medieval period. The narrative, related in 1327 by an elderly monk, regards a visit he made as a young man, together with his mentor, to a Benedictine Abbey. There they were to engage in a disputation with papal emissaries regarding the (biblical-era) poverty of Jesus. The narrator's mentor is, however, engaged by the abbot to investigate the unexplained death of one of the young monk-copyists. Just as the case appears to be solved, a second monk-copyist is found dead. In the second of the biblical allusions, a Franciscan friar warns that the two deaths resonate with signs delivered in the biblical book of Revelation, pointing to the end-time.

Bibliography: ▪ Allegro, J., *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Gretna, La. 1956). ▪ Brown, D., *The Da Vinci Code* (New York 2003). ▪ Eco, U., *The Name of the Rose* (Milan 1980). ▪ Sánchez Hurtado, M., "Sony's Other Code," *Opus Dei* (May 17, 2006; https://opusdei.org).

Ori Z. Soltes

See also → Antony of the Desert, Saint; → Apophthegmata Patrum; → Ascetics, Asceticism; → Carmelite Order; → Carthusian Order; → Cistercian Order; → Demons, Demonology; → Dominican Order, Bible in; → Education; → Franciscan Order; → Interpretation, History of; → Liturgy; → Monasteries; → Pachomius, Pachomian Monasticism

Money

I. Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

Scholars debate whether the ancient Near East actually utilized money. Within the modern study of economics, money has the following accepted functions: (1) medium of exchange; (2) standard of value; (3) storing of value; (4) means of payment. But some have argued that prior to the Industrial Revolution, much economic exchange was non-monetized through either gifting or centralized redistribution. The most influential such voice in ancient Near Eastern studies is Karl Polanyi, who has argued for a position known as substantivism, the idea that all trade was socially-embedded. Even the documented trade between great polities, such as the Old Assyrian Karum trade, may have been primarily a ceremonial performance based on social standing and non-monetized at its core. Still, others have argued for universal formalism, in which economic conditions of supply and demand are axiomatic, thereby undergirding all forms of exchange, whether in ancient or modern times. After continuous debate, many scholars have adopted a centrist position that argues for co-existing components of substantivist and formalist exchange within a given economy.

With that premise, the economic exchange of the ancient Near East minimally served as a precursor to the development of aspects of money. Since the Bronze Age, precious metals, particularly silver, carried some aspects of monetary functions. Bits of silver would be weighed on a balance and then transferred between parties. Silver is the primary standard in Bronze Age economic texts from Mesopotamia, Anatolia, the Levant and Egypt. This penchant for silver continued in the Iron Age, but with the silver collections coming in smaller amounts with official seals for authenticity. Silver was used for commerce, but also for tax collection, fines, dowry, inheritance, and purchase of all sorts of goods. In addition to silver, texts give ample evidence for exchange of prestige items and in-kind payments. Economic archives reveal that each major region had distinct metrological standards to determine basic equivalencies, corroborated by archaeological findings of extant weights, as well as distribution of silver hoards alongside major centers such as Phoenician trade routes. These stacks of hacksilber eventually developed into coinage. The first known coin appears in Anatolia in the late 7th century BCE. By the 6th century, coinage appears in both Greek and Phoenician styles. The rise of the Achaemenid empire brought coinage into a regular system of payments for the empire, with local forms appearing in Philistia, Samaria and Yehud. Coinage began as fiat form without an intrinsic value, and was minted by an authority that guaranteed the actual amount of pure silver. Eventually, the dies (an hardened metal stamping tool) would then authenticate the value of the coinage. But the growing distribution of coinage in itself only marks circulation and makes no direct statement as to the function of coins as actual money for formalist trade, or as a symbolic tokens for socially-embedded exchange.

With the relatively late appearance of money, the HB/OT rarely makes direct reference to coins, but frequently uses the term "silver" (*kesep*), presumably as a means of payments according to standard measures (cf. Lev 19:35; Prov 16:11; Isa 46:11). The HB/OT usage roughly aligns with inscriptional evidence that silver was weighed out and used as a means for payment, yet these texts do not necessarily indicate the nature of the transaction, whether indicating actual monetary exchange, or merely a ceremonial transaction. Transactions include the purchase of humans (Gen 17:23), land (Gen 23:16; 2 Sam 24:24), chariots and horses (1 Kgs 10:29), bride-price (Exod 22:17) and wage labor (Zech 11:12). Beyond purchasing power, silver is

Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception vol. 19

used to store wealth (Gen 24:35), as gifts (Gen 24:53; 1 Kgs 15:19), to pay individual penalties (Exod 21:32), for national tribute (2 Kgs 18:14; 23:33), long distance trade (Isa 60:9; Ezek 27:12), pillaging (Judg 5:19; 2 Kgs 7:8), reward (Judg 16:5) penalty (Exod 21:32), and worship offerings (Exod 25:3; Num 7:13). Though the sheer scope of functionality of silver may suggest its usage as money, these biblical portrayals do not necessarily reflect the dominant economic mode of ancient Israel. The HB/OT also gives plenty of evidence of non-monetary gift exchange. In addition, although prejudiced for official transactions, Northwest Semitic inscriptions record official distributions, such as allocations of wine and oil to regional leaders (Samaria ostraca) and military units (Arad ostraca). The usage of money is not necessary as long as there are alternative methods of economic distribution available.

With the late appearance of coinage, the HB/OT only lists three possible references to actual money (Ezra 2:69/Neh 7:69–71 and 1 Chr 29:7), all referring to the Persian daric. Not surprisingly, all three mentions fall within a purported Persian setting and the references to a centralized distribution. Later writings, such as Sirach (7:18; 29:5–6) and Tobit (5:19) make more frequent reference to currency, though it is ambiguous whether the reference indicates an actual unit of money or an equivalency of precious metal. Although the direct reference to coinage is sparse, the underlying economic activity in the HB/OT previews the shift to a more robust monetary economy of the Greco-Roman era to follow.

Bibliography: ▪ Adams, S., *Social and Economic Life in the Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, Ky. 2014). ▪ Boer, R., *The Sacred Economy of Ancient Israel* (Louisville, Ky. 2015). ▪ Murphy, C., *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (Leiden 2002). ▪ Nam, R., *Portrayals of Economic Exchange in the Book of Kings* (Leiden 2012). ▪ Polanyi, K., *The Great Transformation* (Boston, Mass. 1944). ▪ Schapps, D., *The Invention of Coinage and the Monetization of Ancient Greece* (Ann Arbor, Mich. 2003). ▪ Thompson, C., "Sealed Silver in the Iron Age Cisjordan and the 'Invention' of Coinage," *OJA* 22.1 (2003) 67–107.

Roger Nam

II. Greco-Roman Antiquity

Money is a medium for exchanging value, often – but not always – in the form of currency. The invention and use of money, as opposed to simple barter, corresponds to societal development and sophistication (e.g., Aristotle, *Pol.* 1257a.31–38). The precise definition of "money" in the ancient and modern world remains a matter of debate (see, e.g., Harris 2008). Contemporary scholarship regards money in the Greco-Roman world (*pecunia* and χρήματα) as including a variety of goods and materials. However, money as metal in coin was the most common currency of exchange. Roman currency (*as*, *sestertius*, *denarius*, and *aureus*) spread with the expansion of the Empire and was used across the Mediterranean world. Livestock and bullion were a valuable currency from the time of Homer and remained so into the Imperial Period (cf. Homer, *Il.* 6.235–6; see Hollander). Slaves, a source of incredible wealth, could also be a means of payment (Diodorus Siculus 5.26.3). Part-time laborers could be paid with agriculture product (Cat. Maj., *On Agriculture* 136). The Roman jurists include wine, grain, land, or obligations as money (*Digest* 50.16.222; Gaius, *Inst.* 3.124). "The designation *pecunia* does not only include coinage but absolutely every kind of *pecunia*, that is, every substance (*omnia corpora*); for there is no one who doubts that substances are also included in the designation of *pecunia*" (*Digest* 50.16.178). The wealthy drew upon credit and loans – a currency of trust – on a large scale (see Harris and Rathbone). Sex, not surprisingly, was both an object for purchase with currency and a medium for acquisition of other good, services, and privileges.

Bibliography: ▪ Finley, M. I., *The Ancient Economy* (Berkeley, Calif. ²1985). ▪ Harris, W. V., "The Nature of Roman Money," in *The Monetary Systems of the Greeks and Romans* (ed. W. V. Harris; Oxford 2008) 174–207. ▪ Harris, W. V. (ed.), *The Monetary Systems of the Greeks and Romans* (Oxford 2008). ▪ Hollander, D. B., *Money in the Late Roman Republic* (Leiden 2007). ▪ Hoyer, D., *Money, Culture, and Well-Being in Rome's Economic Development, 0-275 CE* (MnS; Leiden 2018). ▪ Rathbone, D. W., "The Financing of Maritime Commerce in the Roman Empire, I-II AD," in *E Credito e moneta nel mondo romano: atti degli Incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica: Capri, 12-14* (ed. L. Cascio; Naples 2000) 197–229. ▪ Von Reden, S., *Money in Classical Antiquity* (KTAH; Cambridge 2010).

