



Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN
TRINITY COLLEGE

*Safeguarding The Stranger:
A Theology And Ethic Of Protective Hospitality
From The Abrahamic Traditions*

A Dissertation Submitted
For The Degree Of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
Jayme R. Reaves

Irish School of Ecumenics

16 February 2012



Thesis 9746

—

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgement.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

SUMMARY

The research question for this dissertation is: *What are the resources and teachings in the Abrahamic traditions that take hospitality, and more specifically its call to provide protective hospitality seriously enough to inform shared action and belief on behalf of the threatened other in contexts of conflict?*

To answer the above question, this research argues that protective hospitality and its faith-based foundations as seen in the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam merit greater theological attention. More specifically, it argues that the practice of protective hospitality in Christianity can be enhanced by better understanding of Judaism and Islam's practice of hospitality, namely their codes and etiquettes related to honor. Additionally, a positive potential exists for protective hospitality's contribution to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, and reconciliation and the possibility for development of a "cooperative theology" among the Abrahamic traditions are particularly valuable.

The work draws especially on two currents in contemporary Christian theologies: a contextual and political theological approach informed by liberation and feminist theologies; and a cooperative and complementary theological approach informed by inter-religious, Abrahamic, and hospitable approaches to dialogue. It embodies the above methodologies by ultimately situating the research case studies in the inter-religious context of Bosnia, which has been marred by sectarian conflict.

As such, it seeks to contribute to academic debates within theology and religious dialogue and also to discussions within the fields of peace studies and conflict resolution on the positive role that religions might play in contexts of conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Hebrew concept of *chesed*, חסד , is often translated as “steadfast love,” but it gives a name for the quality of going above and beyond the call of duty or obligation, to bend over backwards, to do whatever it takes, to endure despite hardship, and to embody mercy and compassion in all that one does. I have been extremely lucky to be surrounded by people throughout this process who have been full of *chesed*, and they deserve to be acknowledged.

I would first like to thank the staff at the Irish School of Ecumenics in Belfast who have supported me in so many ways since I arrived in 2006. Caroline Clarke, Karen Nicholson, Cathy Higgins, Johnston McMaster, and Gladys Ganiel have all been a tremendous support to me as a student and colleague. In particular, I would like to thank Bríd O’Brien whose help as librarian has made so much of this possible, and especially my supervisor David Tombs for all he has done over the life of this project and his consistent encouragement.

While my years as an undergraduate in university are long gone, I must also acknowledge the influence of two particular professors who have shaped me in the most profound ways and set me on this path. Ann Livingstone taught this kid from small-town American South that an amazing, heartbreaking, complex world waited just beyond my doorstep, and that I need not be afraid of it. Likewise, David Gushee shepherded me through the horrors of genocide and taught me the power of a lived and dynamic faith, the love and healing of family, and the silly delight of Mr. Bean. Both Ann and David have given me myself, a self I doubt I would have ever known without their help.

I would also like to recognize the important contributions of individuals in Northern Ireland and the Former Yugoslavia who are on the frontlines of justice, peacemaking and reconciliation work and, in that work, you have shown me the power of hospitality, giving me the inspiration to pursue this topic. In particular, I would like to thank Goran Bubalo, Randy Puljek-Shank, Amra Pandžo, Entoni Šeperić, Eli Tauber, Moris Albahari, Zilka Spahić-Siljak, Orli Fridman, Samira Murica-Lennox, and Bernadette Devlin McAliskey for their contributions of time, conversations, suggestions, and challenges which have given life to this research.

I have friends and colleagues, too many to name here, who have given tremendous support over the course of this research. In particular, I would like to gratefully recognize the substantial contributions of seminary professors and colleagues from Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond who encouraged me to pursue doctoral work and I want to recognize those who served as readers for this project: Phyllis Rodgerson-Pleasants, Mark Biddle, Tracy Hartman, and Ana Karim.

Finally, I would like to thank my partner, James Pattison, who until now has always known me as a student, but throughout this process has been ever-loving, ever-patient, and ever-supportive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
SUMMARY	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
PREFACE	1
INTRODUCTION	5
1. Research Question and Argument	5
2. Outline of Chapters	10
<u>PART ONE: HOSPITALITY, ETHICS, AND THEOLOGY</u>	
CHAPTER ONE: LOCATING THE THEOLOGICAL APPROACH	17
Introduction	17
1. A Contextual and Political Theological Approach	18
a. Arising from a Context: Contemporary Examples of Protective Hospitality	19
i. The village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon	19
ii. The Sanctuary Movement in U.S.	23
b. Political, Liberationist, and Feminist Theologies	29
2. A Cooperative and Complementary Theological Approach	37
a. Towards an Inter-Religious Approach	37
b. Towards an Abrahamic Approach	52
c. Towards a Hospitable Approach	55
Conclusion	58

CHAPTER TWO: EXTENDING HOSPITALITY: HOSPITALITY AS ETHICAL PRACTICE	59
Introduction	59
1. The Meaning of Hospitality	60
a. The Linguistic Roots of Hospitality	64
b. The Tensions within Hospitality	67
2. Practices of Hospitality	74
a. Table Fellowship	75
b. Intellectual welcome	75
c. Protection	80
3. Hospitality as Ethical Practice	83
a. Hospitality as a Political Practice	85
b. Hospitality and Tolerance	90
c. Hospitality and Solidarity	93
d. Hospitality and Honor	96
Conclusion	102

CHAPTER THREE: HOSPITALITY AND THE ABRAHAMIC TRADITIONS	103
Introduction	103
1. Shared Origins: The Abrahamic Traditions and the Practice of Hospitality	104
a. Model: Abraham	106
b. Ethics Based in Culture	109
i. Mediterranean/Near Eastern Societies	109
ii. Desert Climates and Cultures	114
2. Christianity	117
a. Early Christian Persecution	118
b. Model: Jesus	119
c. Hospitality in Christian Antiquity	122
d. Welcome Others, Welcome Christ	125

e. Hospitality in Contemporary Western Christian Thought	127
f. Contemporary Christianity and Challenges to Hospitality	130
3. Judaism	132
a. Jewish Exile, Slavery, and Exodus	133
b. Hospitality in Jewish Antiquity	134
c. Honor	138
d. Contemporary Judaism and Challenges to Hospitality	141
4. Islam	144
a. First Muslim migration (<i>hijra</i>) to Abyssinia	145
b. Model: Muhammad	147
c. Foundational Values of Hospitality in Islam	149
i. Tawhid	152
ii. Ummah	155
iii. Adab	158
iv. Sulh	160
d. Contemporary Islam and Challenges to Hospitality	162
5. Observations for Christianity's Practice of Hospitality in the Abrahamic Context	164
Conclusion	169

PART TWO: PROTECTIVE HOSPITALITY

CHAPTER FOUR: HOSPITALITY AND PROTECTION	173
Introduction	173
1. The Mechanics of Protective Hospitality	178
a. Stages of Protective Hospitality	178
b. Protection: Meaning and Limitations	181
c. Motivations for Protective Hospitality	185

2. Embracing Risk: Boundaries, Purity, and Violence in the Practice of Protective Hospitality	190
a. Risk	190
i. Place and Boundaries	192
ii. Invited and Uninvited	198
b. Purity	206
c. Violence	214
Conclusion	228

**CHAPTER FIVE: PROTECTIVE HOSPITALITY
AS RELIGIOUS PRACTICE** 231

Introduction	231
1. Protective Hospitality in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible	233
a. Joshua 2:1-22	233
b. Genesis 19:1-14	236
c. Judges 19:14-27	245
d. Combined analysis of Genesis 19 & Judges 19	252
e. The Cities of Refuge	255
2. Protective Hospitality in the Qur'an and Islamic Tradition	265
a. Divine and Human Protection in the Qur'an	265
b. Thematic Analysis of Lot/Lut's Hospitality	268
c. Constitution of Medina, the <i>Ummah</i> , and the <i>Dhimmi</i> ..	276
3. Observations	290
Conclusion	291

CHAPTER SIX: PROTECTIVE HOSPITALITY IN BOSNIA 293

Introduction	293
1. Setting the Stage: Overview of Bosnia	298
a. Inter-religious & Cultural Context	300
b. Historical & Political Context	304

2. Case Study No. 1: Jewish Community of Sarajevo	311
a. Narrative	311
b. Analysis	316
3. Case Study No. 2: The Village of Baljvine	322
a. Narrative	322
b. Analysis	330
4. Case Study No. 3: Father Ivo Marković	337
a. Narrative	337
b. Analysis	344
5. Implications of Case Studies for Research	348
Conclusion	352
CONCLUSION TO RESEARCH	355
BIBLIOGRAPHY	361

Preface

In 2007, I lived next to the Springfield Road peace wall in West Belfast.¹ In the evenings, I saw the kids. They threw things at one another from across the wall built to keep them apart. They taunted and teased each other, trolling for trouble, retreating to their respective neighborhoods when there was just enough of a threat to warrant it. They knew the adults on their side of the wall would back them up. They knew their community would take their side.

Riots have been known to start for things smaller than this. Always on a slow simmer, it doesn't take much for the steam to build up and the lid to pop off. Property damaged, injuries sustained, and a lingering legacy of unrest remained in my neighborhood despite the thirteen-year "peace" of the Northern Ireland Good Friday Agreement.

"I hate Catholics," said one nine-year-old girl who lived on my street. Shocked at such a blatant statement, I asked her why.

"Because, see that wall over there? My daddy says that I need to be careful because they'll come through that wall and beat me up. They make me scared and they hate me, so I hate them back."

My heart sank.

