: Reflections on Content and Context." *New Testament Studies* 50, no. 1 (January 2004): 36–52.

Gentry, Peter J., and Stephen J. Wellum. *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*. 2nd ed. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018.

Girard, René. *I See Satan Fall like Lightning*. Translated by James G. Williams. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Der Epheserbrief*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1971.

_____. *Der Kolosserbrief*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1980.

Goldingay, John. *Psalms 1–41*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

_____. *Psalms 90–150*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Goodrich, John K. "Overseers as Stewards and the Qualifications for Leadership in the Pastoral Epistles." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 104, no. 1 (January 2013): 77–97.

_____. "Sold under Sin: Echoes of Exile in Romans 7.14–25." *New Testament Studies* 59, no. 4 (October 2013): 476–95.

Gordon, Cyrus Herzl. "Note on the Tenth Commandment." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 31, no. 3 (July 1963): 208–9.

Grant, Robert M. "The Decalogue in Early Christianity." *Harvard Theological Review* 40, no. 1 (1947): 1–17.

Greenspoon, Leonard J. "Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus." In *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, 322–48. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 164. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014.

Grey, Jacqueline. "A Prophetic Call to Repentance: David, Bathsheba and a Royal Abuse of Power." *Pneuma* 41, no. 1 (June 2019): 9–25.

Gundry, Robert H. "The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7-25." In *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on*

His 70th Birthday, edited by Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris. Exeter, England: Paternoster Press, 1980.

Gupta, Nijak K. "New Testament Ethics." In *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Nijak K. Gupta, 253–72. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Gurtner, Daniel M. "The Historical and Political Contexts of Second Temple Judaism." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:21–89. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Guthrie, George H. *2 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*. Translated by Robyn Fréchet. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012.

Hafemann, Scott J. *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit: Paul's Defense of His Ministry in 2 Corinthians 2:14–3:3*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

Hakala, Diane L. "The Decalogue as a Summary of the Law: Jewish and New Testament Approaches." PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2014.

_____. "Jesus Said 'Keep the Commandments' and the Rich Man Asked, 'Which Ones?': The Decalogue as a Law Summary in the Story of the Rich Man." In *Searching the Scriptures: Studies in Context and Intertextuality*, edited by Craig A. Evans and Jeremiah J. Johnston, 171–90. Library of New Testament Studies 543. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.

Hamilton, James M. *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.

Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

_____. *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Harlow, Daniel C. *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 12. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1996.

Harnack, Adolf von. "The Old Testament in the Pauline Letters/Churches." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth-Century Approaches*, edited by Brian S. Rosner, 27–49. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.

Harstad, Adolph L. *Joshua*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia, 2004.

Hartman, Lars. "Code and Context: A Few Reflections on the Parenesis of Col 3:6–4:1." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth-Century Approaches*, edited by Brian S. Rosner, 177–91. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Hawk, L. Daniel. *Joshua*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

_____. "'The Gospel Is the Power of God for Salvation to Gentiles Only'? A Critique of Stanley Stowers' *A Rereading of Romans*." *Critical Review of Books in Religion* 9 (1996): 27–44.

_____. "Mapping the Field: Approaches to New Testament Ethics." In *Identity, Ethics, and Ethos in the New Testament*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt and François S. Malan, 3–19. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 141. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

_____. "Scripture-Shaped Community: The Problem of Method in New Testament Ethics." *Interpretation* 44, no. 1 (January 1990): 42–55.

Helleman, Wendy E., ed. *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.

Henry, Eric Leopold. "The Tenth Commandment: A Study in the History of Interpretation." PhD diss., University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1997.

Hepner, Gershon. "The Samaritan Version of the Tenth Commandment." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 20, no. 1 (2006): 147–52.

Hillel, Vered. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:411–15. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Micah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Himbaza, Innocent. *Le décalogue et l'histoire du texte: études des formes textuelles du decalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*. Fribourg, Switzerland: Academic Press, 2004.

_____. "The Reception History of the Decalogue through Early Translations: The Case of the Septuagint, Peshitta, and Targums." In *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*, edited by Dominik Markl, 28–40. Hebrew Bible Monographs 58. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "3 Baruch Revisited: Jewish or Christian Composition, and Why It Matters." *Zeitschrift Für Antikes Christentum* 20, no. 1 (2016): 41–62.

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Hogan, Karina Martin. "The Exegetical Background of the 'Ambiguity of Death' in the Wisdom of Solomon." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 30, no. 1 (1999): 1–24.

Hogue, Timothy. "The Monumentality of the Sinaitic Decalogue: Reading Exodus 20 in Light of Northwest Semitic Monument-Making Practices." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, no. 1 (2019): 79–99.

Holladay, Carl R. *Acts*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016.

Hollander, Harm W., and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 8. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1985.

Holmes, Michael W., ed. and trans. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Holtz, Traugott. "The Question of the Content of Paul's Instructions." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth-Century Approaches*, edited by Brian S. Rosner, 51–71. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Hood, Jared C. "The Decalogue and the Egyptian Book of the Dead." *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (January 2009): 53–72.

_____. "The Decalogue of Genesis 1–3." *Reformed Theological Review* 75, no. 1 (April 2016): 35–59.

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Das Ende des Paulus: historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Horrell, David G. "Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul." In *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, 120–40. T & T Clark Theology. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. *Der Dekalog: seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen*. Fribourg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1982.

