

FAULT

A PRIMER ON RACE, SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

LINES

EDITORS

JONATHAN JANSEN

& CYRILL WALTERS

| 08 |

Of “Basters” and “Bastards”

Overcoming the problematic connection of race and gender in the Hebrew Bible and its interpretation

Juliana Claassens

During the fallout from the now infamous Sport Science article,¹ a colleague of mine in the Faculty of Theology at Stellenbosch University shared an anecdote of some coloured woman who was removed from a shortlist for some position at some company. The reason for this decision: “You know, that study”

Some coloured woman. Some position. Some company. Like most anecdotes, this one is not easily verified. However, what rings true about it is what everyone knows who so fiercely critiqued this study portraying *some* coloured South African women as somehow representing *all* coloured South African women: ethnic and gender stereotypes, once they are out there, have an effect. And even though the article has been retracted, the stereotypes out there remain out there.

A mere translation error?

I first became aware of the incredible power of identity constructions to cause injury while still a student at Stellenbosch University, studying Hebrew. My professor, Ferdinand Deist, taught our class about the incredible harm a translation error can inflict. In his article “The Dangers of Deuteronomy”,² he shows how a translation error in the first Afrikaans Bible translation of 1933 was used as “proof” of God’s “intent” to keep races separate. In a series of laws in Deuteronomy 23, the offspring of an incestuous relationship (NRSV “illicit union”, Hebrew *mamzēr*) are prohibited

from becoming part of the congregation of God (*qēhal yhw̄h*) (Deut. 23:2). This exclusionary law is followed in the next verse by the prohibition against an Ammonite or a Moabite ever setting foot in God's congregation (Deut. 23:3), even up to the tenth generation.

These two laws together likely reflected the troubling story of the two daughters of Lot who, after the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by fire and brimstone, slept with their intoxicated father, as told in Genesis 19:30-38. The two sons born of this incestuous relationship, Ammon and Moab, would become the ancestors of these banned peoples.³

These laws and the associated narrative in Genesis 19 are troubling enough in themselves. However, the 1933 Afrikaans Bible translation caused far greater problems when it turned the Hebrew word *mamzēr*, meaning a child born of incest, into "baster", or "a child born from parents of different races". This corruption of the original meaning was most likely inspired by an earlier, also erroneous, translation – this time of *mamzēr* into the Dutch "bastaard" (cognate to the English "bastard"), which changed its meaning to "a child born out of wedlock".⁴

My Greek professor always used to say, "*un traduttore è un traditore*" – "a translator is a traitor". In this case, though, the translation error had very serious real-world consequences, as a law about incest was turned first into a reference to sexual immorality ("bastaard"), and then, by the Afrikaans translators, into a matter of race ("baster"). The effect of this most problematic line of interpretation was that it condoned prohibiting and expelling individuals from the community of believers – individuals who in today's terms would be described as of mixed-race heritage, or in the South African context, "coloured".

This unfortunate page in the history of biblical interpretation illustrates two things: First, the construction of race and gender in the Hebrew Bible is in itself quite often extremely problematic and in need of serious critical interrogation. And second, the interpretations of these troubling representations of gender and race have also been greatly problematic and equally in need of serious critical investigation.

In this chapter, as a feminist biblical interpreter who for the past nine years has sought to cultivate critical hermeneutical skills in the next generation of biblical interpreters,⁵ I will ask two questions. First, how is one to understand the troubling way race and gender is presented in Deuteronomy 23, which aligns with the narrative of Moab and Ammon's birth story in Genesis 19? And second, how does one explain the problematic association between race and gender that shaped the original translation error and continues to this day, as manifested in the Sport Science article published by students and a faculty member at my university.

Border anxiety

The first task of critical biblical interpretation is to try to understand the disturbing connection drawn in these narrative and legal traditions between the Ammonites/Moabites and incest, which the translation error also later racialised. In this regard, it is important to know that rules about both food and sex played a vital role in creating and maintaining boundaries between Israel and her neighbors. Especially in the Book of Leviticus, many of the laws have to do with the distinction between clean/unclean, pure/impure, permitted/forbidden foods, as well as sexual activities that were considered to be crucial in delineating Israel's identity from that of other nations.