"So much for the new generation...," I thought to myself, trying to figure out how to explain to this young girl that all Catholics aren't bad. Maybe if I lied and told her I was a Catholic, it might have opened her eyes. But such a statement might put me and my own safety at risk, so I let it go. Who knows who she'd tell?

And then there's the graffiti. Marking their territory, words and slogans are written to demarcate boundaries and to antagonize the other side. Occasionally the letters "KAH" are tagged on the Protestant side of the

¹ I lived for a year in The Mennonite House, bought by the parents of Mennonite peacebuilder John Paul Lederach to be used as accommodation for peace-related volunteers and students, and to provide hospitality and a safe space on a conflicted interface area between working class Protestant and Catholic area in West Belfast.

wall. Painted by kids from the Catholic community, they dared to breach the wall, painted the abbreviation of the genocidal “Kill all Huns” and ran back into the safety of their own. They have been subjected to their own version for years; “KAT” or “Kill all Taigs” is rife throughout the city as well. The common nature of such statements is astounding.

I still suspect the implications of these tags on walls are rarely taken seriously by those who paint them. While living in the neighborhood, I often dreamed that in a stroke of madness, I would catch some of the writers in the act, take them by the shoulders and shake them, shouting, “Do you know what you’re really saying?! You’re calling for mass murder!!” But I never did. I kept my mouth shut except to those I knew share my views and with whom I felt safe to express my opinion. You never know who you might offend otherwise. And in this area, offense is not taken lightly. It’s best to keep your head down or a petrol bomb might find its way through your window.

But if I’m honest, I also kept my mouth shut because, deep down, I was glad the wall was there. I hated the wall; but I loved the wall. Despite the kids, my street was a fairly quiet neighborhood because of the wall. Despite the kids, the wall made me feel safe. If this had been a middle-class neighborhood, I wouldn’t have worried. The wall would have been unnecessary. Yet in a working-class area defined by a conflicted interface between Protestant and Catholic communities, the wall provides security to residents on either side, even residents such as me who were working to eventually bring those same walls down.

I have to admit that if I was glad the wall was there, how much more glad are those who actually have more to fear than me, like my nine-year-old neighbor who is afraid of being beaten up by her Catholic neighbors on the other side? Every time I looked at the wall and saw “KAH” painted there, I sighed and shook my head to myself in resignation, but that resignation was always accompanied by a twinge of guilt because I know that both my disgust and comfort in its presence formed a bond of irony within me.

As a researcher interested in theology and peace studying hospitality and protection, the fact that I both loathe and appreciate a very inhospitable,

impenetrable concrete wall with a locked gate, high railing, and barbed wire at the end of my old street separating the Protestants from the Catholics feels contradictory and hypocritical. Yet, I understand the need to feel protected. I understand why it was put there, why it remains, and why it will probably be there for many years to come. The wall provides both protection for those within its boundaries and exclusion of those who are unknown and unwanted within the community.

Nevertheless, the wall is both the antithesis of hospitality and the boundary that makes some acts of hospitality possible. Because of this wall, a group of women from each side of the community go back and forth for tea on a regular basis, making intentional efforts to know one another and work together on communal issues. Would they make such efforts if the wall wasn't there? Maybe. But maybe not. The wall reminds them there is still a lot of work to do. The wall affirms their identities, making encounters with the other a little less threatening knowing they are able to retreat into its safety when the need arises.

At the same time, walls like this enabled some communities to shelter and provide sanctuary for "battered women"² from the other side. Protestant women on one side of the wall harbored Catholic women who had been abused, and Catholic women did the same on their side. The host women knew the abused woman's partner would have greater difficulty finding her and he would be less likely to cross the line out of fear of the men in paramilitaries who enforced the wall's exclusion. These brave women were not part of a systematic movement but were a grassroots initiative that strategically used the presence of the wall to ensure the safety of women in need of sanctuary.³

² They used this term in the 1970s as there was no understanding at that time of Women's Aid or language or services related to domestic abuse. The response was not systematic, but was a grassroots movement among a few women in Northern Ireland from both sides of the conflict to address the issue of violence in women's private lives. The movement was primarily led by Avila Kilmurray but was assisted by Bernadette Devlin McAliskey and others throughout the province. Heretofore, the group's actions have not been formally and systematically documented. Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, Northern Ireland civil rights leader, phone interview by author, 16 September 2011.

³ On the whole, the men of the communities were not aware they were protecting

My neighborhood's wall, along with other similar walls throughout the world, both include and exclude. They provide refuge and identity as well as sustain conflict by concretizing division. Such is the nature of walls. Duality resides along its parapets.

That same duality appears in the practice of hospitality itself. Arising from a root linked to both *hospes* and *hostis*, the tension between hospitality and hostility, inclusion and exclusion, is constantly present. Genuine hospitality requires solid boundaries to provide safety and protection, as well as radical welcome to those who reside beyond those same boundaries. Finding the balance is a particularly tricky and risky endeavor, requiring reflexivity, a commitment to the well-being of all, and an awareness that, as with anything in life, there are no guarantees of success.

This dissertation examines the faith-based practice of and resources for the protective hospitality in the traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The chapters that follow consider the positive potential and limitations of hospitality and the provision of protection, analyzing the tensions and duality in its meaning and practice particularly in relation to contexts of conflict and conflict transformation.

"the other" in their midst. Instead, the women of the communities subverted the sectarian divide to ensure protection, as the movement of an abused woman to "the other side" was the easiest and most effective way to remove her from the reach of her partner or the enforcement of her return by her home community and its respective paramilitary forces. Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, phone interview.

INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH

*...hospitality is not merely one ethics among others,
but the ethics par excellence.*

- Jacques Derrida¹

1. Research Question and Argument

In the past fifteen years, there has been a recent upsurge of religious literature on the topic of hospitality. On the whole, the religious literature related to the topic of hospitality reflects two primary approaches: either it discusses the theory of welcome and the other, or it attempts to recover what it perceives to be a forgotten spiritual practice. Yet, the discussions related to either of these facets are limited. In the theory-based literature, there is a lack of contextual evidence and lived experience that roots the practice of hospitality in everyday life. This body of literature also tends to focus on *why* the other should be welcomed rather than the variety of ways that welcome can be expressed and the realities faced when the other says “yes.” In the practical literature, the reality is considered, yet its attempt to recover hospitality is primarily limited to interpersonal relationships or considering communal identity, extolling the virtues of inviting others into one’s home, recovering the power the ritual of welcome as a personal spiritual practice, or challenging groups and communities who tend to be insular and homogeneous. This practical body of literature often speaks of hospitality in the context of issues related to immigration or homelessness, but it rarely goes beyond general “welcoming the stranger” scenarios as practiced by mainstream religious communities.

Perhaps because of the relatively recent revival of the topic within scholarship or because of a lack of understanding as to the full potential

¹ Jacques Derrida, “Hospitality and Hostility,” from a seminar at University of California, Irvine, 3 April 1996 in Tracy McNulty, *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), xvii.

hospitality entails, there appears to be a reluctance to consider hospitality's practicality beyond the already pre-determined scope. The potential for hospitality to impact and influence ethical behavior and theological understanding is limitless, yet the baggage the term 'hospitality' carries with it and how it is interpreted limits how it is viewed and understood. Therefore, this dissertation is distinctive in that it extends the discussion related to hospitality beyond the usual topics of table fellowship and inclusion by considering the provision of refuge or sanctuary to an endangered other in contexts of conflict as a hospitable act.

Throughout this research, the focus is on an exploration and analysis of protective hospitality and its faith-based motivations and resources. Protective hospitality is defined as *the provision of welcome and sanctuary to the threatened other often at great risk to oneself*.

When practitioners were questioned about why they provided a safe place for someone in danger, they often declared, "It is just what we do." For religious practitioners of protective hospitality, their actions often appear innate, as a matter of course. Yet, to the keen observer, there is something more. Their practice of protective hospitality hinges upon two simple facts: they commonly show their religious devotion through lived experience rather than by doctrinal adherence, and, by their example, they teach future generations to hold many of the same values even if religious adherence dwindles.²

Furthermore, the call to provide protective hospitality is found in all three so-called "Abrahamic traditions" of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Yet, despite this common ethical imperative, there has been no sustained

² In an interview with Northern Irish civil rights leader Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, she declared that she grew up in "a household of protective hospitality," where her mother, a devout Roman Catholic, regularly took in women and children who were victims of domestic abuse throughout Bernadette's childhood. McAliskey referred to her mother's actions as an expression of something that was "deep, ingrained within her, a part of who she was and what she believed," but that her mother never would have been able to articulate it in a religious or theological way. McAliskey then declared that although she herself is not religious, she has no doubts that her mother's hospitable acts placed "an enduring stamp on [her] and subsequent generations," providing a foundation for self-perpetuating values even in the face of sometimes declining religious devotion. Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, phone interview.

effort in the literature thus far to consider hospitality through an inter-religious lens. Therefore, an additional unique contribution of this research is that it considers the Christian practice of protective hospitality by also examining its practice in the Jewish and Islamic traditions, noting commonalities as well as differences which provide new perspectives or opportunities for renewal and growth. Such an analysis highlights the positive potential for a “cooperative theology” between the Abrahamic traditions through the practice of protective hospitality that could address issues of peacebuilding, conflict, marginalization, oppression and threat to the vulnerable in meaningful and effective ways.

I approach this research from a specific context. My interest in hospitality and protection arises from a personal place, and it has taken the duration of this research to realize it fully. My family background was anything but hospitable or protective. I am the third generation of women who were sexually and/or emotionally abused by male authority figures (husbands, fathers, religious leadership, etc.), yet despite the knowledge of its occurrence, nothing was done within the family structure to protect the vulnerable. Relationships and abuse continued and so the threatened had to seek refuge elsewhere.