Hutton, Rodney R. "'Sovereignty' and 'Holiness' in the Decalogue Tradition." In *Raising up a Faithful Exegete: Essays in Honor of Richard D. Nelson*, edited by K. L. Noll and Brooks Schramm, 211–23. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

Hwang, Jerry. "Turning the Tables on Idol Feasts: Paul's Use of Exodus 32:6 in 1 Corinthians 10:7." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54, no. 3 (September 2011): 573–87.

Hymes, David. "Numbers 11: A Pentecostal Perspective." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 13, no. 2 (July 2010): 257–81.

Jackson, Bernard S. "Liability for Mere Intention in Early Jewish Law." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42 (1971): 197–225.

Jacobson, Howard. "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum." In *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, edited by Matthias Henze, 180–99. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.

_____. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1996.

Janzen, David. "The Condemnation of David's 'Taking' in 2 Samuel 12:1-14." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, no. 2 (2012): 209–20.

Jassen, Alex P. “Pesher of Habakkuk.” In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:231–34. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Jipp, Joshua W. “The Acts of the Apostles.” In *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, edited by Scot McKnight and Nijak K. Gupta, 350–67. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Jobling, David. *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 39. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1986.

Johansen, Bjørn Øivind. “The ‘I’ of Romans 7 and Confessions in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *Biblische Notizen* 170 (2016): 101–18.

Johnson, Dru. *Scripture’s Knowing: A Companion to Biblical Epistemology*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.

_____. *Sharing Possessions: What Faith Demands*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2011.

Johnstone, William. “The Influence of the Decalogue on the Shape of Exodus.” In *Torah and Tradition: Papers Read at the Sixteenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap*, Edinburgh, 2015, edited by Klaas Spronk, 150–75. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2017.

Jonge, Marinus de. “The Christian Origin of the Greek Life of Adam and Eve.” In *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*, edited by Gary A. Anderson, Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp, 347–63. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000.

_____. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 18. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.

Josephus. *Against Apion*. Edited and translated by John M. G. Barclay. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary 10. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

_____. *Josephus*. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren, and Louis H. Feldman. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

_____. *Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Edited and translated by Louis H. Feldman. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary 3. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000.

_____. *Judean War 2*. Edited and translated by Steve Mason. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, vol. 1b. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008.

Joubert, Callie. “Genesis 4:8: Why Did Cain Murder His Brother?” *Conspectus* 26

(September 2018): 99–113.

Judge, Thomas A. *Other Gods and Idols: The Relationship between the Worship of Other Gods and the Worship of Idols within the Old Testament*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 674. London: T & T Clark, 2019.

Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1-12*. 2nd ed. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.

Kaminsky, Joel S. "Joshua 7: A Reassessment of Israelite Conceptions of Corporate Punishment." In *The Pitcher Is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström*, 315–36. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 190. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Second Table of the Decalogue and the Implicit Categories of Ancient Near Eastern Law." In *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, edited by John H. Marks and Robert McClive Good, 111–16. Guilford, CT: Four Quarters Publishing, 1987.

_____. "The Structure of the Deuteronomic Law." *Maarav* 1 (1979): 105–58.

Keck, Leander E. "Rethinking 'New Testament Ethics.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 3–16.

Kennett, R. H. *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.

Kessler, Rainer. "Debt and the Decalogue: The Tenth Commandment." *Vetus Testamentum* 65, no. 1 (2015): 53–61.

Kidwell, Brian. "The Adamic Backdrop of Romans." *Criswell Theological Review* 11, no. 1 (Fall 2013): 103–20.

Kilgallen, John J. "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders: Its Structure." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 70, no. 1 (1994): 112–21.

King, Andrew M. "Idolatry and Jewish Identity in Wisdom 13-15." *Conversations with the Biblical World* 36 (2016): 76–96.

King, Justin D. "Rhetorical Chain-Link Construction and the Relationship between Romans 7.1-6 and 7.7-8.39: Additional Evidence for Assessing the Argument of Romans 7-8 and the Identity of the Infamous 'I.'" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39, no. 3 (2017): 258–78.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Kitz, Anne Marie. "Naboth's Vineyard after Mari and Amarna." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 529–45.

Kline, Meredith G. *The Structure of Biblical Authority*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975.

Klopfenstein, Martin A. *Die Lüge nach dem Alten Testament: ihr Begriff, ihre Bedeutung und ihre Beurteilung*. Zürich, Switzerland: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1964.

Knight, George W., III. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1992.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986.

Koet, Bart J. "The Old Testament Background to 1 Cor 10,7-8." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*, edited by R. Bieringer, 607–15. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 125. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1996.

Kolb, Robert, and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Translated by Charles Arand, Eric Gritsch, Robert Kolb, William Russell, James Schaaf, Jane Strohl, and Timothy J. Wengert. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. "An Investigation of the Mission Motif in the Letters to Timothy and Titus with Implications for the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 29, no. 1 (2019): 49–64.

Kowalski, Beate. "Selective Versus Contextual Allusions: Reconsidering Technical Terms of Intertextuality." In *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, edited by David Allen and Steve Smith, 86–102. Library of New Testament Studies 597. New York: T & T Clark, 2020.

Krašovec, Jože. *Reward, Punishment, and Forgiveness: The Thinking and Beliefs of Ancient Israel in the Light of Greek and Modern Views*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 78. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1999.

