

<sup>128</sup> Gen 6:21–22.

Return to text

<sup>129</sup> See the detailed description by Juhuda Feliks, "Animals in the Bible and Talmud," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 3 (1972): 7–19. For wildlife preserves in modern Israel that contain wildlife mentioned in biblical texts, see Roger Caras, "The Promised Land, Israel, for Biblical Beasts," *Wildlife* 3 (1973): 4–13.

Return to text

<sup>130</sup> Compare Lev 11:46–47. Curiously, the text does not explicitly state that other birds might be eaten. Compare Deut 14:11, 20.

Return to text

<sup>131</sup> Compare the diet of John the Baptizer in Matt 3:4.

Return to text

<sup>132</sup> Included under these criteria, but specified in their particularity are all animals "that go on their paws . . . on all fours" (Lev 11:27). This category would also include bears, wolves, many other woods creatures, dogs, and all kinds of feline animals. Horses and asses (or donkeys), though not named, would also be excluded because they do not chew their cud.

Return to text

<sup>133</sup> See, Lev 11:44–47.

Return to text

<sup>134</sup> Contrary to the views expressed in 2 Esd 6:55; 7:11, biblical tradition elsewhere does not hold that the world was created for the sake of Israel, or even of all humankind.

Return to text

<sup>135</sup> It is possible, that later P editors could have inserted this abbreviated list into the book of Deuteronomy.

Return to text

<sup>136</sup> See also Deut 22:9–11.

Return to text

<sup>137</sup> Schorsch, "Learning to Live for Less," in *Spirit and Nature*, Rockefeller and Elder, eds., 32.

Return to text

<sup>138</sup> See notes 29–32 of this paper. See also, Rolston, *Environmental Ethics*, 23:

A thoroughgoing humanist may say that only personal life has value, making every other life form a tributary to human interests, but a sensitive naturalist will suspect that this is a callous rationalization, anthropocentric selfishness calling itself hard science. The first lesson learned in evolution was perhaps one of conflict, but a subsequent one is of kinship, for the life we value in persons is advanced from, but allied with, the life in monkeys, perch, and louseworts. Mixed with other values, this Noahatic principle of preserving breeding population is powerfully present in the Endangered Species Act.

Return to text

<sup>139</sup> See parts I and II of this article

Return to text

<sup>140</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

Return to text

<sup>141</sup> See note 124 of this paper. See also Blumenson, "Who Counts Morally?," *Journal of Law and Religion* 14 (1999–2000): 25–38, arguing for a secular ethic of concern for animal welfare based on animals' sentience. Blumenson does not show how or why, absent religious commitment to the source or realm of living beings, a person should or would care whether an animal experienced suffering, contentment, or pleasure.

Return to text

<sup>142</sup> *Wisd of Sol* 7:15–20.

Return to text

<sup>143</sup> *Wisd of Sol* 7:24–25.

Return to text

<sup>144</sup> *Job* 12:7–8; 39:26; *Prov* 30:24–28; *Sir* 1:9–10.

Return to text

<sup>145</sup> *Job* 39:1–4, 9–12; 40:15–24; 41:1–34; *Pss* 17:12; 84:3; *Prov* 6:6–8; 14:4; 30:18–19, 29–31; *Jer* 8:7.

Return to text

<sup>146</sup> *Deut* 32:11; *Job* 39:27–30; *4 Macc* 14:14–19; compare *Job* 39:13–18.

Return to text

<sup>147</sup> See part IX of this article.

Return to text

<sup>148</sup> See notes 8–14 of this paper.

Return to text

<sup>149</sup> See Steck, *World and Environment*, 107:

The limitations laid down in Genesis 1 show that for P the possibility of an exploitation of the earth to the point of the exhaustion of its resources, or the contingency that autocratic man might poison and destroy living space on earth, is not remotely considered in this authorization. The subjection of the earth is only so that man may be supplied with useful plants—and in addition, the passage presupposes a permanent and completely sufficient supply of wild vegetation for the nourishment of wild animals, birds, and creeping things (*Gen* 1:30).

Return to text

<sup>150</sup> *Gen* 9:13. See note 40 of this paper.

Return to text

<sup>151</sup> See *Deut* 11:11–12; *Job* 38:25–27; and *Pss* 65:9–13. See generally, Wendell Berry, "The Gift of Good Land: A Biblical Argument for Ecological Responsibility," *Sierra* 64 (Nov-Dec, 1979): 20–26.

Return to text

<sup>152</sup> A relatively late text suggests that the earth, in turn, is the mother or matrix of all beings, to which all return *Sir* 40:1, 11. In this connection, see parts IV. B. 1. b and V. B. 1. e of this article.