Trevor W. Thompson

III. New Testament

The subject of money in the NT is closely related to other forms of material wealth, such as property which can be purchased or sold, resources in the form of agricultural produce (Luke 16:5–7); exceptionally large harvests which can be stored and sold (Luke 12:16), clothing (John 19:23–24), and attractive and expensive goods for trading, including slaves/human trafficking (Rev 18:12–13). The merchants in Jas 4:13–15 are not criticized for their need to make profits but for their self-confidence. Money is also related to work which procures income: for a day's work in the vineyard, laborers are promised and given a silver coin (Matt 20:1–16). The NT speaks of the need to earn one's living and not to depend on but rather to share with others (Acts 20:33–35; 1 Thess 4:11–12; 2 Thess 3:6–13). Lack of money means poverty and hunger.

The NT refers to several coins (see "Coins II. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament and New Testament"): there is the silver *denarius* (Matt 18:28) and the *drachma* with about the same value (Luke 15:8). Examples of provincial and local coinage are the two small copper coins mentioned as a widow's offering (two *lepta* which is one *quadrans*, worth 1/64 of a *denarius*, Mark 12:42) and the *assarion* (worth 1/16 of a *denarius*) which would buy two sparrows (Matt 10:29). Larger sums of money are the *talent* (*talanton*, 6000 *denarii*, Matt 18:24; 25:14–28) and the *mina* (100 *denarii*, Luke 19:13–25). The NT also mentions the prices of other products: bread for 200 *denarii* could feed a crowd of 5000 people (Mark 6:37); an inn-keeper receives two *denarii* for nursing a wounded traveller (Luke 10:35); a large amount of costly perfume could cost up to 300 *denarii* (John 12:3–5); thirty pieces of silver (*arguria*) would pay for a field in Jerusalem (Matt 27:3–7); the Christian converts of Ephesus burnt magical texts worth 50.000 *arguria* (Acts 19:19).

Religious and various state taxes play a significant role. When he demanded to give to Caesar those things that are Caesar's, Jesus probably referred to the image of the Emperor Tiberius on Roman *denarii*. The tax for the temple in Jerusalem had to be paid in Tyrian shekels, called *didrachma* in Matt 17:24. Jesus overturned the tables of money changers (*kollubistes*) in the temple area. They enriched themselves in the process of exchanging between coins of different sources (Mark 11:15). Tax-collectors are closely associated with sinners.

Money in the NT is ambiguous. On the one hand, service to God and to Mammon (money or goods as personified objects of false devotion) is mutually exclusive: "You cannot serve God and wealth" (Matt 6:24). Money can keep people out of the kingdom of God (Luke 18:18–27). Judas Iscariot kept the common purse of Jesus and his disciples "and used to steal what was put into it" (John 12:6; 13:29). Eventually he betrayed Jesus for thirty *arguria*, probably Tyrian shekels (Matt 26:15). The Roman governor Felix kept Paul in prison and expected a bribe from him or his followers (Acts 24:26, see also Acts 12:20). Because the giving and receiving of money can create relationships of dependency, Paul was reluctant to accept money from his converts while he ministered to them. He did not covet their silver or gold or clothing (Acts 20:33). His ministry was not a pretext for greed (1 Thess 2:5). The NT contains staunch warning against love of money (*philarguria*). It is the root of all evil and causes believers to loose their faith (1 Tim 6:10); greed is idolatry (Col 3:5). The Pharisees are characterized as loving money (Luke 16:14). In the last days, people will be lovers of money (2 Tim 3:2).

On the other hand, much good can be done with money. It can be used to make friends; its right use indicates a person's trustworthiness (Luke 16:9, 11). By earning one's living, people do not depend on the community. Money can be used to support others and relieve their needs (Acts 11:27–30; 24:17; Phil 4:10–19) and serve to finance the spread of the Gospel (Luke 8:1–3; Acts 15:3; Rom 15:24; 1 Cor 16:5, 11; 2 Cor 1:16; Tit 3:13; 3 John 6). For Paul, a sum of money collected systematically among predominantly gentile Christians could serve to establish and maintain ties between early Christian communities over long distances (Gal 2:10; 1 Cor 16:1–4; 2 Cor 8–9; Rom 15:25–31). Money could express the gentile Christians' indebtedness to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem. In this context Paul emphasizes full transparency in financial matters. The money would at no point end up in his own pocket but would be delivered personally by the delegates appointed by the donating churches (see "Collection for Jerusalem, Paul's").

Money is not a problem per se in the NT. It all depends on how people acquire it, how they spend it and on their attitude towards their material possessions.

Bibliography: ▪ Dickson, J. P., *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: The Shape, Extent and Background of Early Christian Mission* (WUNT.2 159; Tübingen 2003). ▪ Ebner, M. et al., *Gott und das Geld* (JBTh 21; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2006). ▪ Ernst, M. et al., "Geld/Geldwirtschaft 3: Geld im Neuen Testament," in *Sozialgeschichtliches Wörterbuch zur Bibel* (ed. F. Crüsemann et al.; Gütersloh 2009) 193–96. ▪ Förster, N., *Jesus und die Steuerfrage: Die Zinsgroschenperikope auf dem religiösen und politischen Hintergrund ihrer Zeit mit einer Edition von Pseudo-Hieronymus* (De haeresibus Judaeorum; WUNT 294; Tübingen 2012). ▪ Hays, C. M., *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study of Their Coherence and Character* (WUNT.2 275; Tübingen 2010). ▪ Rosner, B. S., *Greed as Idolatry: The Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2007). ▪ Stenschke, C., "Kommt nur darauf an, wie man dazu kommt und was man damit macht: Die Gefahren und Chancen von Geld im Neuen Testament," *VeEc* 31.1 (December 2010; https://verbumetecclesia.org.za).

Christoph Stenschke

IV. Judaism

▪ Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism ▪ Rabbinic Judaism ▪ Medieval Judaism ▪ Modern Judaism

A. Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism

Financial exchanges became more frequent during the Second Temple period, as advancements in currency led to greater uniformity. The earlier reliance on weight balances continued in some localities, and ingots (metal bars) basically served as currency (Heb. *kesep* means "silver" and "money"). Even if many transactions continued to occur through bartering, coinage dramatically increased after the Babylonian exile, usually with the depiction of a particular ruler on the surface of the coin, often with a lengthy inscription highlighting the ruler's accomplishments. Coins also contained other decorative emblems such as fertility symbols. The expansion of trade heightened the need for effective coinage that would be acceptable to a variety of merchants. While there is little extant currency from the Persian period, Egyptian, Greek, and Phoenician coins were clearly used, especially along the coastal regions where trade was more frequent. Archaeologists have discovered indigenous coins with a "YHD" stamp on them, usually written in paleo-

Hebrew or Aramaic script. Hasmonean coins with one of the rulers on the surface were also in abundant use during the Second Temple period.

In terms of values for coins, most currency systems had a basic standard in silver (or gold), and then smaller denominations (e.g., shekels, drachms) were based on that standard. For example, during the Persian period the daric was based on gold, and this amount could be divided into twenty shekels of silver. Later imperial systems followed this basic practice.

During the Roman period, Herodian kings minted their own currency, and the silver or copper-based denarius became a common form of tender (e.g., Matt 18:28). The rapid increase in coinage during this period corresponded with the infrastructure efforts of these rulers and their ongoing need for favor with the Roman imperial system. One finds numerous references in the NT to coinage, including the story of the widow's offering (Mark 12:41–44; Luke 21:1–14) and whether a follower of Jesus should pay royal taxes with a denarius (Mark 12:13–17; Matt 22:15–22; Luke 20:20–26).

Coin usage was not confined to cities or wealthy merchants. Numismatic evidence appears in such remote locations as the Khirbet Qumran site, pointing to the employment of currency even by Jewish sectarians. While the amount of coins found at the site is relatively small when compared to other locations, the community at Qumran clearly utilized currency to purchase essential goods and engage in modest trading.

The increase in currency during the Second Temple period had considerable implications. Even if many transactions continued to occur through local bartering, better reliance on weight systems and coinage allowed for more detailed and precise transactions. Contract writing became more efficient and widespread during this period, and more uniform currency systems allowed for greater adherence to the terms of the contract. Increased coinage also encouraged profit seekers to engage in a variety of speculative interests, including usurious lending and bribery.

Bibliography: ▪ Adams, S. L., *Social and Economic Life in the Second Temple Period* (Louisville, Ky. 2014). ▪ Hendin, D., *Guide to Biblical Coins* (New York [5]2010). ▪ Magness, J., *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2011).

Samuel L. Adams

B. Rabbinic Judaism

By the time the rabbinic movement emerged, in 1st-century Judea, coined money was ubiquitous, commonplace, and self-explanatory. The rabbis understood the Torah as mandating the use of coins and coined money in many contexts.