For instance, in Leviticus 20:22, at the end of a section outlining forbidden sexual relationships, one finds the commandment to keep all the statutes and commandments so that "the land in which you live does not vomit you out" – vomiting being closely associated with the act of casting out, or one could say, abjection.⁶ The divine commandment further calls upon the people to separate themselves from other, unclean, or one could say, disgusting nations so that they may be holy as God is holy (Lev. 20:26).⁷ A similar tendency is also evident in Numbers 25:1-3, where God is portrayed as furious with the people of Israel who "defiled themselves" by their sexual liaisons with Moabite women and their suspicious food practices, which involved eating and bowing down before Baal of Peor.⁸

In particular, the obsession with sex, which exhibits strong connotations of disgust, is frequently used to demonise the vile sexual practices of the Other. This point has been compellingly made by Randall Bailey,⁹ who demonstrates how sexual rhetoric is used to stigmatise and to mark as repulsive members of other ethnic groups. This includes the Canaanites as well as the Moabites and Ammonites whose birth story is depicted in Genesis 19, as we have seen.¹⁰ Such stereotypical representations are almost never rooted in any real observations, but rather in preexisting ideas and feelings of hatred and resentment towards the Other. Kenneth Stone,¹¹ drawing on the work of anthropologist Lila Abu-Lughod, writes that "beliefs about the shameless sexual behaviors of others are put forward even when opportunities for the actual observation of such persons and practices are absent".

Nevertheless, such representations, void of reality as they may be, are psychologically incredibly strong as justifications for acts of abjection. In the story of Lot's daughters that tells of the origins of the Moabites and the Ammonites, it is the close association between sex and disgust that grounds the demonisation and discrediting of the others in Israel's midst whose presence has become threatening to the fragile boundaries of the self. Citing the work of Jonathan Smith, Johnny Miles puts it

this way: “The real problematic emerges when the ‘other’ is ‘TOO-MUCH-LIKE-US’, or when he claims to ‘BE-US’.”¹²

Thus, the story of Lot’s daughters expresses, on a deeply existential level, Israel’s struggle with the Other in her midst – the near descendants of Abraham’s nephew Lot, presented as being born out of repulsive sexual union and hence worthy of being abjected, as decreed in the harsh laws in Deuteronomy 23:2-3. Through these laws and their associated narratives, one sees how boundaries are drawn in terms of revolting sexual practices – incest being particularly offensive in nature. By repeating expressions of disgust in law and in narrative, a certain representation of a particular group is fixed and perpetuated.¹³

It is precisely because there did not exist clear demarcations between Israel and Canaan, or between Israel and Moab/Ammon, that one finds the conscious or subconscious attempts in Israel’s legal and narrative traditions to alleviate what Marion Young has described as “border anxiety”.¹⁴ It is this anxiety over fragile borders that is responsible for the drive to create clear boundaries between “us” and “them”.

These stories and laws addressing illicit sexual practices that are closely associated with disgust, and hence abjection, can thus be explained in terms of this process of identity construction. Bailey puts it well: “The effect of both the narrative in Genesis 19 and the laws in Deuteronomy 23, therefore, is to label within the consciousness of the reader the view of these nations as nothing more than ‘incestuous bastards’.”¹⁵

From disgust to abjection

It is one thing to understand how identity construction works in these ancient narratives and laws. It is another to gain insight also into the human condition that is responsible for such sharp divisions between “us” and “them”, not only in the biblical traditions, but also in interpretations of texts and scholarly engagements today, which, as shown in the case of the Sport Science article, are greatly harmful to flesh-and-blood individuals.

The work of Sarah Ahmed on emotions is quite helpful in this regard. In her book, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Ahmed outlines how the powerful emotion of disgust finds its roots in the way we react from a very early age to things that we perceive to be revolting – in terms of taste, smell, or texture.¹⁶ The emotion of disgust causes strong bodily reactions, from feeling nauseous to cringing and pulling one’s face. Psychologically, the individual, when confronted with what is deemed disgusting, instinctively recoils, thereby distancing him/herself from the tainted

object. On a physical level, this notion of distancing is evident in the act of spewing out, or vomiting that which is considered disgusting.¹⁷

Disgust thus becomes a marker of that which is considered to be inferior or intolerable. Martha Nussbaum shows how, throughout history, various individuals and groups, including Jews, Muslims, women, gays and lesbians, African Americans, and also, in our South African context, black, coloured and Indian individuals, have been subjected to what Nussbaum describes as “projective disgust”.¹⁸