Krauter, Stefan. "Eva in Röm 7." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 99, no. 1 (2008): 1–17.

_____. "Is Romans 7:7–13 about Akrasia?" In *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*, edited by Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson, 113–22. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 284. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

_____. "Röm 7: Adam Oder Eva?" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 101, no. 1 (2010): 145–47.

Kruse, Colin G. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.

Kugler, Robert. "Biblical Interpretation in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum." In *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, edited by Matthias Henze, 337–60. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.

Kujanpää, Katja. *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumentation by Quotations*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 172. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2019.

Kulik, Alexander. "Apocalypse of Abraham." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:93–94. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

_____. *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*. Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 17. Leipzig, Germany: J. C. Hinrichs, 1965.

Kuntz, Paul Grimley, and Thomas D'Evelyn. *The Ten Commandments in History: Mosaic Paradigms for a Well-Ordered Society*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004.

Kurz, William S. "Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, edited by Abraham J. Malherbe, David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks, 171–89. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Lang, Bernhard. "'Du sollst nicht nach der Frau eines anderen verlangen': Eine neue Deutung des 9. und 10. Gebots." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93, no. 2 (1981): 216–24.

_____. "Twelve Commandments—Three Stages: A New Theory on the Formation of the Decalogue." In *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines*, edited by J. Cheryl Exum and H. G. M. Williamson. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Langer, Ruth. "The Decalogue in Jewish Liturgy." In *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*, edited by Dominik Markl, 85–101. Hebrew Bible Monographs 58. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.

Langston, Scott M. *Exodus through the Centuries*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Lanier, Gregory R. "Scriptural Inspiration and the Authorial 'Original' amid Textual Complexity: The Sequences of the Murder-Adultery-Steal Commands as a Case Study." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (March 2018): 47–81.

Lanzillotta, Lautaro Roig. "The Envy of God in the Paradise Story According to the Greek Life of Adam and Eve." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, 537–50. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 122. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

Larsen, Timothy. "Christina Rossetti, the Decalogue, and Biblical Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte* 16, no. 1 (2009): 21–36.

Learoyd, W. H. A. "The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom 2,24." *Expository Times* 51, no. 8 (1940): 195–96.

Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 1-20*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 4. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Levison, John R. "The Exoneration and Denigration of Eve in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve." In *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*, edited by Gary A. Anderson, Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp, 251–75. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000.

_____. "The Exoneration of Eve in the Apocalypse of Moses 15-30." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 20, no. 2 (December 1989): 135–50.

_____. "1 John 3.12, Early Judaism and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 42, no. 4 (June 2020): 453–71.

_____. "Greek Life of Adam and Eve." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:96–100. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

_____. "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38, no. 1 (September 2015): 68–80.

Lincicum, David. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 284. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990.

Lindemann, Andreas. "Paulus und die Rede in Milet (Apg 20,17–38)." In *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, edited by Daniel Marguerat, 175–205. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 229. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009.

Lindqvist, Pekka. *Sin at Sinai: Early Judaism Encounters Exodus*. Studies in Rewritten Bible 2. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Loader, William R. G. *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004.

Lohse, Eduard. *Theological Ethics of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016.

MacDonald, Dennis R. "Paul's Farewell to the Ephesian Elders and Hector's Farewell to Andromache: A Strategic Imitation of Homer's Iliad." In *Contextualizing Acts:*

Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse, edited by Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 189–203. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

MacDonald, Nathan. "Recasting the Golden Calf: The Imaginative Potential of the Old Testament's Portrayal of Idolatry." In *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, 22–39. T & T Clark Theology. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Mackie, Scott D. "The Two Tables of the Law and Paul's Ethical Methodology in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20 and 10:23–11:1." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (April 2013): 315–34.

Madsen, Thorvald B., II. "The Ethics of the Pastoral Epistles." In *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder, 219–40. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2010.

Magdalene, F. Rachel. "Trying the Crime of Abuse of Royal Authority in the Divine Courtroom and the Incident of Naboth's Vineyard." In *The Divine Courtroom in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Ari Mermelstein and Shalom E. Holtz, 167–45. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2015.

Maier, Walter A. *1 Kings 12-22*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia, 2019.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "Ethics in Context: The Thessalonians and Their Neighbors." *Restoration Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (2012): 201–18.

_____. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 32B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Marcus, Joel. "Idolatry in the New Testament." In *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, edited by J. Ross Wagner, Christopher Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb, 107–31. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Marguerat, Daniel, ed. *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 229. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009.

Markl, Dominik, ed. *The Decalogue and Its Cultural Influence*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 58. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.

Martin, Ralph P. *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1991.

_____. *2 Corinthians*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Vol. 1. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997.

Mathews, Kenneth A. *Genesis*. New American Commentary, vol. 1A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1996.

Mays, James Luther. *Micah*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *2 Samuel*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 9. New York: Doubleday, 1984.

McGee, Zane B. "Transitioning Authority and Paul's Farewell Address: Examining the Narrative Function of Acts 20." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 203–14.

McKenzie, Steven L. *King David: A Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

McKenzie, Tracy J. *Idolatry in the Pentateuch: An Innertextual Strategy*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.

McKnight, Scot. *The Letter to the Colossians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018.