In the rabbinic imagination, coins were produced by non-rabbinic state authorities. The act of coining money outside of the imperial government was a revolutionary one: leaders in both Jewish revolts (66 CE and 132 CE) produced coins with their own propaganda messages and images. The rabbis, conversely, did not produce coins; they also ruled that coins produced in revolutionary contexts are not valid for use when mandated by halakhah (*tMSh* 1:6).

Following earlier readers of Scripture, the rabbis read the standard weight terms in the HB, as well as the word *kesef* (silver) as references to current coins. The rabbis thus read the Torah's instructions mandating the use of silver in certain contexts (e.g., the Deuteronomic tithe; Deut 14:22–26) as mandating the use of coins in the same contexts. Thus, the temple tax, purchase of sacrifices, redemption of tithes, and the redeeming of the first born son, are all to be done in coins, rather than weights of silver. Marriage payments (*ketubbah*), pocket-money for wives, money for charity, assessments for damages and many more payments are stated in coinage values. Work is also understood as mandating a cash payment. The rabbis know of illegitimate uses of money, such as payments for positions and bribery.

In rabbinic law, coins are most useful for the settling of debt. Real estate, written documents and human chattel can be bought with coins, and they effect marriages as well (*mKid* 1:1–6). Transferring coinage does not conclude a sale of movables; a sale is only concluded with the transference of the goods in question. Transfer of coinage before transfer of the goods is, in essence, a loan to be repaid with the goods. As such it is sometimes subject to the laws of usury (*mBM* 5:1). Except in the very late strata of the Babylonian Talmud (*bBM* 59a), the value of coinage does not fluctuate (cf. Paul in *Digest* 18.1.1); thus the only loans which do not involve a risk of usury are those with coins (*bBM* 42b; *yBM* 4:1, 9c).

The rabbis recognized that coins could be pulled from circulation by governments of cities and empires (*mBQ* 9:2 and the two talmuds ad loc.); they also arrogated a similar power to themselves. Coins used to buy certain items (e.g., idols) or dedicated to certain causes (e.g., charity) were to be removed from circulation, and were no longer fungible with other coins. Additionally, rabbinic laws on fraud dictated that a worn-down coin was to be broken and taken out of circulation.

Money and wealth are used frequently in rabbinic literature as metaphors for legal knowledge, following wisdom literature and Ps 119. The word *matbea*ʿ (coin) is also used to describe the basic building block of rabbinic liturgy, the blessing, or *berakhah* (see e.g. *tBer* 5:4; *yBer* 5:2, 9b; *bBer* 40b; *MidPs* 19:2, 82a). The Mishnah describes the face on humans as the divine equivalent to the face of the emperor on Roman coins (*mSan* 4:5; cf. Matt 22:15–22; parallels in Mark 12:13–17; Luke 20:20–26).

Rabbinic literature features money terms which have proven useful for the economic and social history of the rabbinic movement and the Roman empire. Additional work remains to be done on similar coin-names from the Sassanian empire.

Bibliography: ▪ Ben-David, A., "Jewish and Roman Bronze and Copper Coins: Their Reciprocal Relations in Mishnah and Talmud from Herod the Great to Trajan and Hadrian," *PEQ* 103.2 (1971) 109–29. ▪ Magness, J., "The Question of the Synagogue: The Problem of Typology," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity* 4 (ed. J. Neusner/A. J. Avery-Peck; Leiden 2000) 1–48. ▪ Meshorer, Y., *City-Coins of Eretz-Israel and the Decapolis in the Roman Period* (Jerusalem 1985). ▪ Mommsen, T./P. Krueger (eds.), *The Digest of Justinian* (trans. A. Watson; Philadelphia, Pa. 1985). ▪ Sperber, D., *Roman Palestine, 200–400, Money and Prices* (Ramat-Gan ^{2}1991 [^{1}1974]). ▪ Waner, M./Z. Safrai, "A Catalogue of Coin Hoards and the Shelf Life of Coins in Palestine Hoards during the Roman-Byzantine Period," *LASBF* 51 (2001) 305–36.

Amit Gvaryahu

C. Medieval Judaism

Jewish thought in the medieval period surrounding private property and money represents a sea-change from that of the biblical period. Whereas several biblical texts emphasize divine ownership of the land of Israel (placing demands such as the sabbatical year on those who held the land, as well as reversion of land that has been sold to its erstwhile owners in the Jubilee year), medieval thinkers generally held that individuals could "own" property. The medieval period also saw a shift in the economic activity of much of the Jewish community from the agrarian pursuits in which most Jews participated up to the close of the talmudic period into urban crafts and trade. There has been a historiographical tendency to see the shift into crafts and trade to be comprehensive, with the Jews of Christian Europe particularly dogged by regulations preventing their holding and working of land, but this tendency has been challenged by recent scholars who highlight the evidence for Jewish persistence in agriculture throughout the medieval period on both sides of the Mediterranean. Despite this, greater involvement in mercantile activities over the course of the medieval period did demand a reevaluation of rabbinic ideas of the role of coinage, fiat currency, and indeed property rights in general. While wealth is recognized by the Bible as ephemeral (cf. Eccl 1:4–12), the shift from subsistence farming that began in late antiquity demanded that rabbinic literature consider the implications of the pursuit and acquisition of wealth. The acquisitive desire is styled "the evil inclination" (Heb. *yetser ha-raʿ*), yet is also seen as essential to procreation, stable families, and the economy alike (cf. *BerR* 9:7). In the high Middle Ages, Moses Maimonides (1138–1204) scorns the idea of the acquisition of wealth; he writes in the *Mishneh Torah* that one should not work beyond meeting one's immediate needs (*Hilkhot Deʿot* 1.4). At the same time, he rejects the idea both of miserliness and poverty (ibid. 1.1); and he argues in the *Guide to the Perplexed* (2.32, following the Talmud and drawing on an Islamic context that was approving of commerce and wealth) that prophecy comes only to one who is "wise, strong, and wealthy."

The ancient prohibition on interest (e.g., Exod 22:24; Lev 25, 36) suggests that one should gain from the work of one's hands or from the growth of one's fields (the fruit, literally, of the human-divine partnership) – and not from simply taking advantage of what economists would come to call "the time value of money." However, the medieval period saw these regulations relaxed where one of the parties to a loan transaction was not a Jew and therefore not covered by the biblical prohibition (Deut 23:20–21). The Talmud recognized the primacy of land by permitting debts to be collected only from real property. But amidst the demographic and occupational changes to the Jewish community that accompanied the rise of Islam, the post-talmudic *geʾonim* decreed that debts could also be collected from chattel. Jews in the medieval Islamic world developed a system of banking that relied on the "bill of exchange" (Arab. *suftaja*) that facilitated long-distance trade via credit. Although it had a rocky reception, the *suftaja* was eventually absorbed into Jewish law by the *geʾonim*. Jewish involvement in a mercantile economy was further supported by a rabbinic approach distinguishing between interest and commercial associations: while simply lending money may not bring one profit, one may profit from taking on risk and liability. The talmudic instrument of the *ʿisqa* (Aram.) came into flower in the medieval period and allowed individuals to participate in mercantile ventures as "silent partners." Credit was an important part of Jewish involvement in the economy in Christian Europe as well, although it is not possible to estimate the relative size of Jewish participation in the field. As they had been in the rabbinic period, debts were treated as assets and were traded. A mortgage market developed in Christian Europe which allowed Jewish farmers to accept land and its fruits as payment. Such mortgages provided ready capital to facilitate both agricultural and commercial ventures. To avoid problems with non-Jewish authorities and to deter the use of stolen goods, Jewish leaders prohibited a broad range of goods from being taken in pawn, to include ecclesiastical utensils, weaponry, and armor, and a range of tools used by artisans (see, for instance, the statement of Isaac ben Samuel of Dampierre, misattributed to Abraham ben David of Posquières in the latter's *Responsa* [ed. Qafiḥ], #140; cf. Toch: 211). As for minting, there is some evidence that Jews participated as minters in both the lands of Islam and Christian Europe, although there is no reason to believe that Jews dominated this area.

Bibliography: ▪ Abraham ben David, of Posquieres, *Teshuvot u-fesaqim* [Responsa and decisions] (ed. Y. Qafiḥ; Jerusalem 1964). ▪ Goitein, S. D., *A Mediterranean Society*, 6 vols.

(Berkeley, Calif. 1968–85). ▪ Satlow, M. (ed.), *Judaism and the Economy* (New York 2019). ▪ Toch, M., *The Economic History of European Jews: Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages* (Leiden 2013). ▪ Twersky, I., *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides (Mishneh Torah)* (YJS 22; New Haven, Conn. 1980). ▪ Westreich, E., "Elements of Negotiability in Talmudic and Geonic Times," *JLASt* 19 (2009) 248–75.