I am also a child of the racially divided American South and have been profoundly formed by witnessing the inequalities and cruelty inflicted by racism, albeit from the safer white female perspective. I grew up with both invisible and real boundaries I was forbidden to cross because people who had darker skin than I did lived on the other side. But also, in recent years, I have lived in two areas of the world – the Former Yugoslavia and Northern Ireland - where religion and its corresponding national identity has divided neighbor against neighbor, community against community as well, in very similar and yet very different ways.

My interest in hospitality began while living in the Former Yugoslavia. After residing in Sarajevo, Bosnia from 1998-2000 and in eastern Croatia in 2003-2004, the impact of hospitality made an indelible mark upon me. How could a society and all its constituent entities - be they Muslim Bošnjak,

Orthodox Serb or Roman Catholic Croatian – express such welcome to me and yet show such inhospitality to one another? How can such amazing warmth and generosity coexist beside hatred and xenophobia, even against those one had lived beside one's whole life? And what motivated those who risked their lives to save someone from the other side? I was perplexed. This research has given me the opportunity to return, clarify, and conduct interviews and further research on the lived experience of practitioners and other individuals related to the provision of protective hospitality in order to inform and supplement the theological work being done here.

During and after my experiences of living in Bosnia and Croatia, a thesis question for research began to form that this dissertation seeks to address. Ethnic cleansing and genocide of the religious other in the Former Yugoslavia – as well as Darfur, Rwanda, and numerous other places - is a reality. Yet, there are defiant examples of people reaching out beyond their own identity to welcome and provide safe haven or assistance to someone from the other side in practically every modern conflict narrative. I began to wonder why some choose to take others in for protection and some do not, and what is required for practitioners of protective hospitality to put themselves and their families at risk to give sanctuary to strangers. On a theological level, I wanted to know what role faith plays in making these decisions, what resources were there to enable these actions to be fostered and utilized to make a difference in the future, and what the Abrahamic traditions might bring to this.

Therefore, my research question is as follows:

What are the resources and teachings in the Abrahamic traditions that take hospitality and, more specifically, its call to provide protective hospitality seriously enough to inform shared action and belief on behalf of the threatened other in contexts of conflict?

To answer this question, this dissertation aims to be both ecumenical and inter-religious in its theological approach. While offering a Christian point of view, it seeks to broaden that same Christian theology by being in intentional

conversation with the perspectives of other Christian denominations beyond my own Baptist background, as well as the other Abrahamic traditions of Judaism and Islam. There are obvious limitations to this approach: I am neither Jew nor Muslim, and I have no Arabic and limited Hebrew experience which requires me to rely upon English translations and interpretations. Therefore, when it comes to textual and interpretive work, I am shaped in many ways by my own Christian, congregationalist, low-church background and training in hermeneutics and exegesis.

Thus, this work will primarily be an endeavor from an inclusive Christian point of view that utilizes resources from both Judaism and Islam to interrogate and challenge the Christian tradition's theology and practice of protective hospitality.³ While this research focuses upon the Abrahamic traditions, it recognizes its limits in speaking with authority beyond the Christian tradition. The analysis of how protective hospitality is discussed in Judaism and Islam is intended as indicative rather than definitive. Whether adherents will wish to own it confessionally or not goes beyond the immediate task of excavating and identifying the resources to which this research appeals.

This dissertation argues:

Protective hospitality and its faith-based foundations, specifically in the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam,⁴ merit greater theological attention.

³ An example of this approach in the area of textual scholarship can be found in the work of Máire Byrne, *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: A Basis for Interfaith Dialogue*, (London: Continuum, 2011), who, in the context of considering the names of God in relation to the role of "Father," notes "[o]nce I had explored the Islamic idea, I began to reflect on my own Christian experience..."(129).

⁴ I recognize that no religion is homogenous or monolithic, and in reality Judaism, Christianity, and Islam do not exist as single entities. Instead, there are a multiplicity of Judaisms, Christianities, and Islams, defined by the diversity of people who adhere to them. Omid Safi writes that religions, as in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, teach nothing. Instead, the "[i]nterpretative communities do...[as d]ivine teachings [are] achieved through human agency." He argues that religion "is always mediated" and that "Islam says nothing. Muslims do." Omid Safi, "Introduction: The Times They Are A-Changin' – A Muslim Quest for Justice, Gender Equality, and Pluralism," in *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender, and Pluralism*, Omid Safi, ed. (Oxford: OneWorld, 2003). Similarly Kwame Anthony Appiah emphasizes the individual and personal, noting: "It's not Muslims; it's particular people now and it...gives it a kind of concreteness...What binds me to Islam is my Sunni friends and my Shiite friends, my Israeli friends, my cousins who happen to be Muslim, and strangers whom I've come to know

More specifically, the practice of protective hospitality in Christianity can be enhanced by better understandings of Judaism and Islam's practice of hospitality, namely their codes and etiquettes related to honor. Additionally, the positive potential for protective hospitality's contribution to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, and reconciliation and the possibility for development of a "cooperative theology" among the Abrahamic traditions are particularly valuable.

2. Outline of Chapters

This dissertation is divided into two parts. The first part is comprised of the first three chapters, focusing upon a greater analysis of hospitality, theology, and ethics. The second part, comprised of the final three chapters, look specifically at protective hospitality.

Chapter One will identify the theological movements and influences that shape the investigation to follow. It begins with contemporary examples of protective hospitality and then discusses two currents in contemporary Christian theologies – a contextual and political theological approach and a cooperative and complementary theological approach – that will shape a dialogical approach to understanding faith-based hospitality. It will identify the capacity for a complementarity in the theology of the Abrahamic traditions which lends itself to a shared heritage of ethical practice, emphasizing the voices within the traditions that seek to challenge rather than collude with the powers and national might. Lastly, it will argue a

and like who are Muslim. What I have in common with these very diverse group of Muslims that I know is different in each case. So that breaks up the sense of them as a kind of monolithic 'them.'" Appiah, "Sidling up to Difference," part of the "Civil Conversations Project," *Krista Tippett: On Being*, American Public Radio, podcast, transcript available at <http://being.publicradio.org/programs/2011/ccp-appiah/transcript.shtml>, accessed 19 September 2011. Accordingly, this research does not speak for all Christians or every Christianity. Instead, it recognizes the complexity within each identified tradition, but it also recognizes the clumsiness and unwieldiness that can come from over-precision in naming just *which* Judaism, Christianity, or Islam is being talked about at every point. Within the context of Christian theology and Christianity mentioned in this dissertation, it will, in most cases, be limited to Western Christianity, recognizing that there are even a multitude of Western Christianities. However, as it would be impractical to similarly differentiate Judaism and Islam in this work of Christian theology (unless particular traditions such as Sufism may apply in a specific area), the research finds it appropriate to take a similarly broad approach to 'Christianity.'

“hermeneutic of hospitality” is appropriate in order for the research to embody its contextual method and structure.

Chapter Two will extend hospitality through examination of its scope and complexity and highlight aspects that contribute to the amorphous nature of hospitality. Inherent tensions in hospitality’s definition and practice will be explored, as seen in the relationships between hospitality and hostility; particularity and universality; inclusivity and exclusivity; safety and threat; invited and uninvited; expected and unexpected; culture and counterculture. This chapter will also argue that three main themes can be identified in the practice of hospitality - table fellowship, intellectual welcome, and the provision of protection – and that hospitality is inextricably linked to the essence of ethics and ethical practice.

Chapter Three will analyze the practice of hospitality as exhibited in the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, considering their shared cultural and geographic origins and patterns related to models of behavior and impact of early experiences of persecution. The chapter will also identify the traditions’ own unique understandings that contribute to the practice of hospitality, highlighting the emphases missing or forgotten in Christianity’s theology and practice in light of the contributions of Judaism and Islam, namely in the more clearly articulated obligations and etiquette related to hospitality which I suggest are associated with a more explicit honor code. It is understood, however, that Christianity is not alone in its neglect of certain aspects of hospitality, and that each religion is never pure in theological systems or ethical practices. Therefore, critiques expressed toward Christianity in this research could be applicable to Judaism or Islam as well.

Chapter Four will examine the stages of hospitality and the role of protection in hospitable practice, while also noting the motivations for action on behalf of a threatened other that have been identified in prior research. Sections in the chapter will also specifically argue that issues of protection, force, and violence give meaning to and limit the practice of protective hospitality, particularly in light of hospitality’s emphasis upon life, freedom

from cruel relationship, and openness to the other. Additionally, this chapter will also consider the role of boundaries, risk, and concerns for purity that enable and hinder communities and individuals from practicing protective hospitality. The challenge of negotiating boundaries, risk and concerns for purity necessitates the need for an ethic of risk to be adopted to inform responsible action.

Chapter Five will identify and explore various texts from the Abrahamic traditions that illustrate the practice and limitations of protective hospitality pointing to an often conflicted and imperfect practice, but a practice authoritatively modeled in the traditions nonetheless. Texts from the Jewish and Christian traditions will be limited to the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible for two reasons. First, the limitation seeks to highlight the shared textual tradition between Judaism and Christianity that shapes the practice of protective hospitality. Second, the limitation is a practical one related to the need for brevity. While there are significant passages in the New Testament which could be included, this work is not an exhaustive analysis of all texts but an analysis of sample texts which problematize, shape, and speak specifically to the provision of protection. From the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, the texts to be analyzed are the Rahab narrative from Joshua 2; the Lot in Sodom narrative from Genesis 19; the Levite, concubine and Ephraimite in Gibeah narrative in Judges 19; and the cities of refuge texts in the deuteronomic witness. Analysis based in the Qur'an and elsewhere in the Islamic tradition will center upon God as protector, the Constitution of Medina and its implications for the *ummah* ("community") and the *dhimmi* ("protected people") and a selection of other texts that address the issue of protection.