The emotion of disgust, with its strong reflex of recoiling or distancing oneself from the contaminating “other”, merges then with other emotions, such as hatred and fear, which together serve the purpose of creating distance between the self and the Other.¹⁹ In this regard, the performative nature of disgust is important. Drawing on Judith Butler’s notion of “performativity”, Ahmed writes about “the power of discourse to produce effects through reiteration”.²⁰ By repeating what is deemed objectionable in discourse such as laws and narratives, one is able to “generate a community of those who are bound together through the shared condemnation of a disgusting object or event”.²¹

In such expressions of disgust, stereotypes play a crucial role. Ahmed employs the useful designation of “sticky signs” to demonstrate how stereotypical perceptions come to be connected to bodies. For example, the term “Paki”, in Ahmed’s London context, has become an insult through repeated association with the ideas “immigrant, outsider, dirty”. However, she argues that “such words do not have to be used once the sign becomes sticky. To use a sticky sign is to evoke other words, which have become intrinsic to the sign through past forms of association”.²²

In this process, stereotypes identify a couple of essential characteristics regarding the way the Other is perceived to look or act, and then proceed to reduce these individuals or groups to these characteristics. As Miles explains, by means of “blanket generalizations”,²³ such traits are “taken out of context and attributed to everyone associated with that characteristic”. Drawing at the same time on difference as well as similarity, Miles notes that stereotypes work with the assumption that “they’ are both different from ‘us’ yet very much like one another”.²⁴

Such stereotypical constructions of the Other that reduce, essentialise, naturalise and fix difference, are, according to Miles, “constructed by and for the benefit of the subject to achieve masterful self-definition”.²⁵ However, “by naming and defining the characteristics of the Other, the dominant self denies ‘others’ their right to name and define themselves”. Stereotypes thus inadvertently serve what Martha Nussbaum describes as “a fundamental refusal of another person’s full humanity”.²⁶

Stereotypical thinking about ethnicity, gender, sexuality and disability that considers the Other to be inferior, repulsive or disgusting, should therefore be named for what it is: a form of interpretative violence that has very real consequences to this day. Discussing Hispanic Americans in the United States, Miles demonstrates how “ethnic stereotypes in the public discourse”,²⁷ expressed in racialised jokes, or as characters on television shows or commercials, have the function of “privileg[ing] one ethnic group by denying the ‘other’ its identity, suppressing its voice and, simultaneously, that nation’s own origins”. One only has to look to the toxic rhetoric of the current American president about Mexicans “invading” the United States, and calling them “criminals, rapists, thugs and animals”, to see the power and the danger of such representations.²⁸ Citing the work of Michael Pickering,²⁹ Miles shows how such identity constructions both “feed upon and reinforce powerful social and national myths”.³⁰

Looking again at our original example, we today may find it shocking how easily the Afrikaner interpreters could take over the identity constructions of the Moabites and Ammonites that are rooted in associations between illicit sex, disgust and abjection. We may find it even more disturbing to contemplate how these Afrikaner interpreters could further apply these ethnic stereotypes to their own context by racialising them through a translation error. However, there are numerous contemporary examples of how ethnic, as well as gendered, stereotypes continue to flourish in public discourse. The dangers such misrepresentations pose to the human dignity of those individuals and groups who have been reduced to a stereotype should guide our current and future scholarly endeavours.

From disgust to humanity

So how does one resist such harmful identity constructions and refuse to view what is other or different from oneself as inferior, or with suspicion, or even with disgust? Martha Nussbaum, in her examination of how prevalent the language of disgust has been in the political discourse that seeks to deny sexual minorities equal rights in the United States,³¹ makes a case for moving beyond what she describes as a “politics of disgust” to a “politics of humanity”.³²

According to Nussbaum, “Disgust diminishes the other, making ‘those’ people look base, more like animals or devils, without the full dignity of a person.”³³ To transcend a politics of disgust and replace it with a politics of humanity, according to Nussbaum, requires respect, deeply rooted in “the ability to see that the other is a person”³⁴ – a person with human hopes and dreams, but also, with just as human insecurities and fears – a person who is a subject, and hence “a center of perception, emotion, and reason, rather than an inert object”.³⁵

Importantly, respect, which is imperative for a politics of humanity, cannot be separated from what Nussbaum describes as “participatory imagination”.³⁶ According to Nussbaum, “[o]nly imagination animates the cold and abstract categories of morality and law, turning them into ways we can live together.”³⁷