Phillip Lieberman

D. Modern Judaism

Modern Jewish thought about money occurs in the shadow of massive political and economic transformations. First in Europe, and later around the world, Jews were increasingly singled out and described by others as proxies for, beneficiaries of, or agents of these transformations. The biblical, rabbinic, and medieval traditions are all reread with such external descriptions in mind, frequently giving the literature an apologetic or polemical tone. For example, Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786), embroiled in a debate over civil rights for Jews in German lands, thought it necessary to defend "the pettiest trafficking Jew," who was "not a mere consumer, but a useful inhabitant (citizen, I must say) of the state – a real producer" (Mendelssohn: 39).

The identification of Jews with "unproductive" commerce provoked anxiety about "productivization" (Penslar: 107–23), the economic component of the wider political and cultural "regeneration" seen as necessary for Jews to integrate into liberal societies. Such anxieties varied by ideology in ways that closely tracked the major political ideological divisions.

Liberals tended to emphasize the fruitful and productive nature of commerce, including finance, as seen in Mendelssohn. This meant pushing back against ancient Aristotelian and Christian frameworks depicting money as dead and the generation of money through money as unnatural. They could draw on legal precedents from the medieval Islamic world in this effort, portraying capitalism as merely an intensified form of long-standing and approved commercial practices rewarding risk and investment. Much of the halakhic literature on monetary issues assumes this ideological background implicitly, even when dealing with issues as unique to modernity as e-commerce or futures markets (*Oxford Handbook*). However, liberals were not immune to productivization discourse; a representative here is the moderate reform rabbi Salomon Herxheimer (1841–1899), who declared in 1837 that "our contemporary widespread [economic] activity *did not exist* among our blessed forefathers, *should not exist* according to our written and oral teachings, and *cannot remain* given the demands of the time" (cited in Penslar: 113).

Nationalists sought to productivize Jews by returning to what they saw as a biblical precedent for landed agriculturalism. The Zionist movement argued that the colonization of Palestine would allow Jews a "normal" occupational structure and profile, treating the primacy of agricultural festivals and relative insignificance of money in the Tanakh (HB) as indicators of the way forward. This quasi-secular transformation of the HB into a historical document is ubiquitous across the Zionist spectrum; one exemplar is the "religion of labor" of the philosopher-guru A. D. Gordon (1856–1922). Nonetheless, the movement depended in its early days on a network of international philanthropy similar to those developed by liberals earlier in the 19th century (Penslar: 240), with the aim of providing aid to distressed Jewish communities and simultaneously "educating" them into modernity (especially in Eastern Europe, the Maghreb, and the Levant). Moreover, economic circumstances in Palestine were not and could not be shaped entirely by Zionist autarkic fantasies: Ottoman and British patterns and global capital flows conditioned what Zionists were able to achieve. The symbol of this contradiction is the new sheqel (*sheqel ḥadash*), the currency of the State of Israel. After decades during which the Israeli pound was pegged to the British pound, the sheqel was introduced in 1980 in accordance with the Zionist reverence for the Tanakh; it was replaced by the new sheqel in 1986 after a period of hyperinflation.

Jewish socialists had to fight on multiple fronts, since Jewish liberals and non-Jewish socialists were frequently united in portraying the Jewish legacy as fundamentally bourgeois (Karp: 254–63). Karl Marx (1818–1883) was neither the first nor the most virulent socialist to hold the view that "money is the jealous god of Israel" (Marx: 50), even as his own Jewish ancestry was frequently held against all socialists by antisemites. Nevertheless, socialists vigorously re-interpreted the biblical legacy, pointing to institutions such as the Sabbath, Sabbatical Year, and Jubilee as examples of socialist tendencies in biblical legislation (as well as the laws of *pe'ah* and *leqet* [laws that mandate leaving the corners of one's field and the gleanings of the harvest for the poor; see Lev 19:9; 23:22], read as imposing mandatory restrictions on property rights and minimal standards of living). While socialists and liberals shared these emphases, they disagreed on exactly how to enact the comprehensive renewal of the biblical and rabbinic laws of charity necessary to meet contemporary challenges; socialists tended to see communal charity obligations as now incumbent upon the public purse rather than the individual or synagogue. Those socialists, who were also Zionists, became a major force in the landscape of Palestine, presenting the kibbutz as an alternative to the money economy. However, their rhetoric was frequently strident in its secularism, with only a small proportion of the movement attempting to combine Judaism and socialism in a thoroughgoing fashion (Fishman).

The polemical landscape in which antisemites and philosemites alike associate Jews with broad features of capitalism has perhaps inhibited the creative Jewish treatment of money itself. "Money" remains a proxy for wealth, power, and inequality. Recent studies of modernity tend to fold consideration of money into topics of wider sweep, addressing the economics of sectors like philanthropy (Berman) and synagogue finances (Judson). It would be interesting to see wider focus on the impact of state theories of money, cultural anthropology, and recent innovations in monetary theory on Jewish thought – but first, such impact would have to occur.

Bibliography: ▪ Berman, L. C., *The American Jewish Philanthropic Complex: The History of a Multibillion-Dollar Institution* (Princeton, N.J. 2020). ▪ Fishman, A., *Judaism and Modernization on the Religious Kibbutz* (New York 1992). ▪ Judson, D., *Pennies for Heaven: The History of American Synagogues and Money* (Waltham, Mass. 2018). ▪ Karp, J., *The Politics of Jewish Commerce: Economic Thought and Emancipation in Europe, 1638–1848* (New York 2008). ▪ Levine, A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Judaism and Economics* (New York 2010). ▪ Marx, K., "On the Jewish Question," in *The Marx-Engels Reader* (ed. R. C. Tucker; New York ²1978) 26–52. ▪ Mendelssohn, M., "Preface to Menasseh ben Israel's *Vindiciae Judaeorum* [1782]," in *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History* (ed. P. Mendes-Flohr/J. Reinharz; New York ³2011). ▪ Penslar, D. J., *Shylock's Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe* (Berkeley, Calif. 2001).

Samuel Hayim Brody

V. Christianity

▪ Patristics and Orthodox Churches ▪ Medieval Christianity and Reformation Era ▪ Modern Europe and America ▪ World Christianity

A. Patristics and Orthodox Churches

In the early centuries of Christianity, patristic authors needed to reconcile views from biblical passages that counseled for the distribution of and/or renunciation of money, and the association between wealth, avarice and sin with increasing numbers of prosperous converts into the religion. Ambiguity in Christian scriptures regarding money presented a challenge for patristic authors. In Christian scriptures there is strong evidence that Jesus' argued for the distribution of money as an act of righteousness (Matt 5:42; Luke 6:30); further, careful management of money can demonstrate shrewdness of character (Luke 16:9–11), generosity of spirit (Acts 11:27–30; 24:17; Phil 4:10–19) and a responsible work ethic (Acts 18:3; 1 Cor 4:12). On the other hand, other biblical passages offer that money is the "root of all evil" (1 Tim 6:10), that people do terrible things with money and for money – such as taking and offering bribes (Exod 23:8; Deut 10:17 and 27:25) – that avarice leads to great poverty and want (Prov 14:31; Luke 12:16–21; 16:19–31), unhappiness (Eccl 5:10) and, potentially, the conflict between money and God can result in a loss of salvation (Matt 16:26; Mark 10:23–27 and Matt 19:16–30; Luke 16:13). Finally, love of money will prove a powerful incentive for the turning over of Jesus to Roman officials (Matt 26:15). In letters, sermons, biblical analysis and theological treatise, the acquisition, use and dissemination of money was linked to the organization of an ethical, pious Christian life; thus, as issues of salvation and private ownership were necessarily linked to economics, the spectrum of financial transactions from traditional urban spending to small purchases or acts of charity took on eschatological significance. An early and important attempt to reconcile wealth and salvation is found in Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur?* (*Who is the Rich to Be Saved?*). Based on the relationship between Jesus and the rich man (of Matt 19 and Mark 10) and placed in the economic context of the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity and the religious context of emerging proto-orthodox Christianity and declining gnostic Christian influence, Clement's counsel is nuanced: he advocates neither for admiration of the wealthy nor their abuse. Clement's approach is Stoic, as he advocates not for the stripping of finances, but for understanding money as morally indifferent, beyond how it is used; for a Christian, the wisest investment of one's wealth is in an imperishable treasure in heaven through the body of the poor. Distinct from Clement, however, Athanasius of Alexandria will, a little more than a century later, use the "rich man" of Matthew and Mark to advocate for severe renunciation of wealth, with the benefits that such renunciation would provide. In his *Life of St. Antony*, the central figure Antony will hear the passage that "If you would be perfect, go, sell what you posses and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven" (Matt 19:21) as a call to abandon his familial wealth and embrace a life of continence and poverty.