Chapter Six will examine the research in accordance with the research's methodology by considering the theory of protective hospitality in light of case studies situated in the context of war-time Bosnia in the 1990s. Three case studies will be examined: the first will focus on the Jewish community of Sarajevo, the second on the village of Baljvine in northwestern Bosnia, and the third on Franciscan priest Ivo Marković. These case studies

will be presented to highlight the activities of adherents of the Abrahamic communities in Bosnia who sought to provide protective hospitality by acting on behalf of the threatened other at great personal and communal risk. The analysis based on these examples will provide a basis upon which responsible, shared action could be established and perpetuated, particularly in relation to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, and reconciliation work in conflicted contexts.

While I acknowledge it is not essential to the purpose of this academic work, I hope that the future potential of this body of research is that it can contribute to the further development of a body of literature that encourages inter-religious cooperative action and the work of creating safe spaces on behalf of marginalized groups and individuals. Moreover, it ultimately aims to spark the imagination and provide a space to consider the development of a culture and cycle of courageous reciprocity and resistance through the memory of acts of protective hospitality provided in the past to counteract cycles of abusive power and violence.

PART ONE:

**HOSPITALITY, ETHICS,
AND THEOLOGY**

PART ONE

HOSPITALITY, ETHICS
AND TECHNOLOGY

**CHAPTER ONE:
LOCATING THE THEOLOGICAL APPROACH**

*Theology begins with my life,
but my life is inter-related with the lives of others.
Thus, 'I am' is always also 'we are.'*
- Jung Young Lee¹

Introduction

This research is primarily a Christian exploration of protective hospitality informed by the Jewish and Islamic traditions. As such, it draws upon the hermeneutical principles and methodology of political theology as seen through the more specific lenses of liberation and feminist theologies in an inter-religious ethical context, and explores how the insights of political theology can be extended beyond the Christian tradition to explore the social issue of protective hospitality from an inter-religious perspective in an increasingly pluralist world.

This research seeks to provide an analysis of Abrahamic protective hospitality in a way that is critical, creative, and constructive. It accomplishes this through the use of two currents in contemporary Christian theologies: a contextual and political theological approach and a cooperative and complementary theological approach. The first approach emphasizes the situating of this research upon context and lived experience and the methodologies of Christian political, liberation, and feminist theologies. The second approach emphasizes cooperative and complementary theological aspects that informed by inter-religious, Abrahamic, and hospitable hermeneutics. In this first chapter, each of these approaches will be identified and explained in turn as they relate to the topic of this research.

¹ Jung Young Lee, *Marginality: The Key to Multicultural Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995), 8.

1. A Contextual and Political Theological Approach

One of the two theological currents utilized in this work is a contextual and political theological approach. Such an approach is useful as it enables one to analyze and reflect on the social and culture practice and experience of hospitality on a theological level. To take seriously this methodology, it is most appropriate to begin with practical, contextual examples to set the stage for what will be addressed in the following chapters. Therefore, this section begins with context set within two examples where protective hospitality was practiced in the twentieth century. After these examples, a discussion of political theology and the more specific approaches of liberation and feminist theology will also be identified as this research is based on social context, assumes a hermeneutic of suspicion, and focuses particularly on issues of the marginalized and persecuted other and the Abrahamic traditions' response to such realities.²

² I acknowledge there is some debate about whether or not liberation and feminist theologies are a type of political theology or political and feminist theologies are a type of liberation theology. William T. Cavanaugh and Peter Scott's edited work, *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004) lists liberation and feminist theologies within a larger family of political theology. Yet, political and liberation theologies are differentiated in Rebecca Chopp's *The Praxis of Suffering: An Interpretation of Liberation and Political Theologies*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990). This debate is heavily nuanced by a variety of factors (such as historical context, political realities, geography, and cultural perspectives) that are understood and yet are mostly beyond the scope of this research. It will be explored briefly later in this chapter, but nevertheless, I am working with the particular understanding of the former - that political theology is a wider schema within which liberation and feminist (as well as black, queer, womanist, mujerista and other) theologies can be situated.

a. Arising from a Context: Contemporary Examples of Protective Hospitality

The highest virtue is always against the law.
– Ralph Waldo Emerson ³

As this research seeks to ultimately consider the Christian practice of protective hospitality, it is appropriate to begin with two significant examples of protective hospitality in practice.⁴

This section will present two brief case studies as initial anchors to contextualize the research. The first is the village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon in France, whose residents provided protective hospitality to Jews during the Holocaust. The second is the Sanctuary Movement in the U.S., which served as a resistance effort against Reagan-era policies in Central America in the 1980s.⁵

i. The Village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon

One of the best-known examples of protective hospitality of the twentieth century are the actions of Christian, Muslim and other non-Jew rescuers⁶ who provided sanctuary and assistance to Jews during the Holocaust. The motivations for rescue and refuge given were varied, but the common narrative is that during this time, over twenty thousand people from forty-five countries⁷ took in strangers, those who were different either

³ "VI: Worship", *The Conduct of Life*, 1860 (revised 1876), available at <http://www.emersoncentral.com/worship.htm>, accessed on 8 October 2010.

⁴ The theory of the inter-religious aspect of protective hospitality will be tested in the case studies based in Bosnia explored in Chapter Six.

⁵ Many other examples were considered for inclusion in this chapter, but for the sake of brevity and to emphasize that this is about a theological/ethical development of protective hospitality and not a survey of every instance where protective hospitality has been practiced, these two examples were selected.

⁶ "Rescuers" is the common term used to refer to those who hid Jews or helped Jews escape during the Holocaust. They are also referred to as "Righteous Among the Nations" or "Righteous Gentiles." They are memorialized and remembered at Yad Vashem in Israel, but certain criteria must be met for them to be officially recognized. See Yad Vashem's website for more details: <http://www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/righteous/about.asp>, accessed on 18 July 2011.

⁷ The precise number recognized as "Righteous Among the Nations" according to Yad Vashem in 2011 is 23,788.

religiously, politically, or ethnically, risking their lives for the sake of the other's wellbeing. Out of their understanding of the place for the other in their faith and life, communities saw intervention and provision of protection for the other as the only option and saved thousands of lives from the extermination system of the 1930s and 1940s.⁸

Throughout the literature, however, the actions of the village Le Chambon-sur-Lignon⁹ in France are cited as a prime example of hospitality in the context of rescuers during the Holocaust. Under the primary leadership of Protestant pastors André Trocmé and Edouard Theis, the village rescued between three and five thousand Jews by providing sanctuary within the community, either by helping them get to safer locations (such as Switzerland) or by harboring them more long-term in private homes, local farms or public buildings in the village. Putting themselves in harm's way and giving up much of their own freedom while under the Vichy regime of World War II France, the villagers of Le Chambon, also referred to as Chambonnais, practiced hospitality in some of the most costly ways.

The understanding of protection for the Chambonnais was rooted in their own tradition as descendents of the Calvinist French Huguenots who had been severely persecuted during the European Reformation as a result of their criticism of the use of power by the kings of France and the Roman

⁸ See Philip P. Hallie, *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed: The Story of Le Chambon and How Goodness Happened There*, (New York: Harper, 1979); Nechama Tec, *When Light Pierced the Darkness: Christian Rescue of Jews in Nazi-Occupied Poland*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Eva Fogelman, *Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust* (New York: Anchor, 1994); David P. Gushee, *The Righteous Gentiles of the Holocaust*, (New York: Paragon, 2003); Peter Hellman, *When Courage was Stronger Than Fear: Remarkable Stories of Christians and Muslims who Saved Jews from the Holocaust*, (New York: Marlowe and Company, 2004); Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories From the Holocaust's Long Reach into Arab Lands*, (New York: PublicAffairs, 2006) as examples.

⁹ Most often it will be referred to as simply "Le Chambon."

Catholic Church.¹⁰ This use of historical memory informs what theologian Letty Russell refers to as their “heritage of resistance.”¹¹

Russell’s term “heritage of resistance” encourages a discussion of the term coined by Christian political theologian Johann Baptist Metz - “dangerous memory” - which, for Metz, stems from Christian Eucharistic theology and the concept of *anamnesis*, wherein adherents *remember* God’s saving deeds as an act of worship.¹² From meaningful, healthy remembrance of past events and the communal narrative comes action, and it is action that can be described as “dangerous” as it often challenges the status quo, highlight injustice and will, on many occasions, inform and motivate acts of resistance.¹³

In the case of Le Chambon and their own dangerous memory, ethicist Philip Hallie notes that even the routes the Chambonnais used to take Jewish children and families through the mountains of southeastern France into the safety of Switzerland were the same routes their Huguenot ancestors took when fleeing persecution.¹⁴ As such, that heritage formed memories and

¹⁰ See Warren C. Scoville, *The Persecution of Huguenots and French Economic Development, 1680-1720*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1960); Philip Conner, *Huguenot Heartland: Montauban and Southern French Calvinism During The Wars of Religion*, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History series, (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2002); and Glenn S. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572*, (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003).

¹¹ Letty Russell, “Hot-House Ecclesiology: A Feminist Interpretation of the Church,” *Ecumenical Review* 53/1 (January 2001), 50.