The capacity for imaginative and emotional participation in the lives of others is an essential ingredient of any respect worthy the name. Only this capacity makes real an ability that is a key part of respect, the ability to see the other as an end, not as a mere means. The politics of humanity includes, then, both respect and imagination, and imagination understood as an ingredient essential to respect itself.³⁸

Such participatory imagination can, and ought to, be applied on various levels. In the first instance, participatory imagination extends to the world of the biblical text, as readers enter “the lives of others” from a very long time ago, and in a very different part of the world. Some of the interpretative tools employed in contemporary biblical interpretation, such as feminist, postcolonial, and queer biblical interpretation, as well as the recent approach of trauma hermeneutics, all have in common a commitment to read against the grain of the text, and to identify with the marginalised, the most vulnerable, and the subordinated or subaltern others in the text.³⁹

These contextual approaches to biblical interpretation can be described as “theology from below”. Contextual biblical interpreters ask important questions, such as Who has the power? What hidden forms of systemic or structural violence ought to be brought to light? What would those without a voice feel or think or say or do if they were given the opportunity? These approaches all interrogate constructions about the Other – as defined in terms of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or class. And they share an interest in creating space for alternative, life-giving interpretations to emerge that take seriously the experiences of those whose voices have not been heard, or whose identities have been crushed by the stereotypical constructs forced upon them by those in power.⁴⁰

However, participatory imagination extends also into the real world. Interpreters of biblical texts, and also scholars writing academic articles, live in communities with flesh-and-blood people who can be hurt by interpretations and stereotypical constructs about them that are rooted in a conscious or subconscious desire to name and control the Other. Participatory imagination requires changing one’s positionality, being aware of one’s own prejudices and blind spots, and most importantly, seeing the Other “as an end, not as a mere means”⁴¹ – as a subject in his/her own right and not as an object to be studied and controlled. Such an attitude is described by Nussbaum as a “curious, questioning, and receptive demeanor that says, in effect, ‘Here is another human being. I wonder what he (or she) is seeing and feeling right now’”.⁴²

Conclusion

At a colloquium organised by members of the Stellenbosch University Council to help members of the community process and deal with the Sport Science article, Professor Jonathan Jansen declared: “I was surprised that you were surprised by this article.” What he captured in this statement is that we at Stellenbosch University have to face a long and painful history of scholarship that has caused, and continues to cause, a great deal of hurt with its racial and gendered ideologies.

However, what gives me hope is that there are individuals at this same university, in various departments and from different disciplines, who are fighting for things to be different. This is true of many of us who seek to challenge harmful biblical interpretations that perpetuate problematic identity constructions in terms of race, gender, class and sexual orientation, as it was also true in the case of the essay written more than 25 years ago by the professor who taught me Hebrew.

Martha Nussbaum remains hopeful that societies (and, here, I would add universities) may change, that people can unlearn disgust, can transcend racism, sexism, and homophobia, by replacing a politics of disgust with a politics of humanity. However, as she reminds us: “Ultimately, the process involves transformation at the level of the human heart, and that means that it requires great patience.”⁴³

Patience, yes. But I would also say, resolve and commitment, in addition to hard, dedicated work. And do not forget about institutional will.

Endnotes

- 1 Sharné Nieuwoudt et al., “Retracted Article: Age- and Education-Related Effects on Cognitive Functioning in Colored South African Women”, *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B: Aging, Neuropsychology And Cognition* (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2019.1598538>
- 2 Ferdinand E. Deist, “The Dangers of Deuteronomy: A Page from the Reception History of the Book”, in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 26-27.
- 3 Ruth Tsoffar, “The Trauma of Otherness and Hunger: Ruth and Lot’s Daughters”, *Women in Judaism* 5, no. 1 (2007): 7-8.
- 4 Deist, “The Dangers of Deuteronomy: A Page from the Reception History of the Book”, 26-27.
- 5 These critical hermeneutical skills pertain to methodological approaches such as gender, postcolonial, and queer biblical interpretation that all seek to critically interrogate representations of gender, race and sexual orientation in the biblical text, but also by the interpreters of the text.