In time, in patristic and monastic texts, money and its uses will become linked with acts of almsgiving or lending without demand for interest – or even repayment – during times of economic distress as a means of shoring up "treasure in heaven" (Matt 6:19–20) and as a central component of Christian formation. Cappadocian theologians and bishops Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzus and, additionally, the Antiochene John Chrysostom are especially known for using their authoritative positions to offer vigorous appeals in their homilies to wealthier community members during times of public health crises, most of which are grounded in their interpretations of biblical views of money. For example, acclaimed bishop and preacher John Chrysostom's will deliver a series of homilies devoted to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus from Luke 16:19–31 to make a similar point to Clement, that the failure to use wealth properly to assist those in need and contribute to the social challenges of poverty is a fundamental mismanagement of that which does not belong to the wealthy person to begin with (*Laz.* 6.8).

Irrespective of status, gender or station, laity and monastics alike dealt with consequences of the ambiguous relationship that Christianity as a religious system and individual Christians had with money. Under careful administration of bishops, the distribution of money as an act of Christian charity took on an organized form in the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire, with philanthropia as a "philosophy and a way of life" (Constantelos: xi); hospitals, orphanages, hospices, poor homes and homes for the aged are some examples of the recipients of organized monastery donations. This is seen clearly in the philanthropic institution established by Basil of Caesarea – as noted in Gregory of Nazianus' touching *Or. Bas.* 43 and in Basil's own letters (*Ep.* 94, 150, 176) – and the pinnacle of this practice as demonstrated in the hagiographic account of the Life of John the Almsgiver, whose distribution of money extended beyond the city of Alexandria and was not limited to religious identity.

Bibliography. ***Primary:*** ▪ Basil of Caesarea, *Saint Basil: Letters*, 4 vols. (trans. R. J. Deferrari/M. R. McGuire; LCL; Cambridge, Mass. 1961). ▪ Bishop Sophronios/J. Moschos, "The Life of Our Holy Father, John the Almsgiver and Bishop Leontius, A Supplement to the Life of John the Almsgiver, Our Saintly Father and Archbishop of Alexandria," in *Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. Theodore of Sykeon and St. John the Almsgiver* (Crestwood, N.Y. 1996).

Secondary: ▪ Avila, C., *Ownership: Early Christian Teaching* (Marynoll, N.Y. 1981). ▪ Brown, P., *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Lebanon, N.H. 2002). ▪ Constantelos, D. J., *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare* (Chicago, Ill. 1968). ▪ Gonzalez, J. L., *Faith and Wealth: A History of Early Christian Ideas on the Origin, Significance and Use of Money* (Eugene, Oreg. 2002). ▪ Holman, S. (ed.), *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2008). ▪ Rhee, H., *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2012).

Brenda Llewellyn Ihssen

B. Medieval Christianity and Reformation Era

The medieval period saw the elaboration, systematization, and, in the case of usury, the erosion, of basic attitudes to money which emerged during the patristic period, all of which became highly contested in the era of the Reformation. A central assumption of pre-Reformation exegesis was the negative spiritual "charge" associated with money (1 Tim 6:10), which accounts both for the deep suspicion with which usury and other commercial activities were typically held, as well as for the privileged role of almsgiving and renunciation in medieval soteriology. Luther's protest against indulgences was aimed precisely at the junction where late medieval discourses of money and salvation met, such that the emerging Protestant traditions were forced to engage in a reevaluation of the Bible's teaching on money across a wide range of theoretical and practical domains. Four areas in particular stand out: the tithe, almsgiving, renunciation, and usury.

The tithe is first mentioned in Gen 14:17–20, where Abram gives a tenth of his spoils to Melchizedek after a joint military campaign, with extended legislation in Lev 27, Num 18, and in Deut 12, 14, and 26. Medieval interpreters often discerned a spiritual meaning in these texts, but rarely so as to occlude the plain sense of a concrete obligation. Isidore of Seville argued that because Melchizedek prefigures Christ in his priestly office, so Abram's tithe prefigures the offering of later Christians (*Glossa ordinaria* 1:206). The continued relevance of the tithe was never seriously questioned during the Reformation era; what was questioned was the effective status of the tithe as a tax. Carolingian kings had enforced their collection, and conflict over proprietary churches prior to the Gregorian reforms had reinforced their obligatory character. Mandatory tithes continued in many areas where the Reformation was imposed by the state, though the voluntary character of these offerings was increasingly stressed (Zimmerman). Calvin, for example, observed that Abram "voluntarily gave tithes to Melchizedek, to do honor to his priesthood" as a gift, rather than as an annual tax (CO 23:201–202).

Medieval exegetes inherited a discourse of "salvific almsgiving" originating from at least as far back as the Second Temple period (Anderson). Texts in the wisdom literature (esp. Prov 19:17), Sirach 29, the book of Tobit, and Jesus' teaching regarding "treasure in heaven" (e.g., Matt 6:19–21, Mark 10:21; Luke 12:33) were commonly harmonized to suggest the possibility of exchanging earthly treasure for spiritual rewards beyond the grave. After the Pelagian controversy, this exchange was increasingly read as a steady trickle of alms, rather than a complete renunciation of wealth (Brown). The mendicant movements of the 13th century (esp. the Franciscans) reintroduced a more literal reading of Christ's command to "sell your possessions and give to the poor" (Matt 19:16–30; Mark 10:17–31; Luke 18:18–30; cf., Francis, *Regula non bullata* 1.1–5), but controversies over the so-called *usus pauper* effectively limited such radical literalism to the fringes of orthodoxy. By the later middle ages, more typical was a two-tier gloss on such passages, whereby almsgiving was enjoined upon all Christians as a legal precept, but renunciation was celebrated as an evangelical counsel for those who would pursue spiritual perfection (see, e.g., Denys the Carthusian: 11:216–19).

Early Protestant reformers rejected the medieval theology of merit underwriting this distinction, reconfiguring almsgiving as a proper result of justification by faith, rather than an instrumental cause of justifying grace or an obligatory work of satisfaction following sacramental confession. As a result, Protestants tended to view money itself as morally neutral (*adiaphoron*) and renunciation as misguided (WA 47:337–60). While this may have weakened one set of rationales for almsgiving, it also spurred reconsideration of the structural causes of poverty: from the revolutionary apocalypticism of Thomas Müntzer, to civic ordinances establishing a "common purse" for poor relief, to the utopian experiments in communal living among the various radical and Anabaptist groups (Lindberg: 128–60), Protestants expected that true reform would eliminate poverty altogether (Deut 15:4).

Throughout this period the biblical injunctions against usury (esp. Exod 22:25; Lev 25:35–37; Deut 23:19–20; Ezek 18:5–17) were widely interpreted as prohibiting any return on a loan for more than the sum lent (Gratian, *Decretum* II, C. 14, q. 3; Le Goff), and scholastic theologians developed additional arguments based on natural law (e.g., Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* II-II q. 78). Beginning in the late-13th century, however, increasingly sophisticated rationales were developed to circumvent these prohibitions, such that by the end of the 15th century the canonical prohibition of usury was a dead letter. This perceived hypocrisy, combined with his contempt for the scholastics' dependence on Aristotle, helps explain the ferocity of Luther's rejection of usury on exegetical grounds (WA 15:292–322; WA 6:36–60), though polemic never eclipsed his pastoral concerns. Calvin, in his comments on Ps 15:15, developed a distinction between the Hebrew *neshek* (to bite) and *tarbit* (to take increase), arguing that the latter was legitimate so long as it was governed by Christ's command of equity (Matt 7:12; CO 31:148) – essentially the position taken a generation earlier by Luther's opponent Johannes Eck.

Bibliography: ▪ Anderson, G., *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven, Conn. 2013). ▪ *Biblia sacra cum glossa ordinaria* (Venice 1603). ▪ Brown, P., *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity* (Cambridge 2015). ▪ Calvin, J., *Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, 59 vols. (CO; Brunswick/Berlin 1863–1900). ▪ Denys the Carthusian, *D. Dionysii Cartusiani Opera Omnia*, 42 vols. (DCO; Montreuil-sur-Mer 1896–1913). ▪ Francis of Assisi, *Fontes Franciscini* (Assisi 1995). ▪ Le Goff, J., *La Bourse et la vie: économie et religion au Moyen Âge* (Paris 1983). ▪ Lindberg, C., *Beyond Charity: Reformation Initiatives for the Poor* (Minneapolis, Minn. 1993). ▪ Luther, M., *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Ausgabe*, 120 vols. (WA; Weimar 1883–2009). ▪ Zimmermann, G., *Die Antwort der Reformatoren auf die Zehntenfrage* (Bern 1982).

David C. Fink

C. Modern Europe and America

At the dawn of the early modern era Christians were heirs to 1500 years of thinking about the moral status of money and as likely as people in any other age to desire it. Centuries of the church's teaching premised on Jesus' generally negative view of Mammon as a hindrance to God's favor had hardened into the medieval view voiced by Thomas Aquinas, "Greed is a sin against God." Martin Luther in treating the first commandment called the desire for money "the most common idol on earth." Yet as Luther wrote, the Western view of money was in flux as a largely feudal system of land-based wealth gave way to a proto-capitalist economic system based on trade and manufacture that required money as a medium of exchange and value store. Concurrently Spain and Portugal caught "gold fever" in the New World, as Christopher Columbus linked his exploits to a hoped-for financing of a final Spanish crusade to the Holy Land to exterminate all Jews and Moors. For their part Dutch, English, and American Calvinists excelled in using the new capitalism to make money while practicing conspicuous self-denial when it came to the enjoyment of their wealth, lest their salvation be compromised. This led to further success at business and, for some, a sense that God was prospering their earthly endeavors, a paradox that Max Weber would describe in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905).