McKnight, Scot, and Nijak K. Gupta, eds. *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Meadowcroft, Tim. "Additions to Daniel." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:146–49. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Meek, Russell. "Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology." *Biblica* 95, no. 2 (2014): 280–91.

Meeks, Wayne A. "'And Rose up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1–22." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5, no. 16 (September 1982): 64–78.

_____. *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Meiser, Martin, ed. *The Torah in the Ethics of Paul*. Library of New Testament Studies 473. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Melick, Richard R. *Philippians, Colossians, Philemon*. New American Commentary, vol. 32. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1991.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Meyer, E. E. "The חֵרֶם in Joshua 6 and 7, Influenced by P?" *Acta Theologica* 26 (2018): 71–87.

Middendorf, Michael P. *The "I" in the Storm: A Study of Romans 7*. St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 1997.

_____. *Romans 1-8*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia, 2013.

_____. *Romans 9-16*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia, 2016.

Milavec, Aaron, ed. *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.

Millard, Alan. "The Tablets in the Ark." In *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*, edited by J. G. McConville and Karl Möller, 254–66. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 461. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.

Miller, David M. "Reading Law as Prophecy: Torah Ethics in Acts." In *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*, edited by Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller, 75–91. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016.

Miller, Geoffrey D. "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 9, no. 3 (June 2011): 283–309.

Miller, Patrick D. *The Ten Commandments*. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Minear, Paul Sevier. "Paul's Teaching on the Eucharist in First Corinthians." *Worship* 44, no. 2 (February 1970): 83–92.

Mody, Rohintan. "'The Case of the Missing Thousand': Paul's Use of the Old Testament in 1 Corinthians 10:8—A New Proposal." *Churchman* 121, no. 1 (2007): 61–79.

Moessner, David P., Daniel Marguerat, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Michael Wolter, eds. *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*. Translated by James D. Ernest. Library of New Testament Studies 452. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Moo, Douglas J. "Israel and Paul in Romans 7.7-12." *New Testament Studies* 32, no. 1 (1986): 122–35.

_____. *The Letter of James*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.

_____. *The Letter to the Romans*. 2nd ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018.

_____. *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.

Moran, William L. "Conclusion of the Decalogue, Ex 20:17–Dt 5:21." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (October 1967): 543–54.

Morris, Leon. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.

Moscicke, Hans. "The Concept of Evil in 4 Maccabees: Stoic Absorption and Adaption." *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 25, no. 2 (2017): 163–95.

Motyer, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers

Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993.

Moule, C. F. D. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

_____. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002.

Murphy, Frederick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

_____. "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107, no. 2 (June 1988): 275–87.

Na'aman, Nadav. "Naboth's Vineyard and the Foundation of Jezreel." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33, no. 2 (December 2008): 197–218.

Nebe, Gottfried. "The Decalogue in Paul, Especially in His Letter to the Romans." In *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, edited by Henning Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, 50–87. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 509. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.

Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

_____. *Joshua*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

Nicholson, Ernest W. "Decalogue as the Direct Address of God." *Vetus Testamentum* 27, no. 4 (October 1977): 422–33.

Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Nir, Rivka. "The Struggle between the 'Image of God' and Satan in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 61, no. 3 (2008): 327–39.

Noort, Ed. "Balaam the Villain: The History of Reception of the Balaam Narrative in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets." In *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*, edited by George H. van Kooten and Jacques van Ruiten, 3–23. Themes in Biblical Narrative 11. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008.

Noth, Martin. *Numbers*. Translated by James D. Martin. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Novakovic, Lidija. "The Decalogue in the New Testament." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 35, no. 4 (Winter 2008): 373–86.

Novick, T. "Peddling Scents: Merchandise and Meaning in 2 Corinthians 2:14–17."

Journal of Biblical Literature 130, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 543–49.

O'Brien, Peter T. *Colossians, Philemon*. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982.

_____. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.

Oliver, Isaac W. "The 'Historical Paul' and the Paul of Acts." In *Paul the Jew: Rereading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Carlos A. Segovia, 51–80. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

Oppenheimer, Aharon. "Removing the Decalogue from the Shema and Phylacteries: The Historical Implications." In *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, edited by Henning Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, 97–105. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 509. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.

Origen. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Books 6-10*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Fathers of the Church. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

_____. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. Fathers of the Church. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Orlov, Andrei A. "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65, no. 2 (April 2003): 184–201.

Osumi, Yuichi. "One Decalogue in Different Texts." In *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28-31, 2007*, edited by Akio Moriya and Gōhei Hata, 23–38. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 158. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012.

Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 1–39*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.

_____. *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40–66*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.

Pao, David W. *Colossians and Philemon*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Pascuzzi, Maria. "Reconsidering the Authorship of Colossians." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 23, no. 2 (2013): 223–45.

Paynter, Helen. "Ahab—Heedless Father, Sullen Son: Humour and Intertextuality in 1 Kings 21." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 41, no. 4 (2017): 451–74.

Pelletier, André. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. Sources chrétiennes 89. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962.

Peppard, Michael. "Torah for the Man Who Has Everything: 'Do Not Defraud' in Mark 10:19." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 3 (2015): 595–604.

Perrot, Charles. “Les exemples du désert (1 Co. 10.6-11).” *New Testament Studies* 29, no. 4 (October 1983): 437–52.

Pervo, Richard I. “The Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Letters: Aspects of Luke as an Interpreter of the Corpus Paulinum.” In *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, edited by Daniel Marguerat, 141–55. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 229. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009.

Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Achronism?” In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, 285–306. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 122. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

Phillips, Thomas E., ed., *Acts and Ethics*. New Testament Monographs 9. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.

_____. “Paul as a Role Model in Acts.” In *Acts and Ethics*, edited by Thomas E. Phillips, 49–63. New Testament Monographs 9. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.

Philo. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and Ralph Marcus. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Phua, Richard Liong-Seng. *Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1–11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*. Library of New Testament Studies 299. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Plato. *Plato*. Translated by Harold North Fowler, R. G. Bury, Paul Shorey, and W. R. M. Lamb. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–1990.

Picard, J. -C., ed. “Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece.” In *Testamentum Iobi, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 81–96. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Plümacher, Eckhard. “Eine Thukydidesreminiszenz in der Apostelgeschichte (Act 20,33–35 – Thuk. II 97,3f.).” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 83, nos. 3–4 (1992): 270–75.

Polybius. *The Histories*. Volume 3, *Books 5-8*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Edited by F. W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Porter, Stanley E. “Ἴστε Γινώσκοντες in Ephesians 5,5: Does Chiasm Solve a Problem?” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 81, nos. 3–4 (1990): 270–76.

_____, ed. *Paul and Pseudepigraphy*. Pauline Studies 8. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2013.

_____. “Was Paulinism a Thing When Luke-Acts Was Written?” In *Reception of Paulinism in Acts: Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, edited by Daniel Marguerat, 1–13. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium

229. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009.

Pratscher, Wilhelm. “Der Verzicht des Paulus auf finanziellen Unterhalt durch seine Gemeinden: ein Aspekt seiner Missionsweise.” *New Testament Studies* 25, no. 3 (April 1979): 284–98.

Pressler, Carolyn. *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*. Word Biblical Commentary. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 19–40*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 2A. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

Provan, Iain W. *The Reformation and the Right Reading of Scripture*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017.

Rabens, Volker. “Ethics.” In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 2:252–54. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

_____. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. 2nd ed. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Redalié, Yann. “‘Working with One’s Hands’: One Model, Many Applications (Acts 20.33; 1 Timothy 5:17; 2 Thessalonians 3.7-10).” In *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul’s Claim upon Israel’s Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*, edited by David P. Moessner, Daniel Marguerat, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Michael Wolter, translated by Michael D. Thomas, Alexandre Thiltges, and Theresa Varney Kennedy, 282–89. Library of New Testament Studies 452. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Rees, Anthony. *[Re]Reading Again: A Mosaic Reading of Numbers 25*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 589. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Reinmuth, Eckart. *Geist und Gesetz: Studien zu Voraussetzungen und Inhalt der paulinischen Paränese*. Theologische Arbeiten 44. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985.

Reis, Pamela Tamarkin. “Numbers XI: Seeing Moses Plain.” *Vetus Testamentum* 55, no. 2 (2005): 207–31.

Reumann, John. *Philippians*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 33B. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Reventlow, Henning, and Yair Hoffman, eds. *The Decalogue in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 509. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.

Rhodes, James N. “Diet and Desire: The Logic of the Dietary Laws According to Philo.” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 79, no. 1 (April 2003): 122–33.

_____. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 188. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Richard, Earl. *First and Second Thessalonians*. Sacra Pagina 11. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995.

Ro, He-Won. "The Exodus Decalogue in Deuteronomistic Redaction." *Asia Journal of Theology* 16, no. 2 (October 2002): 315.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 3rd ed. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Robinson, J. Armitage. *Commentary on Ephesians: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indexes*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Tenth Commandment in the Light of Four Deuteronomic Laws." In *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, edited by Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, translated by Gershon Levi, 45–65. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

_____. "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story." *Vetus Testamentum* 38, no. 1 (January 1988): 89–104.

Rogers, Trent A. *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8–10*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 427. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Rösel, Hartmut N. *Joshua*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011.

Rosner, Brian S. *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.

_____. *Paul and the Law: Keeping the Commandments of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013.

_____. *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 22. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994.

_____. "Paul's Ethics." In *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*, edited by James D. G. Dunn, 212–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Rossetti, Christina Georgina. *Letter and Spirit: Notes on the Commandments*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1883.

Russell, Stephen C. "The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth's Vineyard." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 4 (June 2014): 453–69.

_____. "Ideologies of Attachment in the Story of Naboth's Vineyard." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 44, no. 1 (February 2014): 29–39.

Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

_____. "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria." *Temenos-Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* 27 (1991).

_____. "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria (1991)." In *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 27–76. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

_____. "'Do Not Be Idolaters!' (1 Cor 10:7) (1995)." In *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 94–108. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

_____. "Drawing the Line: Paul on Food and Idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1." In *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 109–32. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

_____. "Philo and Paul on Alien Religion: A Comparison (2005)." In *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 133–60. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Sandt, Huub van de, and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Assen, Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2002.

Sänger, Dieter. "Tora für die Völker – Weisungen der Liebe: Zur Rezeption des Dekalogs im frühen Judentum und Neuen Testament." In *Von der Bestimmtheit des Anfangs: Studien zu Jesus, Paulus und zum frühchristlichen Schriftverständnis*, 266–301. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener, 2007.