- 6 Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 5-6. Kristeva, from a psychoanalytic point of view, describes the notion of “abjection” as an important part of identity formation. The “I” explores the boundaries of the self and deems objectionable that which does not fit into the vision of what constitutes the borders of the self.
- 7 Ken Stone, *Practising Safer Texts: Food, Sex, and Bible in Queer Perspective* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 50.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 53.
- 9 Randall C. Bailey, “They’re Nothing But Incestuous Bastards: The Polemical Use of Sex and Sexuality in Hebrew Canon Narratives”, in *Reading from This Place. Vol. 1, Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 123-24.
- 10 Stone, *Practising Safer Texts: Food, Sex, and Bible in Queer Perspective*, 63. Stone describes how William Albright was quite influential in cementing the notion of the wicked Canaanites, particularly in terms of their “sexual abominations” when it came to justifying their extermination.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 51.
- 12 Johnny E. Miles, *Constructing the Other in Ancient Israel and the USA* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011), 14; Jonathan Z. Smith, “What a Difference a Difference Makes”, in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Ernest S. Frerichs and Caroline McCracken-Flesher (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 47.
- 13 Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 93.
- 14 Stone, *Practising Safer Texts: Food, Sex, and Bible in Queer Perspective*, 58-67; Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 144.
- 15 Bailey, “They’re Nothing But Incestuous Bastards: The Polemical Use of Sex and Sexuality in Hebrew Canon Narratives”, 131.
- 16 Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 85. See also Kristeva’s notion of the abject, which has been important for a discussion of Israel’s process of identity formation, particularly as it pertains to Israel’s relationship to her neighbor in Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 1-6. See also J. Cheryl Exum, “Hagar en Procès: The Abject in Search of Subjectivity”, in *From the Margins 1: Women of the Hebrew Bible and Their Afterlives*, ed. Peter S. Hawkins and Lesleigh Cushing Stahlberg (Sheffield Sheffield Phoenix Press Limited, 2009), 1.
- 17 Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 85.
- 18 Martha C. Nussbaum, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 23, <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065918>. For a more extensive engagement with Nussbaum’s work on the intersection of fear and disgust and its relevance for the Hebrew Bible, see L. Juliana Claassens, “From Fear’s Narcissism to Participatory Imagination: Disrupting Disgust and Overcoming the Fear of Israel’s Hērem Laws”, in *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature*, ed. F. Scott Spencer (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 77-96, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1w1vm30.8>

- 19 Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 88.
- 20 Ibid., 92; See also Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 33.
- 21 Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 92.
- 22 Ibid.; See also L. Juliana Claassens, “God and Violence in the Prophets”, in *Oxford Handbook to the Prophets*, ed. Carolyn J. Sharp (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 339, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199859559.013.19>
- 23 Miles, *Constructing the Other in Ancient Israel and the USA*, 32.
- 24 Ibid., 38.
- 25 Ibid., 32.
- 26 Martha C. Nussbaum, *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), xiv.
- 27 Miles, *Constructing the Other in Ancient Israel and the USA*, 138.
- 28 Anthony Rivas, “Trump’s Language about Mexican Immigrants Under Scrutiny in Wake of El Paso Shooting”, *ABC News*, 4 August 2019, <https://abcn.ws/3bsDKsJ>; Philip Rucker “How Do You Stop These People?: Trump’s Anti-immigrant Rhetoric Looms Over El Paso Massacre”, *The Washington Post*, 4 August 2019, <https://wapo.st/31ME1IH>
- 29 Michael Pickering, “Racial Stereotypes”, in *Social Identities: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, ed. Gary Taylor and Steve Spencer (New York: Routledge, 2004), https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203338674_chapter_5
- 30 Miles, *Constructing the Other in Ancient Israel and the USA*, 39; Pickering, “Racial Stereotypes”, 97.
- 31 Dahlia Lithwick, “Why Has a Divided America Taken Gay Rights Seriously? A Philosopher Credits the Power of Imagination”, *Slate*, 8 March 2010, <https://bit.ly/2Sl6kEI>. According to Lithwick, Nussbaum demonstrates how “much of the political rhetoric around denying equal rights to gay Americans is rooted in the language of disgust. Their activities are depicted as ‘vile and revolting’, threatening to ‘contaminate and defile’ the rest of us. Looked at starkly, she argues, much of the anti-gay argument is bound up in feces and saliva, germs, contagion and blood.”
- 32 Nussbaum, *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*, xii-xxiii.
- 33 Ibid., 48.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid., xix.
- 36 See also Nussbaum, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*, 2-3.
- 37 Nussbaum, *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*, xix.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 See, for example, two collections of essays that include some of the scholars who are reading the Hebrew Bible in such a way, Christl M. Maier and Carolyn J. Sharp, *Prophecy and Power: Jeremiah in Feminist and Postcolonial Perspective* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); L. Juliana Claassens and Carolyn J. Sharp, *Feminist Frameworks and the Bible: Celebrating Intersectionality, Interrogating Power, Embracing Ambiguity* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).