The pattern of effectively making God one's business partner became a popular motif of 20th and 21st century US evangelicalism. The businessmen who financed Billy Graham and parachurch organizations often expressed their joy in being rich in religious terms, "God has blessed me, so I can be a blessing." A related but separate view is found in Prosperity theology, in which believers are challenged after having tithed 10 percent to their churches to put a faith offering on the altar so that God can bless it and return the offering tenfold. Money in these modern Christian settings is a positive good, portrayed as something God wants Christ's faithful to have.

A stark contrast to this money-is-good viewpoint, is found in modern Catholic social justice thinking which returned to some of Aquinas' ideas about justice among human beings. The idea of tempering greed with social justice was given its widest expression in Pope Leo XIII's 1891 encyclical *Rerum novarum*, which advocated economic distributism while condemning socialism. Catholic social teaching based on *Rerum novarum* taught that the wealthy had duties to the poor, and all economic life and forms were to be lived according to the principle of subsidiarity, a principle that issues should be resolved at the most immediate level, a view at odds with the West's prevailing nationalist and capitalist tendencies. It would lead in time to the "preferential option for the poor" championed by liberation theology and Pope John Paul II in *Centesimus annus* (1991). In the United States, Father John A. Ryan was a particularly effective advocate of Catholic social justice in thought and organization between the First and Second World Wars.

As their teachings about money in the world changed, so also the churches behaved differently with respect to money. The American Revolution

(1776–89) resulted in a freedom of religion that effectively privatized Christian churches in the new US and left them to seek money to support their ministries. Cut off from governmental support, churches tried renting out lands, charging rent for pews, voluntary offerings, tithing (Mal 3:7–9), proportional giving (1 Cor 16:2) and more. Catholics simultaneously valorized voluntary poverty, the giving of alms for the poor, and building of churches and schools, such that rich and generous lay givers became celebrated in Catholic parishes, much as Protestant wealthy contributors were recognized in their churches. One of the ways these mixed messages are ameliorated is through the substantial charitable giving beyond local congregations, a feature across American religious life. Finally, as European state support has slipped for organized religion, the voluntary pattern of monetary support has repeated itself in Europe.

Bibliography: ▪ Boer, R./C. Petterson, *Idols of Nations: Biblical Myth at the Origins of Capitalism* (Minneapolis, Minn. 2014). ▪ Hudnut-Beumler, J., *In Pursuit of the Almighty's Dollar* (Chapel Hill, N.C. 2007). ▪ Porterfield, A. et al., *The Business Turn in American Religious History* (New York 2017).

James Hudnut-Beumler

D. World Christianity

As Christianity spread beyond its Middle Eastern, North African, and European roots, the role of "money," as both object and concept, has taken on a wide variety of meanings. In early colonial Christianity, the introduction of money, and the subsequent extraction of it from converts in colonial contexts, were often part of a process of moving those non-Western people not already integrated into commodity exchange away from their traditional gift economies into the commodity-based economies of colonial empires. As those commodity economies became more entwined with developing Christian communities, and throughout the colonial world generally, the meaning and uses of money became more variegated and ambiguous.

Today, perhaps most well-known in contemporary Christianity (throughout the world, but quite prominent in the global south) has been the rise of the "Prosperity Gospel." Citing such biblical verses as Gal 6:7 ("… a person reaps what he sows") and biblical examples such as Job – a faithful man who was blessed by God with wealth, marriage, and children – movements of the Prosperity Gospel or Prosperity Theology have combined with forms of charismatic Christianity throughout the globe.

At the same time, many Christians in the global south, like Christians elsewhere, link money, and the desire for money, to Christian devotion, generosity, and unity. In Zambia, for example, some Christians take the story in 1 Sam 9:6–10 to note the importance of giving gifts to the "man of God." Pastors and bishops will point to this account as a sign that giving to the "man of God" is a way of giving to God directly. Anthropologist Naomi Haynes describes this process in one church, in which giving money to the "man of God" was considered a way of "planting a seed" that God would repay "one hundred times" (Mark 10:30). Similarly, Katherine Wiegele, in her study of the *El Shaddai* Catholic prosperity movement in the Philippines, cites the "seed-faith theology" (a concept partly imported from Oral Roberts' Oklahoma-based ministry.) Explicitly invoking passages such as Gal 6:7 as well as as well as Jesus' parable of the sower given in Matt 13, leaders of *El Shaddai* emphasize the importance of giving money to the ministry as a way of receiving blessings from God and indicating one's commitment to God. *El Shaddai* frames the physical object of currency itself as important. One *El Shaddai* adherent is quoted as saying that "a prayer request is a prayer with money in it." In this way, the use of currency and monetary exchange becomes freighted with Christian meaning. Among Tanzanian Pentecostals, Martin Lindhardt notes that the value of currency, blessed by the clergy, can serve as a mediating element between the sacred world of God and the mundane world of economics, linking the two in powerful, and occasionally dangerous ways.

These theologies also become ways Christians enter into new relationships with money. As Devaka Premarwadhana argues from his study of a U.S. congregation of the Brazilian-based Universal Church of God, an appeal to the Luke 18:1–5 account of the widow seeking justice, can become a lesson in the "rights and responsibilities" of Christians, in which the giving of money to God (through the church) not only serves to strengthen the giver's relationship to God, but it reminds the giver of his or her responsibilities to work hard, spend carefully, and steward resources well according to logics of investment and fiduciary responsibility.

Among some Catholics in highland Bolivia, it is monetary exchange that guarantees the efficacy of the rites such as communion, baptism, and even the mass itself. Although in this popular Catholicism, specific Bible texts are often less likely to be invoked than traditional religious practices, among the Aymara, they may say that the Aymaran religious tradition *is* their "Old Testament," that which informs how they read the Gospels of Jesus. In this way, the giving of money (whether as cash or through local products) becomes like the first fruits "sacrifice" God demanded in ancient Israel's ritual life.

Among many Christians, though, the temptations for money and wealth are seen as problematic or dangerous. The Christian church among the Auhewala of Normandy Island, Papua New Guinea explicitly recognizes the risk of money in fomenting division and selfishness. In a context where exchange and generosity are the highest virtues, giving money to relatives, the needy, and the church is an important act of Christian life. Ryan Schram notes that for the Christians here, giving money to "charity," as a distinct category from "business," allows the church to introduce a moral logic of money that resists the market logics of competition and accumulation. In the church, references to the story of the widow's offering (Mark 12:41–43) form a basis for charity in which reciprocity is not expected, and generosity can be practiced outside market, or traditional, logics of human exchange and indebtedness. Money, for these Christians, is a multivalent object that must be categorized differently in the church than in "the world."

Bibliography: ▪ Comaroff, J./J. Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa* (Chicago, Ill. 1991). ▪ Harris, O., "The Eternal Return of Conversion: Christianity as Contested Domain in Bolivia," in *The Anthropology of Christianity* (ed. F. Cannell; Durham, N.C. 2006) 51–77. ▪ Haynes, N., *Moving by the Spirit: Pentecostal Social Life on the Zambian Copperbelt* (Berkeley, Calif. 2017). ▪ Lindhardt, M., "Mediating Money: Materiality and Spiritual Warfare in Tanzanian Charismatic Christianity," in *The Anthropology of Global Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism* (ed. S. Coleman/R. I. J. Hackett; New York 2013) 147–61. ▪ Orta, A., *Catechizing Culture; Missionaries, Aymara, and the "New Evangelization"* (New York 2004). ▪ Premarwardhana, D., "Transformational Tithing: Sacrifice and Tithing in a Neo-Pentecostal Church," *Novo Religio* 15.4 (2012) 85–109. ▪ Schram, R., "Finding Money: Business and Charity in Auhelawa, Papua New Guinea," *Ethnos* 74.4 (2010) 447–70. ▪ Wiegele, K., *Investing in Miracles: El Shaddai and the Transformation of Popular Catholicism in the Philippines* (Honolulu, Hawaii 2008).