¹² While this understanding is particularly relevant to Christianity, there is room for different foundations within non-Christian traditions as well. In fact, the term “dangerous memory” does not necessarily need a religious foundation at all to still be effective in its meaning, albeit different from Metz’ original intent. The Christian understanding argued by Metz is based in Jesus’ proclamation that when followers share bread or drink from the cup, they are to do it “in remembrance” of him (Luke 22:19; I Corinthians 11:24-25). God’s saving acts include not just spiritual salvation, but also physical as seen in deliverance of the Israelites from slavery and redemption from injustice. Cf. Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Society* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980) and *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997). However, it is worth noting here that the term “dangerous” can be problematic. Metz’s understanding of “dangerous” meant defiant or remembering that endangers the abusive status quo. Yet, “dangerous memory” in the minds of many can also refer to unhealthy memory, such as in relation to nationalistic, violent, martyr-related memories which divide and exclude. My perception as an American is that the memory of 11 September 2011 has fallen into this latter, unhealthy category.

¹³ ‘Dangerous memory’ is discussed further in the context of the case studies in Chapter Six.

¹⁴ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” *The Hastings Center Report*, Vol. 11, No.

self-identification that enabled the community to wed hospitality, which often came at a great personal price, to the provision of protection as a “faithful response to new social, political and economic developments and to particular historical crises,” resulting in the protection of thousands from death camps.¹⁵

This heritage of resistance also enabled the Chambonnais to understand “the importance of welcome and hospitality [as]...they stretched this welcome as far as they could.”¹⁶ Those rescued by the Chambonnais remarked upon the hospitality they encountered there, enabling them, even in the midst of their suffering, to “find realistic hope in a world of persisting cruelty.”¹⁷ For example, when a new refugee family found protection in the village, it was customary on the following morning after their arrival to “find on their front door a wreath with ‘*Bienvenue!*’ ‘Welcome!’ painted on a piece of cardboard attached to the wreath...[but] nobody knew who had brought the wreath; in effect, the whole town had brought it.”¹⁸

Yet, in the midst of this hospitality, the Chambonnais were keenly aware of the risks they were taking on behalf of the threatened other in their midst. Russell refers to Magda Trocmé, wife of André Trocmé, as noting that “the righteous must often pay a price for their righteousness; their own ethical purity” when it came to affirming life by providing sanctuary.¹⁹ Additionally, both André Trocmé and Edouard Theis along with others were arrested for their actions and sent to an internment camp. Upon their release, they were asked to sign a promise of obedience to the law, which

3 (Jun., 1981), 27

¹⁵ Luke Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness Amid Moral Diversity*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 141.

¹⁶ Russell, “Hot-House Ecclesiology,” 50. This tradition of resistance as seen in the actions of Le Chambon, despite its extraordinary witness, is also not unique to the Christian tradition in its practice of hospitality. All three of the Abrahamic traditions have this “heritage of resistance” at its core and all subsequently advocate welcome and hospitality as a result.

¹⁷ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” 27

¹⁸ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” 27.

¹⁹ Russell, “Hot-House Ecclesiology,” 50.

they refused, and, as a result, were forced to go underground to continue their protection efforts after their release.²⁰

ii. Sanctuary Movement in the U.S.

The Sanctuary Movement in the United States in the 1980s “began as a movement of hospitality that aimed to provide for the humanitarian needs of vulnerable refugees” from Central America.²¹ From that practice of hospitality, however, a political movement was born that sought to protest U.S. President Ronald Reagan’s destructive policies supporting wars in Central America.²² Refugees from the violence in Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua who had entered the U.S. illegally lived “with the immediate expectations of death if they were deported back to their countries,” yet the U.S. immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) demanded their return, and, therefore, the Sanctuary Movement was born.²³ Churches, synagogues, and

²⁰ See Hallie’s *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed* for the history of the village and the risks they took for their actions.

²¹ Christian Smith, *Resisting Reagan: The U.S. Central America Peace Movement*, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996), 69.

²² Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 69. See also Walter LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America*, 2nd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993); Thomas Carothers, *In the Name of Democracy: U.S. Policy toward Latin America in the Reagan Years*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993); William M. LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). For a theological perspective of the events in El Salvador at that time, see Oscar Romero, *Voice of the Voiceless: The Four Pastoral Letters and Other Statements*, Michael J. Walsh, trans. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985).

²³ Penny Golden and Michael McConnell, *Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986), viii. For the sake of brevity, I will rely primarily on the Smith and Golden and McConnell texts for this section. However, see also Ignatius Bau, *This Ground is Holy: Church Sanctuary and Central American Refugees*, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985); Ann Crittenden, *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision*, (New York: Grove Press, 1988); Hilary Cunningham, *God and Caesar at the Rio Grande: Sanctuary and the Politics of Religion*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995); and Sharon Erickson Nepstad, *Convictions of the Soul: Religion, Culture, and Agency in the Central America Solidarity Movement*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). For an exploration of feminist issues and the role of women in the movement, see Robin Lorentzen, *Women in the Sanctuary Movement*, (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1991). While it is not scholarly material per se, an interesting account of the Sanctuary Movement from the perspective of a thirteen year old Guatemalan refugee is found in Marge Pellegrino’s *Journey of Dreams*, (London: Frances Lincoln Children’s Books, 2009). For a more contemporary look at the movement and implications for more recent immigration policies in North American post-9/11 context, see María Cristina García, *Seeking Refuge: Central American Migration to Mexico, the United States and Canada*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006).

community groups, and organizations responded to the needs of those fleeing the violence, torture, and trauma of their homelands by actively taking in and harboring the refugees.²⁴

Members of the movement “declare[d] their buildings sanctuaries for refugees,”²⁵ and in so doing, their actions put them in direct defiance of the American government and its interpretation of the Refugee Act of 1980. According to Golden and McConnell, the U.S. government classed what the members of the Sanctuary Movement were doing in the 1980s as “criminal, punishable by a \$2,000 fine and up to five years in prison.”²⁶ Furthermore, Golden and McConnell note that “[b]y declaring sanctuary, white, middle-class congregations experienced something of the risk that the...church of Central America...[had] endured for years.”²⁷

The members of the Sanctuary Movement did not take risks and violate the law casually. The decision to enter into the work of providing sanctuary was a thorough and much-discussed process, with some communities taking a couple months and others taking almost a year to decide if they were going to become involved.²⁸ For those who decided to join the movement, their decisions were most often marked by a turning point upon which they refused to submit to secular authority, but only to God and the call for justice.²⁹ Golden and McConnell describe the decision to participate and conduct an illegal network of sanctuary as follows:

²⁴ Golden and McConnell note Native Americans in the U.S. also participated in this movement, using their reservations as sanctuaries. They were “very much concerned about the plight of Guatemalan Indians” as “[o]ne branch of the Mohawk nation in upper New York state...declared its sacred land a sanctuary” and “near Indiantown, Florida, Seminoles...harbored hundreds of Guatemalan Indians” which “paralleled [their involvement] in the original [Underground] railroad when Seminoles harbored escaped slaves making their way to Oklahoma and Mexico.” (60).

²⁵ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, viii. The sanctuary, however, was not based primarily as a physical place but as a “collective will of a faith community taking a stand for life” and served as a safe place where truth could be spoken (11).

²⁶ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 1-2.

²⁷ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 1-2.

²⁸ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 132. Golden and McConnell reference an article in the *Wall Street Journal* (24 June 1984, 18) where members of the sanctuary movement are accused of committing a “willful and casual violation of American law.” It is noted that while the “willful” claim was true, casual it was not.

²⁹ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 134.

The calls came, coded conversations – midnight emergency calls from a Colorado highway driver, from the Rio Grande valley, from a pastor in Ohio, from a Methodist housekeeper in Nebraska, from refugees alone in a room in a dark church, from the clandestine Mexican church, from a Trappist monastery, from an Amerindian tribe in upstate New York, from a Concordia, Kansas, retreat center, from a farm collective in Iowa, from a synagogue in Madison, Wisconsin...The decision was made to keep everything in the open, to allow the public to see as clearly as possible what sanctuary was and who was involved in it. But this did not preclude caution and security efforts to protect refugees from arrest, especially when they were en route to a sanctuary. To date [1986], no refugee has been taken from a sanctuary or the railroad and deported...from 30 sanctuaries in 1982 to 3,000 in 1984.³⁰

The public aspect of the Sanctuary Movement is of particular interest. Leaders of the movement recognized that if the provision of sanctuary were made public, it would “give the refugees a platform to tell their stories about atrocities experienced in Central America”³¹ and bear witness to the brutality supported by the Reagan administration. Furthermore, the decision to remain public was an attempt by the providers of sanctuary to circumvent the INS and “claim the high moral ground [by] openly explain[ing] themselves to the media and their denominations.”³² As providers of sanctuary began to be arrested, the arrests “only served to increase the movement’s visibility and produce an outpouring of support from around the country.”³³ That support grew to include condemnation of the arrests and support of the provision of sanctuary from the National Council of Churches and groups of Roman Catholic bishops and religious orders. This support was followed by the announcement that “the city of Los Angeles and the state of New Mexico declared themselves Sanctuaries.”³⁴ As a result, in 1987, the number of Sanctuary groups, according to Smith, totaled over four hundred:

³⁰ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 52-53.

³¹ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 67.

³² Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 66.

³³ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 70.

³⁴ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 70.