Return to text

<sup>153</sup> See, *Exod* 9:29b; *Deut* 10:14; *Pss* 24:1–2; 50:10–12; 89:11–12; 95:4–5; 96:1, 11–12. But see, *Pss* 115:16. Conversely, the land or earth, itself, is said to praise

or bless God. See Pss 69:34; 100:1; Isa 49:13; Song of the Three v. 52. See generally, Anderson, *From Creation to New Creation*, 1–18, and Santmire, *The Travail of Nature*, 190–92.

Return to text

<sup>154</sup> See Hos 4:1–11:7; Amos 3:1–9:8a. See also, part VII. D. of this article. See generally, Geoffrey R. Lilburne, *A Sense of Place: Christian Theology of the Land* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1989) 45–54.

Return to text

<sup>155</sup> See note 153 of this paper.

Return to text

<sup>156</sup> See Deut 10:14 (“Behold, to YHWH your God belong heaven and . . . the earth with all that is in it”) and Ps 24:1 (“The earth is YHWH’s . . .”).

Return to text

<sup>157</sup> See John Hart, *The Spirit of the Earth: A Theology of the Land* (Ramsey, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1984) 51–55, 119–23.

Return to text

<sup>158</sup> Leviticus 25 and 27; See Raymond Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1991) 24–35, 53, 58–68; and Richard H. Hiers, “Transfer of Property by Inheritance and Bequest in Biblical Law and Tradition,” *Journal of Law and Religion* 10 (1993–1994): 121.

Return to text

<sup>159</sup> See Berry, *The Gift of the Good Land*, 269–81.

Return to text

<sup>160</sup> Compare Exod 23:10–11; Lev 25:2–7.

Return to text

<sup>161</sup> Exod 20:8–11; 23:12; Deut 5:12–15.

Return to text

<sup>162</sup> See part V. F. 1. of this article.

Return to text

<sup>163</sup> See also Lev 25:2–7, 8–12, considered in part V. F. 2. of this article. See Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*, 37: “There is no mention of the poor [in Lev 25], however; the reason assigned is that the land, being God’s land, must keep the Sabbath, that is, the Sabbath principle is extended to cover nature as well as man.”

Return to text

<sup>164</sup> See part V. F. 2. of this article.

Return to text

<sup>165</sup> Compare Lev 25:1.

Return to text

<sup>166</sup> Exod 23:10–11; Lev 25:1–7.

Return to text

<sup>167</sup> See part II of this article.

Return to text

<sup>168</sup> Biblical tradition contains few other references to defecation: 1 Sam 24:3; 1 Kings 18:27.  
Return to text

<sup>169</sup> Compare the trial scene in Susanna vv. 28–60.  
Return to text

<sup>170</sup> Compare the procedure prescribed in Deut 21:1–9, where the murderer had not been found. See note 83 of this paper. See generally, Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*, 69–72.  
Return to text

<sup>171</sup> See also Deut 7:1–11.  
Return to text

<sup>172</sup> Compare Lev 25:23: “[T]he land is mine; . . . you are strangers and guests with me” (Heart, *The Spirit of the Earth*, 53).  
Return to text

<sup>173</sup> Compare former Interior Secretary James Watt’s explanation for his decision to open 800 million acres of federal land for corporate exploitation: “My responsibility is to follow the Scriptures which call upon us to occupy the land until Jesus returns” *Maclean* 94 (June 15, 1981): 41. There is, of course, no such biblical text or requirement. See Robert Lekachman’s comment: “At his confirmation hearing, Mr. Watt casually confided to the senators in attendance that ‘I do not know how many future generations we can count on before the Lord returns.’ . . . [T]his uncertainty appeared, mysteriously to justify opening of public lands to coal miners, oil explorers, lumbermen, resort developers, stock grazers, and other predators. Scripture, asserted Mr. Watt, endorsed his plan.” *Greed is Not Enough: Reganomics* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983) 51. As to Protestant fundamentalist preoccupations vis-a-vis environmental concerns, see Fowler, *The Greening of Protestant Thought*, 45–57.  
Return to text

<sup>174</sup> On New Testament expectations, see McAfee, “Ecology and Biblical Studies,” in *Theology for Earth Community*, Hessel, ed., 38–41.  
Return to text

<sup>175</sup> See Prov 27:18; Zech 3:10; Mic 4:4; compare Luke 13:6–9.  
Return to text

<sup>176</sup> See Job 40:21–22; Ps 104:16–17; Ezek 17:22–24; compare Matt 13:31–32; Luke 13:18–19.  
Return to text

<sup>177</sup> See, Ps 148:9 (“fruit trees and all cedars”); see also Song of the Three v. 54 (“all things that grow on the earth”).  
Return to text

<sup>178</sup> This is the second instance of “forbidden fruit” in biblical tradition. The first, of course, was the fruit of the “tree of knowing good and evil” (Gen 2:16–17).  
Return to text

<sup>179</sup> See part VIII. B. 4. b of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>180</sup> See von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 133.  
Return to text