Brian Howell

VI. Islam

The word "money" (*māl*, *amwal*) appears numerous of times in the Qurʾān. The latter also refers to money in different terms such as *khayr* (good) (S 2:110–272, 273), *faḍl Allāh* (God's bounty) (S 62:4, 10; 73:20), and *al-ṭayyibāt* (the good things) (S 2:172–267). The Qurʾān has established some rules regarding what is permitted and not permitted in regard to dealing with money as well as the methods that money can be gained. Among the first qurʾānic legal injunctions in regard to business transactions is the prohibition of gaining money unlawfully. The Qurʾān commands Muslims not to squander their wealth among themselves in vanity unless it is a trade by mutual consent, and not to kill one another, for God is ever merciful (S 4:29). This legal injunction prohibits people from taking the money of others through unlawful means. Unlawful money is defined as money earned through excessive interest or usury (*ribā*), gambling, or oppression (al-Ṭūsī: 178–79; cf. Exod 22:25; Lev 25:37; Ps 15:5). The Qurʾān makes lawful money earned through trade by mutual consent. Also, according to the verse above, the taking of money unlawfully creates enmity between people and, as a result, leads people to kill each other. The verse also indicates that God is ever merciful, so God prohibits the taking of money unlawfully so people would avoid divine punishment (al-Ṭūsī: 180).

The Qurʾān also prohibits the misuse of money as it creates chaos in society. Sura 2:188 commands the people not to bribe rulers and individuals who yield power for this would corrupt the relationship between the people and their rulers (cf. Exod 23:8; Deut 16:19; Sir 40:12). According to the Qurʾān, bribery is not only a misuse or unlawful use of money, but is also considered an act of stealing public money (*saht*). Sura 5:42 warns against those who are greedy for bribery or illicit gain (*akkalun liʾ-suht*), for bribery leads to the corruption of the ruler and the loss of justice. Moreover, out of concern for just and fair dealings in matters of business, the Qurʾān mandates that all business transactions, including debt contracts, be recorded in writing (S 2:282–83).

While the Qurʾān gives equal importance to money and human life – defining the true believers as those who have striven hard (*jāhadū*) in God's cause with their possessions (*bi amwālihim*) and their lives (*wa anfūsihim*) (S 4:95; 8:72; 9:20, 44, 81, 88; 49:15) – it also warns against the temptation of money (*innamā amwālukum fitna*) (S 64:15; cf. 1 Tim 6:10). The Qurʾān states that money and wealth lead to injustice and cause men to become rebellious and tyrants. For instance, S 96:6–7 states: "No, but truly man is tyrant. That he thinks himself independent." According to Qurʾān commentator al-Zamakhsharī (d. 1144), the word "no" at the beginning of the verse serves as a deterrence to the misuse of God's bounty (i.e., wealth, money) that makes its possessor independent (i.e., not needing God's blessings), which amounts to disbelief (*kufr*) (al-Zamakhsharī: 1213). The Qurʾān has established guidelines for dealing with money in order to eliminate injustices in society. Although the Qurʾān recognizes that money is essential to maintain an economic system, the text however speaks against the misuse of money that leads to tyranny and oppression.

Bibliography: ▪ McAuliffe, J. (ed.), *The Qurʾān* (New York/London 2017). ▪ al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *Al-Tibyān fī Tafsīr al-Qurʾān*, vol. 3 (Beirut n.d.). ▪ al-Zamakhsharī, Abū al-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar, *Tafsīr al-Kashshāf* (Beirut ^{3}2009).

Hussam Timani

VII. Literature

The literary afterlife of the biblical topoi dealing with money clearly covers a vast canvas, with the set-pieces of the sale of Joseph into slavery and Jesus' pronouncement on the tribute money prominent.

The episode in Genesis of the sale of Joseph by his brothers to the Midianites records the price as twenty pieces of silver (Gen 37:28), a figure faithfully repeated in the Jewish compilation, *The Book of Heroes* (*Sefer ha-Yashar*, ca. 1150) and here notably reinforced in a secondary transaction in which the Midianites sell Joseph on to the Ishmaelites. In the Muslim *The Story of Yusuf* (*La Leyenda de Yusuf*, ca. 1450) it is merely "a low price, a number of dirhams," whereas in the Spanish *General History* (*Estoria de España*, ca. 1272) of Alfonso X, Christian allegory converts the figure into thirty pieces of silver (McGaha 1997: 88–89, 176, 337). Lope de Vega's play, *The Trials of Jacob* (*Los trabajos de Jacob*, 1620–30) reverts to the biblical twenty pieces of silver (McGaha 1998: 105).

Medieval biblical drama in its earthiness was alert to the possibilities for embroidering scenes suggestive of monetary transactions. In the Innsbruck Easter Play (14th cent.), the fifth Jew pays the soldiers who are to guard the tomb:

My lords, if you will take our money,
Both silver and gold,
And if you guard the tomb
Three nights and three days,
Then we will give you wages,
and whatever cash can buy,
And everything your heart desires.
(Wright: 47)

In the Innsbruck Corpus Christi play (14th cent.), the disciple Matthew, as a former tax-gatherer, speaks about faith in the language of money:

Even if he gives a hundred thousand pounds
All to the glory of God,
That would not help him
more than a blackberry …
(Wright: 109)

The English Stonyhurst Pageants (17th cent.) are noted for referring to the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims translation of the Bible. This is particularly evident in the delivery of Moses' speech about the prompt payment to the poor hired laborer: "Deny not the hyer of the pore, but see that the same day/ That he hath done his worke, his wages thou unto him pay" (quoted in Tomkins: 132).

If the pursuit of money and the Christian life are seen as an antithesis, nowhere is this better expressed than in Robert Southwell's poem "Content and Rich" (ca. 1590) which takes Col 3:8–16 as its hypotext: "I feel no care of coin, / Well-doing is my wealth …" (anthologized in Atwan/Wieder: 2:302–03).

The contrast was most forcefully expressed in Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Dr Faustus* (1592) where Faustus abandons the ancient book of the Scriptures commended to him by the "Good Angell" and turns instead to the "damned booke" which will bring him worldly wealth.

The reputation of the mass-produced Bible as something cheap, because printed on thin, flimsy paper is a trope overturned in Henry Vaughan's poem, "The Book" (ca. 1650), where the underlying substances used in paper production are celebrated as God's work.

The episode of the tribute money, already the subject of contradictory interpretations in the history of Christian exegesis, attracts even more confusing readings in literature. Renaissance writers on numismatics such as Enea Vico record the spiritually healing effects of coin collecting on individuals (Nygren: 477), while Christina Rossetti's narrative poem *Goblin Market* (1862) introduces a silver coin which has a very complex relationship with Jesus' parable of the lost coin, as Viktor Mendoza indicates in an article. The coin (and its connection with Maundy money) can be seen as symptomatic of the tussle between materiality and spirituality in the Pre-Raphaelite era.

The slightly teasing juxtaposition between the Bible itself as both sacred object and commodity is apparent in George Borrow's accounts of his travels as a Bible salesman in *The Bible in Spain* (1843) and the short story by Borden Deal, "Death and the Bible Salesman" (1972). Borrow's work is a celebrated travelogue, noted for its part in the romanticizing of Spain. In Deal's tale a Bible salesman, intent on preying on bereaved families with volumes supposedly ordered by the deceased, is himself outwitted by a shrewd family. There is a telling description of the volume on offer: "He could have bought a cheaper one; but, no sir, he wanted the one with the four-color illustrations and the words spoken by our Saviour printed in red" (Deal: 29).

A counterweight to the commonplace use of 1 Tim 6:10 ("the love of money is the root of all evil") is Neal Stephenson's science fiction novel, *Cryptonomicon* (1999), where a crypotocurrency is developed which prevents the wrongful use of money, so that it can serve only Good: "the Philippines becomes for Stephenson the sacred space of the (re)birth of a happy capitalism pitched between Golgotha and a tomb, gold and the Crypt, confident in the moral and economic authority to quash ethnic cleansing and stabilize tottering currencies" (Youngquist: 343).

Bibliography: ▪ Atwan, R./L. Wieder, *Chapters into Verse*, vol. 2 (Oxford 1993). ▪ Calhoun, J., "The Word Made Flax: Cheap Bibles, Textual Corruption, and the Poetics of Paper," *PMLA* 126.2 (2011) 327–44. ▪ Deal, B., "Death and the Bible salesman," *Mississippi Review* 1.1 (1972) 26–37. ▪ McGaha, M., *Coat of Many Cultures: The Story of Joseph in Spanish Literature 1200–1492* (Philadelphia, Pa./Jerusalem 1997). ▪ McGaha, M., *The Story of Joseph in Spanish Golden Age Drama* (Lewisburg, Pa. 1998). ▪ Mendoza, V. R., "'Come Buy': The Crossing of Sexual and Consumer Desire in Christina Rossetti's 'Goblin Market,'" *ELH* 73.4 (2006) 913–47. ▪ Nygren, C. J., "Titian's Christ with the Coin," *RenQ* 69.2 (2016) 449–88. ▪ Tomkins, J. C., "Old Testament Adaptation in 'The Stonyhurst Pageants,'" *Early Theatre* 16.1 (2013) 119–37. ▪ Wright, S. K. (ed./trans.), *Medieval German Drama: Four Plays in Translation* (Fairview, N.C. 2002). ▪ Youngquist, P., "Cyberpunk, War, and Money: Neal Stephenson's 'Cryptonomicon,'" *Contemporary Literature* 53.2 (2012) 319–47.