Types of Sanctuary Groups, 1987 ³⁵	Number	Percent
Protestant Churches	93	22
Anabaptist Churches	80	19
Unitarian Universalist Churches	67	16
Roman Catholic Churches	65	15
Jewish Synagogues	41	10
Ecumenical Religious Groups	25	6
Cities	24	6
Universities	15	4
Other Secular Groups	13	3
Religious Groups	371	88
Secular Groups	52	12

In 1984, the INS shifted its strategy toward the Sanctuary Movement and began arresting offenders who provided sanctuary to illegal refugees. When interviewed, Christians claimed in court that their motivation was that they were “fulfilling a Christian moral duty” by providing sanctuary.³⁶ One person in particular, Nena MacDonald from Lubbock, Texas, had been arrested with fifteen others for providing sanctuary and rationalized her actions by stating:

If I walked down a street in Lubbock and saw a person lying in the street hurt, people would think there is something wrong with me if I didn't help. What I have done with refugees is no

³⁵ Sourced from Chicago Religious Task Force Sanctuary Directory, 1987 as Table 7.7 in Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 185. The numbers reflected here do not correspond with the numbers given in Golden and McConnell (53) which are much higher, but Smith's book looks at the group called Sanctuary through which primary provision was given, whereas Golden and McConnell register any church, synagogue or group that were primary or secondary providers of sanctuary, sometimes in connection with and other times independent of the organization Sanctuary. One should also point out that, as noted in the above table, the role of the secular groups in the provision of protective hospitality in the Sanctuary Movement was a small but important one. Golden and McConnell reference the work of Nicaraguan theologian Juan Hernández Pico who argued that those who are faithful to the God of history may be those whose motivating convictions stand outside religious categories.” They quote Pico: “[In the revolutionary process] seeing people die for others, and not hearing any talk from them about faith in God being the motivating factor, liberates Christians from the prejudice of trying to encounter true love solely and exclusively within the boundaries of faith. It also helps to free them from the temptation of not considering a revolutionary process authentic unless it bears the label ‘Christian’.” From Sergio Torres and John Eagleson, eds., *The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities: Papers from the International Ecumenical Congress of Theology, February 29-March 2, 1980, Sao Paulo, Brasil*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1981), 64 in Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 178.

³⁶ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 68.

different. If people come here to drink from the well of kindness and we turn them away, we will have poisoned the well. Someday when we ourselves may need to drink from that same well, we will find it poisoned with floating bodies.³⁷

Similarly, one of the founders of the Sanctuary Movement, Jim Corbett, found that the laws that were broken as a result of his actions were of less importance compared to the moral imperative he felt to protect the endangered lives of Central Americans seeking safety in the U.S. For Corbett, the Nuremberg trials, which he had grown up hearing about because of his father's legal profession, had proven moral responsibility was greater than inhumane laws of a nation-state.³⁸

While the churches and religious communities overall in the U.S. tend not to be particularly liberationist, Golden, McConnell, and Smith all noted they have a history which points to revolutionary tendencies at certain times when the need arose, seeking liberation for those who were victims of injustice and oppression.³⁹ The Sanctuary Movement also found inspiration in the "dangerous memory" of protective hospitality enacted by the faithful in times past. Smith, Golden and McConnell summarize these as:

- In the declaration of "entire cities as sanctuaries of refuge for accused criminals" in the Hebrew Bible⁴⁰
- In Christian churches "during the Roman Empire and in medieval England [which] had offered themselves as sanctuaries for fugitives of blood revenge"⁴¹
- In the early American colonial era when churches "protected escaped political prisoners from British agents" and Quakers were known for "harboring...religious dissenters"⁴²
- During the era of American slavery and the work toward its abolition, churches "provided refuge and protection to fugitive

³⁷ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 77.

³⁸ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 65. For more information on Jim Corbett and his role in the Sanctuary Movement, see Miriam Davidson, *Convictions of the Heart: Jim Corbett and the Sanctuary Movement*, (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1988).

³⁹ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 4; Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 65-67.

⁴⁰ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 67.

⁴¹ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 67.

⁴² Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 4.

slaves in direct defiance of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850" via the Underground Railroad⁴³

- During World War II, religious communities harbored Jews and other threatened groups or individuals.⁴⁴
- And during the Vietnam War, when "many churches sheltered conscientious objectors"⁴⁵

In addition to the memories of these models of protective hospitality, the Sanctuary Movement also looked to the history of the religious traditions involved – primarily Judaism and Christianity – which were both "born in the travail of escape."⁴⁶ For those involved in the work of the Sanctuary Movement, liberation theology became more real as they came to see God as "the force acting in history on the side of those first refugees, leading them from slavery to freedom" and whose "identity was rooted in action and proclaimed in verbs of struggle – leading, delivering, freeing."⁴⁷

Golden and McConnell also noted a paradigm shift among communities that participated in the provision of protective hospitality in the Sanctuary Movement. They noted that with the "learning process and the wrestling with faith that occur[s] before a declaration of sanctuary" came a process of conscientization, a "shift of consciousness," which signals a "change of understanding and a change of heart that leads to deeper commitment."⁴⁸ Concurrently, Smith argues the conscientization occurred because as more communities "considered declaring sanctuary, they were forced to learn the reasons why so many traumatized and anguished Central Americans were flooding northward."⁴⁹

⁴³ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 4.

⁴⁴ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 13.

⁴⁵ Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 67.

⁴⁶ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 14-15. Islam also has this history, but there is no mention in the referenced materials of Muslim involvement in the particular actions of Sanctuary Movement.

⁴⁷ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 14-15.

⁴⁸ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 135. They refer to Paulo Friere's term *conscientization* as "a process of critical reflection at deeper and deeper levels about how human beings live and die in this world" as it "invariably destroys old assumptions and breaks down mythologies that no longer explain reality because of new information." Smith's use of the term is much more practical and concrete, utilizing it as a means of education that informs resistance and social action.

⁴⁹ Christian Smith, *Resisting Reagan*, 69.

b. Political, Liberationist, and Feminist Theologies

Political theology arises out of the reality of history, suffering, and memory usually connected with some form of political upheaval. As such, political theology has been defined as “the analysis and criticism of political arrangements (including cultural-psychological, social and economic aspects) from the perspective of differing interpretations of God’s ways in the world.”⁵⁰ While the term “political theology” is most commonly used in the context of Christian theology, there is no good reason to argue Christianity is the sole proprietor of such theological thought. Nevertheless, in spite of (and, perhaps, because of) this, the majority of the literature related to “political theology” is Christian. Therefore, as far as methodology is concerned, this research addresses what is available, and will seek to expand and enhance it where applicable in relation to other religious traditions.

Political theology as seen in its early days, sometimes referred to as European or German political theology, began as an ecumenical and collaborative endeavor, developed as a collaboration between Protestant and Catholic theologians. It arose from a context of post-World War II Europe as both churches faced the common problem of secularism and lack of capacity to respond to the horrors that the previous years of conflict had inflicted upon the continent and the rest of the world.⁵¹ Two of its primary thinkers, Johann Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann who are Catholic and Protestant respectively, reflected the inter-church nature of this theological development. While context was not as specifically identified as it would be later in liberation and feminist theologies, political theology began to lay the groundwork for considering religion’s role in a world of conflict, modern explorations of ethical behavior toward one’s neighbor, and the social implications of the theological belief albeit from a more theoretical approach. Utilizing Marxist criticisms and a hermeneutic of suspicion,⁵² political theology

⁵⁰ Cavanaugh and Scott, *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, 1.

⁵¹ Jürgen Moltmann, *On Human Dignity: Political Theology and Ethics* (London: SCM Press, 1984), 98.

⁵² The origins of the hermeneutics of suspicion are discussed in more detail in the context of the thoughts and writings of Sigmund Freud, Friedrich Nietzsche and Karl Marx in

began to emphasize praxis, considering the effect doctrine had upon the social and political as well as the spiritual and psychological realms.⁵³

Through careful scrutiny, political theologians considered various theological doctrines and deemed them to be “oppressive or liberating, alienating or humanizing.”⁵⁴ In this way, political theology as a method was seen as “a corrective to situationless theologies” as it counter-acted naïve idealism and sought out the more difficult of human experiences for theological reflection.⁵⁵ Working particularly on the themes of memory, suffering and hope, Moltmann and Metz saw there was no such thing as an “apolitical theology”⁵⁶ and they began to formulate critiques of long-held concepts such as the nature of God, the nature of humanity, freedom, and interpretation of history necessitated by the manipulation of these ideas in war-time Europe in the early twentieth century.⁵⁷

This early political theology had its weaknesses, namely in that it was predominantly androcentric and Eurocentric. It has been justly criticized as primarily reflecting “the voice of the bourgeoisie, questioning their own basic assumptions and seeking grace and hope in conversion.”⁵⁸ These limitations meant political theology did not offer the full potential it encouraged when taken seriously. There were other voices to be heard other than the male, European middle and upper classes. Over the years, the work of theologians such as Dorothee Sölle began to draw together the work of the German predecessors and the new theological voices arising from other parts of the

Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, Denis Savage, trans. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 32-35 and *Hermeneutics and The Human Sciences*, Jihn B. Thompson, ed. and trans., reprint of 1981 edition (Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 34. See also Juan Lois Segundo, *The Liberation of Theology* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1978); James G. O'Donnell, "The Influence of Freud's Hermeneutic of Suspicion on the Writings of Juan Segundo," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 10 (1982): 28-34; and Rowan Williams, "The Suspicion of Suspicion: Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer" in *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology*, R. H. Bell, ed. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988): 36-53.

⁵³ Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, 98.

⁵⁴ Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, 98.

⁵⁵ Metz, *A Passion for God*, 23-24.

⁵⁶ Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, 99

⁵⁷ Chopp, *The Praxis of Suffering*, 4.