- 40 My own work exploring the intersection of gender and trauma is informed by exactly these questions. For instance, with regard to the story of Lot’s daughters, I seek to enter the text by means of what can be described as participatory imagination as I employ such approaches as feminist, postcolonial biblical interpretation and trauma hermeneutics to identify the multiple, intersecting levels of the traumatic memories of Israel and her neighbours that continue to haunt Israel as they seek to make sense of their place in the world; see “Excavating Trauma Narratives: Haunting Memories in the Story of Lot’s Daughters”, in *Transgression and Transformation: The Role of Feminist, Postcolonial and Queer Biblical Interpretation in Fostering Communities of Justice* (London: T&T Clark, in press).
- 41 Nussbaum, *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*, xix.
- 42 Nussbaum, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*, 2-3.
- 43 Nussbaum, *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*, xx.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Bailey, Randall C. “They’re Nothing But Incestuous Bastards: The Polemical Use of Sex and Sexuality in Hebrew Canon Narratives”. In *Reading from This Place. Vol. 1, Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, edited by Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, 121-38. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Claassens, L. Juliana. “God and Violence in the Prophets”. In *Oxford Handbook to the Prophets*, edited by Carolyn J. Sharp, 334-49. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199859559.013.19>
- Claassens, L. Juliana. “From Fear’s Narcissism to Participatory Imagination: Disrupting Disgust and Overcoming the Fear of Israel’s Hērem Laws”. In *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature*, edited by F. Scott Spencer, 77-96. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1w1vm30.8>
- Claassens, L. Juliana. “Excavating Trauma Narratives: Haunting Memories in the Story of Lot’s Daughters”. In *Transgression and Transformation: The Role of Feminist, Postcolonial and Queer Biblical Interpretation in Fostering Communities of Justice*. London: T&T Clark (in press).
- Claassens, L. Juliana and Carolyn J. Sharp. *Feminist Frameworks and the Bible: Celebrating Intersectionality, Interrogating Power, Embracing Ambiguity*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Deist, Ferdinand E. “The Dangers of Deuteronomy: A Page from the Reception History of the Book”. In *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten and A.S. van der Woude, 13-29. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Exum, J. Cheryl. “Hagar En Procès: The Subject in Search of Subjectivity”. In *From the Margins 1: Women of the Hebrew Bible and Their Afterlives*, edited by Peter S. Hawkins and Lesleigh Cushing Stahlberg, 1-16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Lithwick, Dahlia. “Why Has a Divided America Taken Gay Rights Seriously? A Philosopher Credits the Power of Imagination”. *Slate*, 8 March 2010. <https://bit.ly/2Sl6kEI>

- Maier, Christl M. and Carolyn J. Sharp. *Prophecy and Power: Jeremiah in Feminist and Postcolonial Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Miles, Johnny E. *Constructing the Other in Ancient Israel and the USA*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.
- Nieuwoudt, Sharné, Kasha Elizabeth Dickie, Carla Coetsee, Louise Engelbrecht and Elmarie Terblanche. "Retracted Article: Age- and Education-Related Effects on Cognitive Functioning in Colored South African Women". *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B: Aging, Neuropsychology and Cognition* (2019): 1. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2019.1598538>
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065918>
- Pickering, Michael. "Racial Stereotypes". In *Social Identities: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, edited by Gary Taylor and Steve Spencer, 91-106. New York: Routledge, 2004. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203338674_chapter_5
- Rivas, Anthony. "Trump's Language About Mexican Immigrants under Scrutiny in Wake of El Paso Shooting". *ABC News*, 4 August 2019. <https://abcn.ws/3bsDKsJ>
- Rucker, Philip. "How Do You Stop These People?: Trump's Anti-Immigrant Rhetoric Looms over El Paso Massacre". *The Washington Post*, 4 August 2019. <https://wapo.st/31ME1IH>
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "What a Difference a Difference Makes". In *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, edited by Jacob Neusner, Ernest S. Frerichs and Caroline McCracken-Flesher, 3-48. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Stone, Ken. *Practising Safer Texts: Food, Sex, and Bible in Queer Perspective*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Tsoffar, Ruth. "The Trauma of Otherness and Hunger: Ruth and Lot's Daughters". *Women in Judaism* 5, no. 1 (2007): 1-13.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.