Anthony Swindell

Fig. 15 G. F. Watts, *Mammon* (1884–85)

VIII. Visual Arts

The NT refers to money as Mammon, probably a personification of an Aramaic deity of wealth and greed (Matt 6:19–21, cf. aram. *māmonāʾ*), as a pejorative term in reference to gluttony, and ultimately in regard to excessive materialism and usury (Matt 25:14–30). Furthermore, money serves as an attribute of Matthew the Patron of bankers and accountants, and is closely associated with Judas Iscariot's "Thirty Silver Pieces" (Matt 26:14–15; Matt 27:1–8; Acts 1:18). Personification of money, and pejorative use of the word also appear in various sources of the Early and High Middle Ages e.g., "Eight Principal Vices" of Evagrius Ponticus (Prov 6:16–19) and "The Seven Deadly Sins" of Thomas Aquinas.

In visual arts, earliest representations of the personification of money were inspired by Albert Barnes' notes of 1832 to the NT. Barnes traced back the origin of the word to the Aramaic God of greed, which was based on the passage "You cannot serve God and Mammon" (Matt 6:19–21). George Frederic Watts in *Mammon* (1884–85; Tate Britain) thus depicts the demonic figure as a brutish despot, an ugly, lumpen figure seated on his throne of revulsion, decorated with skulls, holding a moneybag (see fig. 15). Similarly, Evelin De Morgan in the *Worship of Mammon* (ca. 1909; Watts Gallery Artist's Village, Compton), shows a woman cutting herself off from the love of God to worship Mammon, causing her own demise.

Money in association with the acts of usury and gluttony is addressed in the woodcuts of Lucas Cranach the Elder *Passionary of Christ and Antichrist (Usury)* (1521). Jesus drives the usurers out of the temple, which is loosely based on the the parable of the bags of gold from the NT, which condemns any profit gaining at the expense of others (Matt 25:14–30; Luke 19:12–27). Association of Matthew with money derives from his work as a tax collector in the city of Capernaum. However, upon Jesus' call, Matthew got up, left the money where it laid on the table to turn his back on a life of government-sanctioned larceny and join the handful of men known as the twelve apostles (Matt 9:9–13). This came to be a very popular theme in visual arts. The most famous depictions thereof include Andrea Orcagna's and Jacopo di Cione's *St. Matthew and Four Stories from His Life* (1367–68), and Caravaggio's *Calling of Saint Matthew* (1599–1600). Caravaggio's work juxtaposes the daily routine interrupted by a miracle, the position of the silver pieces serving as an iconographical symbol.

Money (thirty silver pieces) further represents a symbol of Judas Iscariot (Matt 26:14–15; 27:1–8; Acts 1:18). Rembrandt in his *Judas Returning the Thirty Silver Pieces* (1629; Mulgrave Castle, Lythe) relied on Matt 27:5: "So Judas threw the money into the temple and left. Then he went away and hanged himself." Rembrandt's depiction has been praised for the ambivalent emotional depiction of Judas. As Acts 1:18 suggests that with the payment he received for his wickedness, Judas bought a field (the field of blood) where he fell head long. This motif can be found in the *Maskell Passion Ivory* (420–30) made in Rome or in Abraham Bloemaert's *Sinner of the Old and New Testament* (1611).

Rembrandt's celebrated painting was the centerpiece of the exhibition "Jews, Money, Myth," which was organized by the Jewish Museum in London in 2019. This work was chosen to set the historical tone for Judas's greed, which helped the proliferation of antisemitic sentiment in Christian iconography and inspired a number of anti-Jewish stereotypes – the Jewish moneylender being one of them. Abigail Morris, the then director of the museum, stated that the aim of the exhibition was to demonstrate that "Myths and stereotypes have origins," and show "how certain dangerous, even deadly, interpretations emerged and still proliferate around the world."

Bibliography: ▪ Hibbard, H., *Caravaggio* (London 1983). ▪ Jewish Museum London, *Jews, Money, Myth* (2019). [Available at https://jewishmuseum.org.uk] ▪ Slive, S., *Dutch*

Painting: 1600–1800 (New Haven, Conn./London 1995). ▪ Tumay, M., "Jews, Money, Myth: Debunking the Illusion," *Impakter* (August 12, 2019; https://impakter.com).

Tijana Zakula and Yannis Johanides

IX. Film

Money has served as a major theme in film, with infamous characters like Gordon Gekko (*Wall Street*; dir. Oliver Stone, 1987, US) dominating popular consciousness as the archpriest of modern capitalism; Gekko's infamous baptism of vice is: "Greed, for lack of a better word, is good." The American superhero film *Constantine* (dir. Francis Lawrence, 2005, US/DE) makes use of Milton's personification of Mammon as a fallen angel in his classic, *Paradise Lost*. Two films, however, stand out as exemplary in offering more biblically informed and complex accounts of money, of its impact on personal character, and of its place in the social order: *Winter Sleep* and *There Will Be Blood*.

Anton Chekhov's *The Wife* (along with several other of Chekhov's short stories) provides the inspiration for Nuri Bilge Ceylan's 2014 film *Kış Uykusu* (TR/FR/DE, *Winter Sleep*). Although the film's impact within Western circles may be limited, critics honored the film with the Palme d'Or at Cannes. The story, set in the mountains of Anatolia, examines the significant divide between rich and poor as well as the powerful and the powerless in contemporary Turkey. In the film, Aydın (Haluk Bilginer) sees himself as the local benevolent Don, intervening in the business of the local townspeople below the mountain and pontificating on perceived social ills through his newspaper column as he sits atop his cave-like office in his mountain inn. The truth, however, is that Aydın is almost universally despised and resented. In particular, his wife, Nihal (Melisa Sözen), stands as a foil, challenging Aydın's imperiousness and casual indifference to the suffering of those beneath him in the social order. As Aydın becomes preoccupied with writing a history of Turkish theater, Nihal dedicates her efforts to fundraising for developing schools, a cause not shared by Aydın. When Nihal organizes a fundraiser in their home, Aydın belittles her for her inexperience and lack of financial skill. But, in a characteristically transparent act of self-aggrandizement, Aydın makes a large anonymous cash donation to the fundraiser, one that will eventually be thrown into a fire when Nihal offers it to their tenants, a local imam, and his extended family, who are in danger of being evicted. The biblical and qurʾānic admonitions concerning wealth, power, and the care of the poor and vulnerable echo throughout the film (see, e.g., S 2:177; Prov 22:16).

Upton Sinclair's novel *Oil!* (1926–27) provides the basic structure of Paul Thomas Anderson's *There Will Be Blood* (2007, US), a ruthless unmasking of the so-called Protestant work ethic and the American dream of entrepreneurial integrity and triumph. Daniel Day-Lewis plays Daniel Plainview, a silver miner-turned-oilman on a ruthless quest for wealth during the California oil rush at the turn of the last century. Daniel's efforts to acquire drilling rights on property are initially thwarted by a local preacher, Eli Sunday, who demands a large cash donation for his church. Daniel's efforts are further complicated by an orphan whom he passes off as his son, and a stranger who presents himself as a "long-lost brother," both of whom become opportunities to advance as well as obstacles to be overcome. Daniel's murderous pursuit of wealth and status leaves him a "ruin unto himself" (Prov 11:17) even as he acquires enormous wealth. The film's murderous conclusion leaves Eli dead and Daniel declaring that he is "finished."

Bibliography: ▪ Blake, R. A., "After Sunset," *America* 198.8 (March 10, 2008) 18–20. ▪ Diken, B., "Money, Religion, and Symbolic Exchange in 'Winter Sleep,'" *Religion and Society* 8 (2017) 94–108.

Christopher McMahon

See also → Alms; → Cleansing of the Temple; → Coins; → Debt, Debts; → Inclinations (Good and Evil); → Judas; → Mammon; → Moneylending; → Poor, Poverty; → Prosperity Gospel; → Salvation; → Seven Deadly Sins; → Shekel, Half-Shekel; → Silver; → Taxes and Taxation; → Temptation; → Trade and Commerce; → Usury; → Wealth and Riches

Moneylending

I. Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

1. Semantics and Word Usage. Two roots are used to evoke in-kind or moneylending (money could be grains, weighted metal or coins, see "Money") in the HB: *l–w–h* (LXX, δανείζω; qal, "to borrow"; hiphʿil, "to lend") and *n–š–h* (qal, "to lend," "be a creditor" [with *bet*]; hiphʿil, also, "to lend"; "make a loan"). The former is positively connoted as helping a person in financial difficulty by granting a loan, while the latter has a negative connotation. In the legal and wisdom traditions, the "righteous" and the "wicked" are opposed in regards to lending money; the righteous lends (MT *lwh*) out of pity or gives to the one in need while the wicked practices usury by applying a high interest rate (MT *nāšak*, LXX τόκος; Exod 22:24; Lev