⁵⁸ Chopp, *The Praxis of Suffering*, 4.

world, and expanded political theology's boundaries into what would become known as liberation theology.⁵⁹

Liberation theology was influenced by political theology as it took root as its own movement, but it evolved into something distinctive.⁶⁰ It carried with it substantial political and social critique, but increasingly focused upon the realities of poverty and oppression, namely in the development of the hermeneutic that emphasized God's preferential option for the poor and oppressed. It sought to go one step further than earlier European versions of political theology had done; it sought to put theory into practice through creating base communities, fostering dialogue, and coordinating resistance around certain political issues such as social class and economic deprivation, oppressive government regimes, and the rights of indigenous and marginalized peoples. Yet, liberation theology would go through its own evolution; it was susceptible to the similar charge of androcentrism and was critiqued as being primarily Roman Catholic, particularly in its development in Central and South America.

Out of these critiques of male-centered theology both in the political and liberationist realms, feminist theology gained ground.⁶¹ Believing

⁵⁹ Cf. Dorothee Sölle, *Political Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971); *Suffering*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1984); *Celebrating Resistance: The Way of the Cross in Latin America*, (London: Mowbray, 1993); and *The Silent Cry: Mysticism and Resistance*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).

⁶⁰ All of these theologies (political, liberation, and feminist) could be discussed in the plural, rather than the singular, such as political theologies, liberation theologies, and feminist theologies. Usage of the plural reflects the understanding that even these different methodologies are not monolithic.

⁶¹ Feminist theology in a variety of forms had existed previous to this time, as seen in Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a Woman?" speech, given in 1851, where she states: "[The preacher] says women can't have as much rights as men, 'cause Christ wasn't a woman! Where did your Christ come from? Where did your Christ come from? From God and a woman! Man had nothing to do with Him. If the first woman God ever made was strong enough to turn the world upside down all alone, these women together ought to be able to turn it back, and get it right side up again! And now they is asking to do it, the men better let them." Available at <http://www.feminist.com/resources/artsspeech/genwom/sojour.html>, accessed 25 September 2011. See bell hooks, *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*, (Brooklyn, NY: South End Press, 1981) for further information. Similarly, Elizabeth Cady Stanton's work with the Seneca Falls collective on *The Woman's Bible* (1895; Dover Publications, 2003) was influential as it was the first time the Christian Bible had been published with commentary and critique that spoke to the needs of women. Nevertheless, the modern period of feminist theology quickly developed with the work of Mary Daly, such as *The Church and the Second Sex*, (Boston: Beacon, 1968, reissue 1985) and *Beyond God the*

women's experiences and issues related to women were not being adequately represented, feminist theologians asked serious questions about concepts of gender, power, violence, and trauma. Utilizing some of the same hermeneutical tools as liberation theologians, feminist theologians went further in that they sought to give voice and support not only to the case of the poor and the oppressed, but also to the experiences of women and the effects of women's issues upon on the faith community and society.⁶²

All three of these theological approaches inspire, challenge, and borrow from one another, and the lines between them are continually blurred with the emergence of related theologies such as queer, womanist, *mujerista*, or Asian women's theologies.⁶³ Furthermore, it is possible that all three also fit within schema of contextual theology as one can interpret their theological hermeneutic as "explicitly [placing] the recognition of the contextual nature of theology at the forefront of the theological process,"⁶⁴ whether it be in the form of a geographical, cultural, sexual, economic, or political context.⁶⁵

While liberation and feminist theologies lie under the more general umbrella of political theology, each have their unique place, and yet in cooperation with one another, they bear on different aspects of the research presented here. As such, there are a variety of contributions found in

Father, (Boston: Beacon, 1973, reissue 1985), and Rosemary Radford Ruether's *Mary, the Feminine Face of the Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977).

⁶² See Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn, eds. *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*, (Cleveland: Pilgrim, 1989); Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, Overtures to Biblical Theology series, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984); Chung Hyun Kyung, *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990); and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*, (Boston: Beacon, 1993).

⁶³ For queer, womanist, *mujerista* and Asian women's theology examples, see the following respectively: Marcella Althaus-Reid, *The Queer God*, (London: Routledge, 2003); Delores Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995); Maria Pilar Aquino, Daisy L. Machado, Jeanette Rodriguez, *A Reader in Latina Feminist Theology: Religion and Justice*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002); Chung Hyun Kyung, *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology*, (London: SCM, 1991).

⁶⁴ Angie Pears, *Doing Contextual Theology* (London: Routledge, 2010), 1.

⁶⁵ It is understood, however, that while all theology is contextual, not everyone recognizes it as such, *explicitly* emphasizing the context within theological construction. See Pears, *Doing Contextual Theology*, 1-4.

political, liberation and feminist theologies that might contribute to a theological investigation of protective hospitality.

First, there is the issue of audience. This research seeks to consider the needs of the powerless, marginalized, and threatened other by primarily addressing those who are in the position to provide protective hospitality, those who have the power to host.⁶⁶ Those who are within the powerful mainstream are usually the ones who are in the easiest position to provide protection of the persecuted. Therefore, this research keeps in mind the needs of the threatened other, which requires the tools of liberation and feminist theologies. Yet, it utilizes the tools of political theology by identifying theological and ethical imperatives that may contribute to meaningful action for those who have the power to provide protective hospitality.⁶⁷

Second is the issue of hermeneutics. Most useful to this research are two particular hermeneutics within political theology: the hermeneutic of suspicion, found in all expressions of political theology, and the hermeneutic of liberation for all, found mostly in liberation and feminist theologies. The hermeneutic of suspicion can shed light on long-held, but often forgotten, ideas and traditions related to welcoming the other in the Abrahamic tradition of hospitality. Additionally, as the practice of protective hospitality calls into question ideas related to power and authority, both hermeneutics

⁶⁶ Jacques Derrida argues that hospitality relies upon one having the “power to host,” as noted in Jacques Derrida, “Hospitality,” in *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, with a commentary by John D. Caputo, ed. (Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 1997), 110-112. This acknowledgement to hospitality’s need for “the power to host” is also referred to by Jack Reynolds, *Merleau-Ponty and Derrida: Intertwining Embodiment and Alterity*, (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2004), 177-79; George Newlands, *Hospitable God: The Transformative Dream*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), 77-78; and Seforosa Carroll, “Reimagining Home: A Diasporic Perspective on Encounters with the Religious Other in Australia,” in *Asian and Oceanic Christianities in Conversation: Exploring Theological Identities at Home and in Diaspora*, Heup Young Kim, Fumitaka Matsuoka, and Anri Morimoto, eds. (Amsterdam: Rodopi Editions, 2011), 179-181.

⁶⁷ Nevertheless, there are protectors as well as those in need of refuge who are part of the marginalized of this world. I think specifically of networks of battered women who join forces to protect one another. In their case, utilizing only general political theology as an approach can be lacking and would benefit from more specific feminist perspectives. Therefore, since this research seeks to address their plight as well, the more specific disciplines of liberation and feminist theologies are required.

of suspicion and liberation are likely to be of particular value for theological analysis.

Third, the engagement with political, liberation, and feminist theologies highlight that the nature of this research is centered upon social practice and lived experience. The theological formulations herein were not incubated in a vacuum, but were shaped and matured in response to concrete experience. As feminist theologians Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn have stated, “[t]heology follows life; it does not precede it.”⁶⁸ Moreover, this emphasis upon applied praxis understands that theological formulations are of no value to anyone if they are not disseminated and lived out in a constructive way. If left in the realm of doctrine only, theology becomes mere conjecture rather than practical, concrete expression of dynamic faith. Similarly, liberation theology exhorts contextual praxis, seeing everyday concerns as integral to theological formation while considering the recitation of creed and tradition without corresponding action lifeless and empty. In this way, liberation theology sees itself not as “a new theme for reflection but as a *new way* to do theology.”⁶⁹ Liberation theology does not, however, stop at reflection, but seeks “to be a part of the process through which the world is transformed.”⁷⁰ Transformation is essential to the narrative of protective hospitality as depicted in this research, and, therefore, should not be ignored.

Fourth, the emphasis upon violence, trauma, exclusion, and the needs for security as emphasized in feminist theology has a great deal to contribute to the discussion of protective hospitality. Whereas European political theology and liberation theology tend to give more patriarchal understandings of suffering, feminist theology takes a different approach by giving voice and bearing witness to those who have been abused and neglected, tortured, and persecuted. Feminist theology challenges

⁶⁸ Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, xii.

⁶⁹ Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*, C. Inda and J. Eagleson, trans. and ed., (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1973), 15. Also referenced in David Tombs, *Latin American Liberation Theology*, (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002), 119.

⁷⁰ Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* 15.

justifications for suffering as a means of redemption.⁷¹ The refusal to “grant [violence] power”⁷² and, subsequently, the emphasis upon acts of resistance to power is a foundational concept of feminist theology that can offer crucial sensitivity in this research. Likewise, issues of social inequality, systems of patriarchy, and exploitation of the weak and vulnerable are ever present in discussing the concept of protective hospitality, and so the feminist perspective is useful to this discussion.

Fifth, the use of other types of literature beyond simply the sacred texts as evidenced in feminist theological constructions is valuable. Particularly in the practice of hospitality, looking to other sources and authorities that challenge and shape cultural practice of welcome and safety is helpful. Furthermore, in light of the fact that those in need of protection are often those who have been marginalized even by the formal structures of the religious traditions, feminist theology’s inspiration from extra-textual sources and primary narratives is necessary to give voice to those experiences.⁷³ Such sources provide “helpful insights to the human condition” and can also articulate the “experiences of those who have been marginalized by the dominant tradition.”⁷⁴ In turn, they have the potential “to challenge theology, deconstructing its authoritative status and ‘unmasking’ theological narratives.”⁷⁵ Therefore, the stories of practitioners and other instances of protective hospitality to the threatened other during conflict, even in recent history and current events, are vitally important to the theological analysis present in this research.