Scheffler, Eben. "Caring for the Needy in the Acts of the Apostles." *Neotestamentica* 50, no. 3 (2016): 131–65.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Apostel und seine Gemeinde: Auslegung des ersten Briefes an die Thessalonicher*. 2nd ed. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1973.

Schmidt, Ludwig. "Dekalog und Bundesbuch im Kontext von Exodus 19-24." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 128, no. 4 (2016): 579–93.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Early Christian Mission*. Vol. 2. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

_____. "How Paul Developed His Ethics: Motivations, Norms, and Criteria of Pauline Ethics." In *Jesus, Paul, and the Early Church: Missionary Realities in Historical Contexts; Collected Essays*, 193–222. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 406. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

_____. "How Paul Developed His Ethics: Motivations, Norms and Criteria of Pauline Ethics." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*, edited by

Brian S. Rosner, 267–97. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

_____. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 16. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Ephesians*. Translated by Helon Heron. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Schottroff, Luise. "Die Befreiung vom Götzendienst der Habgier." In *Wer ist unser Gott? Beiträge zu einer Befreiungstheologie im Kontext der "ersten" Welt*, edited by Luise Schottroff and Willy Schottroff, 137–52. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1986.

Schreiber, Stefan. "Law and Love in Romans 13.8-10." In *The Torah in the Ethics of Paul*, edited by Martin Meiser, 100–119. Library of New Testament Studies 473. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *1 Corinthians*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018.

_____. "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15." In *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, 163–225. 3rd ed. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016.

_____. *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993.

_____. *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

_____. *Romans*. 2nd ed. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

Schultz, Richard L. *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Segal, Ben-Tsiyon, and Gershon Levi, eds. *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

Seifrid, Mark A. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2014.

Seitz, Christopher R. *The Character of Christian Scripture: The Significance of a Two-Testament Bible*. Studies in Theological Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Shen, Michael Li-Tak. *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Studies in Biblical Literature 83. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

Shogren, Gary Steven. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Rev. and exp. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

_____, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 2nd ed. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

_____. "Old Testament in Paul." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid, 630–42. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Sivan, Hagith. *Between Woman, Man, and God: A New Interpretation of the Ten Commandments*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 401. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Skralovnik, Samo. "The Dynamism of Desire: The Root *ḥmd* in Relation to the Root *'wh*." *Vetus Testamentum* 67, no. 2 (2017): 273–84.

_____. "God's Desire in the Psalms: A Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* and *'wh* Word Fields in Ps 68:17 and Ps 132:13-14." *Bogoslovska Smotra* 86, no. 1 (2016): 181–93.

_____. "The Meaning and Interpretation of Desire in the Tenth Commandment (Exod 20,17): The Semantic Study of the *ḥmd* Word Field." *Biblische Notizen* 171 (2016): 13–25.

_____. "Raba korena חמד na religioznem področju. Semantična analiza besednega polja חמד pri Izaiji." *Bogoslovni vestnik* 79, no. 4 (2019): 909–21.

Smith, Lesley. *The Ten Commandments: Interpreting the Bible in the Medieval World*. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 175. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014.

Smith, Louis. "Original Sin as `Envy': The Structure of the Biblical Decalogue." *Dialog* 30, no. 3 (Summer 1991): 227–30.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. *Micah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminister John Knox Press, 2015.

Smolar, Leivy, and Moshe Aberbach. "The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39 (1968): 91–116.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

_____. "Reflecting on Moses: The Redaction of Numbers 11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 601–24.

Spilsbury, Paul. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Spolsky, Ellen, and Eleonore Stump, eds. "Susanna and the Elders: Wisdom and Folly." In *The Judgment of Susanna: Authority and Witness*, 85–100. Early Judaism and Its

Literature 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Stamm, J. J., and M. E. Andrew. *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*. London: S. C. M. Press, 1967.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.

_____. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Stec, David M. "The Mantle Hidden by Achan." *Vetus Testamentum* 41, no. 3 (July 1991): 356–59.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *Harvard Theological Review* 56, no. 3 (July 1963): 199–215.

Steyn, Gert. J. "Pretexts of the Second Table of the Decalogue and Early Christian Intertexts." *Neotestamentica* 30, no. 2 (1996): 451–64.

Still, Elias Coye, III. "The Rationale behind the Pauline Instructions on Food Offered to Idols: A Study of the Relationship between 1 Corinthians 4:6–21 and 8:1–11:1." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2000.

Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Strelan, John G. "A Note on the Old Testament Background of Romans 7:7." *Lutheran Theological Journal* 15, no. 1–2 (May 1981): 23–25.

Stuart, Douglas K. *Exodus*. New American Commentary, vol. 2. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2006.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "What Is Second Temple Judaism?" In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:1–19. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

Sumney, Jerry L. *Colossians*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Svebakken, Hans. *Philo of Alexandria's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment*. Studia Philonica Monographs 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *1 and 2 Kings*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

_____. *Isaiah 1–39*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 16. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

_____. *Isaiah 40-66*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 19. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016.

Tabb, Brian J. *Suffering in Ancient Worldview: Luke, Seneca and 4 Maccabees in*

Dialogue. Library of New Testament Studies 569. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.

Tamási, Balázs. "Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship behind the Fragments?" *Henoch* 31 (2009): 325–41.

Tannehill, Robert C. "Do the Ethics of Acts Include the Ethical Teaching in Luke?" In *Acts and Ethics*, edited by Thomas E. Phillips, 109–22. New Testament Monographs 9. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.