<sup>181</sup> See part IV. B. 1. of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>182</sup> See von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 115; G. Ernest Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1960) 6–7.  
Return to text

<sup>183</sup> Compare Deut 16:21, which prohibits planting trees as Asherim by the altar at the one place. Of course, if trees were regarded as Asherim in Deut 12:1–3, they, too would have been subject to destruction as such.  
Return to text

<sup>184</sup> Gen 2:5, 15; 3:23, all in the J tradition.  
Return to text

<sup>185</sup> Pss 65:9–13; 104:14–15.  
Return to text

<sup>186</sup> See also Ps 104:10–13, 16–18. See generally, Tucker, "Rain on a Land Where No One Lives," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 116 (1997): 3–17.  
Return to text

<sup>187</sup> See note 210 of this paper.  
Return to text

<sup>188</sup> See part V. F. 2. of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>189</sup> See also Exod 3:8 and Num 14:8. Compare Num 16:13, where two dissidents complain that Moses took them out of "a land flowing with milk and honey," namely, Egypt! Aldo Leopold once complained, "Conservation is getting nowhere because it is incompatible with our Abrahamic conception of land. We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us." Leopold explained, "Abraham knew exactly what the land was for: it was to drip milk and honey into Abraham's mouth." Aldo Leopold, *Sand County Almanac* (1949; reprinted New York: Oxford University Press, 1970) viii, 204–205. Actually, biblical tradition does not characterize the promised land as flowing with "milk and honey" until the time of Moses, several centuries after Abraham; moreover, no biblical text authorizes Abraham (or anyone else) to exploit or abuse the land. Nor does any biblical text suggest that Abraham viewed land as a commodity. Only the ungodly or depraved are represented as despoiling the creation (Wisdom of Solomon 2:6–9).  
Return to text

<sup>190</sup> See Richard Hiers, *Jesus and the Future: Unresolved Questions for Understanding and Faith* (Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1981) 72–86.  
Return to text

<sup>191</sup> See also Prov 3:9–10; Hag 1:7–11; 2:15–19; Mal 3:9–12. See also Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*, 481–82 as to 2 Sam 21:1–2.  
Return to text

<sup>192</sup> See part VI. D. of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>193</sup> See 1 Kings 17:1; 18:46; Amos 4:6–9; Hag 1:2–11; Zech 10:1–2; and Mal 3:5–12.  
Return to text

<sup>194</sup> See Jer 2:4–28; Hos 2:1–13.

Return to text

<sup>195</sup> See Deut 6:1–15; 7:12–14; 8:6–20; compare Hag 2:15–19; Mal 3:9–12.  
Return to text

<sup>196</sup> See also Lev 26:1–26.  
Return to text

<sup>197</sup> The substantive provisions of that code probably concluded either with Deuteronomy 25 or 26.  
Return to text

<sup>198</sup> Compare Deuteronomy 27.  
Return to text

<sup>199</sup> Compare Gen 9:2–3.  
Return to text

<sup>200</sup> See also Lev 26:21–22; Deut 32:24; Jer 8:17; 19:7; Ezek 29:5; 33:27; 39:4–5, 17–20; Hos 2:17; Amos 9:3; and Wisd of Sol 5:17–23, where wild beasts act as agents of God's judgment. See also Rev 19:17–18. Such texts may have inspired the denouement scene in C. S. Lewis's novel, *That Hideous Strength: A Modern Fairy Tale for Grownups* (New York: Macmillan, 1965).  
Return to text

<sup>201</sup> See Lam 5:19–22.  
Return to text

<sup>202</sup> See also Exod 12:1–20, 43–49.  
Return to text

<sup>203</sup> See Theodor H. Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year: A Modern Interpretation and Guide* (New York: Sloane, 1953) 31–104.  
Return to text

<sup>204</sup> Reference to "the place" and special concern for "the Levite" in Deut 26:1–22 suggest that these verses were part of the Deuteronomistic Reform legislation. See part IV. B. 1. a. of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>205</sup> See Ruth chapter 2.  
Return to text

<sup>206</sup> See also Lev 23:22. See generally, Hart, *The Spirit of the Earth*, 77–81.  
Return to text

<sup>207</sup> Compare Lev 19:9–11 and Deut 24:19–20. Under such laws, the poor had a right to engage in such gleaning. Compare Prov 29:7: "A righteous man knows the rights of the poor." Such rights, however, were not seen as intrinsic or inherent. Rather, they derived from God's law, which actualized God's caring for the people of Israel. That care was part of the biblical faith-understanding best characterized as theocentric or radical monotheism. See note 124 of this paper.  
Return to text

<sup>208</sup> Compare provisions for the sabbatical year, part V. F. 2. of this article.  
Return to text

<sup>209</sup> See part IV. B. 1. of this article as to the Deuteronomistic Reform. To facilitate