Thielman, Frank. *Ephesians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

_____. *Romans*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.

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

Tian, Haihua. "Literary Context of the Decalogue and Its Different Versions in the Hebrew Bible." *Journal of Sino-Western Communications* 2, no. 1 (July 2010): 61–72.

Timmins, Will N. *Romans 7 and Christian Identity: A Study of the "I" in Its Literary Context*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph 170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Tooman, William A. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2 52. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.

Tromp, Johannes, ed. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 6. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005.

Tsumura, David Toshio. *The Second Book of Samuel*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2019.

Turner, Marie. *God's Wisdom or the Devil's Envy: Death and Creation Deconstructing in The Wisdom of Solomon*. Adelaide, Australia: ATF Press, 2009.

Tushima, Cephas T. A. "The Paradigmatic Role of Genesis 3 for Reading Biblical Narratives about Desire." *Unio Cum Christo* 5, no. 1 (April 2019): 87–102.

VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

van Henten, J. W. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 57. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997.

van Nes, Jermo. *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the Corpus Paulinum*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 16. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2018.

Vasholz, Robert Ivan. "You Shall Not Covet Your Neighbor's Wife." *Westminster Theological Journal* 49, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 397–403.

Verbrugge, Verlyn D., and Keith R. Krell. *Paul and Money: A Biblical and Theological Analysis of the Apostle's Teachings and Practices*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.

Versluis, Arie. "Devotion and/or Destruction? The Meaning and Function of חרם in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 128, no. 2 (2016): 233–46.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Marty, 33–50. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Vokes, F. E. "The Ten Commandments in the New Testament and in First Century Judaism." In *Studia Evangelica*. Vol. 5, *Papers Presented at the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965*. Pt. 2, *The New Testament Message*, edited by F. L. Cross, 146–54. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

von Nordheim-Diehl, Miriam. "Der Neid Gottes, des Teufels und der Menschen - eine motivgeschichtliche Skizze." In *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul*, 431–50. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

Vos, J. Cornelis de. *Rezeption und Wirkung des Dekalogs in jüdischen und christlichen Schriften bis 200 n.Chr*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 95. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016.

Walsh, Jerome T. *1 Kings*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce K. *A Commentary on Micah*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.

Walton, John H. "The Decalogue Structure of the Deuteronomic Law." In *Interpreting Deuteronomy: Issues and Approaches*, edited by David G. Firth and Philip Johnston, 95–117. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.

Walton, Steve. *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

Wannenwetsch, Bernd. "You Shall Not Kill—What Does It Take? Why We Need the Other Commandments If We Are to Abstain from Killing." In *I Am the Lord Your God: Christian Reflections on the Ten Commandments*, edited by Carl E. Braaten and Christopher R. Seitz, 148–74. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.

Wasserman, Emma. *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 256. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Wassmuth, Olaf. "Sibylline Oracles 1–2." In *T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1:493–95. London: T & T Clark, 2020.

_____. *Sibyllinische Orakel 1-2: Studien Und Kommentar*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 76. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2011.

Watson, Francis. "Constructing an Antithesis: Pauline and Other Jewish Perspectives on Divine and Human Agency." In *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, 99–139. Library of New Testament Studies. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

_____. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

Watson, Thomas. *The Ten Commandments*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.

Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34–66*. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.

Weber, Reinhard. *Das "Gesetz" bei Philon von Alexandrien und Flavius Josephus: Studien zum Verständnis und zur Funktion der Thora bei den beiden Hauptzeugen des hellenistischen Judentums*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001.

Wedderburn, A. J., and Nikolaus Walter, eds. "Paul and the Early Christian Jesus-Tradition." In *Paul and Jesus: Collected Essays*, 51–80. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 37. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989.

Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *1-2 Thessalonians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

_____. "The Uniqueness of the Decalogue and Its Place in Jewish Tradition." In *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, edited by Ben-Tsiyon Segal and Gershon Levi, translated by Gershon Levi, 1–44. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

Wendel, Susan J., and David M. Miller, eds. *Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2016.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

_____. *Psalms as Torah: Reading Biblical Song Ethically*. Studies in Theological Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

Westbrook, April D. *"And He Will Take Your Daughters . . . .": Woman Story and the Ethical Evaluation of Monarchy in the David Narrative*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 610. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.

Westbrook, Raymond. *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law*. Cahiers de la Revue biblique 26. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1988.

Westerholm, Stephen. *Law and Ethics in Early Judaism and the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 383. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Westermann, Claus C. *Isaiah 40–66*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Wevers, John William, ed. *Deuteronomy*. Vol. 3. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

_____, ed. *Exodus*. Vol. 2. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

White, Marsha. "Naboth's Vineyard and Jehu's Coup: The Legitimation of a Dynastic Extermination." *Vetus Testamentum* 44, no. 1 (January 1994): 66–76.

White, Sidnie Ann. "The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 193–206.

White, Thomas Joseph. *Exodus*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2016.

Williamson, H. G. M. *Isaiah 1-5*. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Williamson, William Andrew. "The Influence of You Shall Not Murder on Paul's Ethics in Romans and 1 Corinthians." PhD diss., University of Western Sydney, 2007.

Willis, Wendell Lee. *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 68. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Wilson, R. McL. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Wilson, Walter T. *Philo of Alexandria: On Virtues; Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Vol. 3. Philo of Alexandria Commentary. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2011.

_____. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Winger, Thomas M. *Ephesians*. Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia, 2015.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.

Witherington, Ben, III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand

Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.

_____. *What's in the Word: Rethinking the Socio-Rhetorical Character of the New Testament*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Wittenberg, Gunther H. "The Tenth Commandment in the Old Testament." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 22 (March 1978): 3–17.

Wold, Benjamin G. "Family Ethics in *4QInstruction* and the New Testament." *Novum Testamentum* 50, no. 3 (2008): 286–300.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Micah*. Translated by Gary Stansell. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Wolter, M. "Die ethische Identität christlicher Gemeinden in neutestamentlicher Zeit." In *Woran orientiert sich Ethik?*, edited by Wilfried Härle, 61–90. Marburger Jahrbuch Theologie 13. Marburg, Germany: Elwert, 2001.

Woudstra, Marten H. *The Book of Joshua*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Wright, Benjamin G., III. *Letter of Aristeas*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.

Wright, Christopher J. H. *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

_____. *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004.

Wright, N. T. "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." In vol. 10 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, 393–770. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.

Yarbrough, O. Larry. *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 80. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Yarbrough, Robert W. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2018.

Zemler-Cizewski, Wanda. "The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve: Recent Scholarly Work." *Anglican Theological Review* 86, no. 4 (Fall 2004): 671–77.

Ziesler, John A. "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33 (June 1988): 41–56.

Zimmermann, Ruben. "The 'Implicit Ethics' of New Testament Writings: A Draft on a New Methodology for Analysing New Testament Ethics." *Neotestamentica* 43, no. 2 (2009): 399–423.

_____. *The Logic of Love: Discovering Paul's "Implicit Ethics" through 1*

Corinthians. Translated by Dieter T. Roth. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018.

Zimmermann, Ruben, and Stephan Joubert. *Biblical Ethics and Application: Purview, Validity, and Relevance of Biblical Texts in Ethical Discourse*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 384. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Zurawski, Jason. "Separating the Devil from the Diabolos: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21, no. 4 (June 2012): 366–99.

ABSTRACT

"DO NOT COVET": THE TENTH COMMANDMENT
IN PAULINE ETHICS

Elias Coye Still IV, PhD
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2021
Chair: Dr. Thomas R. Schreiner

This dissertation argues that the Tenth Commandment plays a formative role in Paul's ethical instruction in the following ways: (1) Paul describes and defines sin using the Tenth Commandment (Rom 7:7; 1 Cor 10:6); (2) he connects covetousness and idolatry (1 Cor 10:6–7; Eph 5:5; Col 3:5); (3) he links violating the Tenth Commandment to violating other prohibitions from the second table of the Decalogue (Rom 13:8–10; 1 Cor 10:6–8; 1 Thess 4:3–7); and, (4) he presents covetousness as a test of faithful and unfaithful ministry (e.g., 2 Cor 2:17; 7:2; 12:11–18). To demonstrate this claim, this dissertation undertakes an exegetical, historical, and canonical study of the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish literature, and Paul. Over the course of this investigation, it is demonstrated that the Tenth Word plays a more influential role in the ethical thought of Paul than previously recognized.

Chapter 1 details the thesis, methodology, and significance of the project in addition to surveying some relevant research. Chapter 2 surveys the Tenth Commandment in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature to answer the vital questions, what is the Tenth Commandment, and how would Paul have encountered it? Chapter 3 traces the connections between the Tenth Word, Genesis 2–3, and Numbers 11 in the Hebrew Bible, early Jewish literature, and Paul. Chapter 4 highlights the connection between covetousness and idolatry in 1 Corinthians 10:6–7, Ephesians 5:5, and Colossians 3:5 against the background of the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish

literature. Chapter 5 shows that the violation of the Tenth Commandment results in the violation of the other prohibitions of the Decalogue in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, and Paul demonstrates this idea in Romans 13:8–10, 1 Corinthians 10:6–8, and 1 Thessalonians 4:3–7. Chapter 6 observes the phenomenon of the Tenth Commandment being particularly violated by the religious, economic, and political elite in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature, and suggests this may influence Pauline thought on faithful and unfaithful ministry. Chapter 7 summarizes the findings of the investigation and offers implications.

VITA

Elias Coye Still IV

EDUCATION

BA, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 2014
MDiv, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017

PUBLICATIONS

Review of *Preaching in the New Testament*, by Jonathan I. Griffiths. *Midwestern Journal of Theology* 18, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 139–42.

"Solving the Rubik's Cube." Review of *Romans 7 and Christian Identity: A Study of the 'I' in Its Literary Context*, by Will N. Timmins. *Expository Times* 131, no. 3 (December 2019): 131–32.

Review of *Scripture as Real Presence: Sacramental Exegesis in the Early Church*, by Hans Boersma. *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 61, no. 1 (Fall 2018): 101–2.

ORGANIZATIONS

Evangelical Theological Society

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Adjunct Professor of New Testament Interpretation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 2020

MINISTERIAL EMPLOYMENT

Assistant Pastor/Minister to Students, Elizabethtown Baptist Church, Elizabethtown, Kentucky, 2015-2016

Pastoral Assistant of Youth Ministries, Clifton Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, 2016-2017

Minister of Youth, Clifton Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, 2017-