Lastly, this research emphasizes the poor as found in liberation theology, but seeks to explore the definition of who exactly “the poor” are. It

⁷¹ See Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker’s work *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering and the Search for What Saves Us*, (Boston: Beacon, 2002) for an example of how feminist theologians are questioning the role of violence, suffering and trauma as being redemptive.

⁷² Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, xii.

⁷³ Elaine Graham, Heather Walton, Frances Ward, eds. *Theological Reflection: Methods*, vol. 1, (London: SCM, 2005), 71-72

⁷⁴ Graham, *Theological Reflection*, 72 referring to Heather Walton’s work, “Speaking in Signs: Narrative and Trauma in Practical Theology,” *Scottish Journal of Healthcare Chaplaincy*, 5/2 (2002), 2-6.

⁷⁵ Graham, *Theological Reflection*, 72 referring to Walton, 2-6.

does not rely upon economic poverty, per se, as liberation theology practitioners have traditionally sought to do. Economic realities certainly play a role, but are not the sole contributing factor to the need for protective hospitality. One of the most valuable contributions to this discussion comes from the liberation theologian Jon Sobrino, who asserts “the poor are those who die before their time.” For most of the poor, death comes slowly through grinding poverty. For a few, however, their death is a “swift, violent death, caused by repression and wars, when the poor threaten these unjust structures...[and] are deprived even of their cultures in order to weaken their identities and make them more defenseless.”⁷⁶ According to Sobrino, those targeted for persecution in such a way that they need protective hospitality are, indeed, “the poor.” Similarly, other liberation theologians such as James Cone and N.L. Eiesland define the poor as those who have been subjected to discrimination, marginalization, and dehumanization because of their race, ethnicity, class, or disability.⁷⁷ Therefore “the poor” are not simply the economically deprived, but are all who are oppressed or marginalized within a society, anyone who is suffering because of injustice or in need of protection.

Accordingly, what is presented in the following five chapters builds upon the understanding that the respective Abrahamic traditions have a strong foundation in social justice traditions. While the three traditions carry out their commitments to social justice in a variety of ways, there is a shared end result to these commitments: to live lives that honor God and the dignity of one’s fellow human beings.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Jon Sobrino, *The Principle of Mercy: Taking the Crucified People from the Cross* trans. various, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994), 50. Also referenced in Tombs, *Latin American Liberation Theology*, 213.

⁷⁷ N.L. Eiesland, *The Disabled God: Toward a Liberatory Theology of Disability*, (Nashville: Abington Press, 1994); James H. Cone, *God of the Oppressed*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997);

⁷⁸ See Farid Esack, *Qur’an, Liberation and Pluralism*, (Oxford: Oneworld Press, 1997); Marc Ellis, *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987); Amos Yong, *Hospitality and the Other: Pentecost, Christian Practices, and the Neighbor*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008).

2. A Cooperative and Complementary Theological Approach

In addition to a contextual and political approach, the second theological current drawn upon by this research is a cooperative and complementary theological approach informed by three particular distinctive emphases identified as the inter-religious, Abrahamic, and hospitable. To succeed in this endeavor, the research draws upon both disciplines of Christian theology and religious studies, taking a step beyond a solely Christian outlook by seeking to engage more directly with lived experience in a pluralist world.

a. Towards an Inter-Religious Approach

The reality of a pluralist world and its role in developing self-understanding was acknowledged in the nineteenth century by thinkers such as Max Müller and Goethe, who both argued that “to know one is to know none.”⁷⁹ Comparative religion scholar Ruth ApRoberts utilizes Müller’s assertion, and declares that “to know Judaism and Christianity we must study non-Jewish, non-Christian cultures, especially of the surrounding peoples.”⁸⁰ Therefore, to truly understand Christianity’s theology and ethic of protective hospitality, it is beneficial to consider other non-Christian traditions that shed light on particular aspects that may be invisible otherwise. Therefore, this research seeks to examine Christian theology and protective hospitality through the interpretative lenses of Judaism and Islam’s own practice in such a way that is respectful of difference and highlights complementarity and enables cooperation for mutual benefit. More specifically, the theology analyzed and developed here seeks to emphasize complementarity in thought and identify potential cooperative action through extending protective welcome to the endangered other.

⁷⁹ Müller made this observation in the area of religions; Goethe, in the area of language. This statement is credited to both in several sources including Ruth ApRoberts, *The Ancient Dialect: Thomas Carlyle and Comparative Religion*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), 28 and Mathieu Courville, *Edward Said's Rhetoric of the Secular*, (London: Continuum, 2010), 66.

⁸⁰ ApRoberts, *The Ancient Dialect*, 28

Furthermore, this research acknowledges that these two main theological approaches – the contextual and political, and the cooperative and complementary - are interlinked. The dual usage of these approaches of Christian political theology and inter-religious hermeneutics is considered a necessity by both Asian liberation theologian Aloysius Pieris and inter-religious scholar Paul Knitter, whose work argues that if inter-religious dialogue “does not come out of an experience of human suffering, and does not explore the this-worldly, liberative message of all religions, [then it] is a violation of the very nature of religion and interreligious dialogue.”⁸¹ Yet, Pieris also questions his fellow liberation theologians by questioning if their “vision of the kingdom of God [is] perhaps too narrow because it is too Christian.”⁸² Pieris, therefore, understands that if one is to consider political theology, one must also consider the inter-religious; and if one is to consider the inter-religious, one must consider political theology in light of “the many poor and the many religious”⁸³ of this globalized world. Those of different religious traditions still live in the same world, have the same human needs, have many of the same values, and suffer the same abuses. John Donne’s classic assertion that “no man is an island”⁸⁴ rings true for the inclusion of religious traditions as well in the current pluralist and globalized context. Conversely, to try to control that which is different and enforce homogeneity is to dominate and control, which is unhelpful to dialogue.

Yet, in light of the practicalities of an inter-religious hermeneutic, this research also understands that those who profess a particular faith are “never innocent of other philosophical influences.”⁸⁵ Whenever theological constructs are proposed, they are contextual in that they are based in a

⁸¹ Paul Knitter, in the Foreword to Aloysius Pieris, *An Asian Theology of Liberation*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988), xi-xii. See also Aloysius Pieris, *Love Meets Wisdom: The Christian Experience of Buddhism* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988).

⁸² Knitter, foreword in Pieris, *An Asian Theology of Liberation*, xii.

⁸³ Paul F. Knitter, “Pluralism and Oppression: Dialogue between the Many Religions and the Many Poor,” in *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of the Parliament of the World’s Religions*, Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns, eds., (New York: Continuum, 1996), 198-208.

⁸⁴ John Donne, “Meditation XVII,” in *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, 1624.

⁸⁵ Graham, *Theological Reflection: Methods*, 138.

“specific place and time”⁸⁶ and are reflective of an individual’s or community’s experiences and world view informed by culture, national and political identities, and other self-defining factors. The key to constructing a socially relevant and contextually oriented approach is to be aware of those factors. If one seeks for that approach also to be inter-religious and cooperative in nature as this research seeks to be, then demonstrating inter-religious literacy, making “measured judgments within the bounds of [one’s] learning”, and knowing when “to stop speaking about things beyond [one’s] expertise” are also required.⁸⁷ Therefore, what follows seeks to highlight cooperation in ethical practice with a view to the context out of which it arises.

As Christian political theology in its various forms seeks to address suffering and violence, and no religious tradition’s adherents are immune to suffering, it is no surprise that feminist and liberationist perspectives found in Judaism and Islam also take suffering, violence, and marginalization seriously. Such perspectives may be relatively recent, and in many ways are exceptional, but their existence is important.⁸⁸ While a variety of disciplines will be utilized to draw a variety of strands together, feminist and liberationist hermeneutics of the textual sources and tradition will most often prevail throughout this analysis.

⁸⁶ Graham, *Theological Reflection: Methods*, 138-139.

⁸⁷ Francis X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders*, (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 6.

⁸⁸ Their legitimacy in the overall presence and structure in the respective religious traditions cannot be debated at length here, but are understood within this research. For liberationist perspectives in Islam and Judaism, see Farid Esack, *Qur’an, Liberation and Pluralism: An Islamic Perspective of Interreligious Solidarity Against Oppression*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 1997); Hamid Dabashi, *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire*, (New York: Routledge, 2008); and Marc H. Ellis, *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987) and *Reading the Torah Out Loud*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007). For feminist perspectives, see Amina Wadud, *Qur’an and Woman: Rereading the Sacred Text from a Woman’s Perspective*, (New York: Oxford, 1999) and *Inside the Gender Jihad: Women’s Reform in Islam*, (New York: Oneworld, 2006); Riffat Hassan, "Challenging the Stereotypes of Fundamentalism: An Islamic Feminist Perspective," *The Muslim World*, 91/1-2 (2001): 55-69; Judith Plaskow, *Standing Against Sinai: Judaism from a Feminist Perspective*, (San Francisco: Harper, 1991); Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad and John L. Esposito, eds. *Daughters of Abraham: Feminist Thought in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002).

A word regarding the feminist role in this discussion of suffering, solidarity, and inter-religious cooperation is required. Feminism is, according to feminist theologian Ursula King, “the missing dimension in the dialogue of religions” and that “interfaith dialogue is mostly, at least on the official level, carried out by men, and gender issues have rarely been on the agenda.”⁸⁹ Additionally, feminist theology fills a role in ethical formation that has been heretofore lacking: it is relational in its ethical constructions. Women tend to “develop...relation-centered ethics...[which] contrasts to the stress on rules and autonomy in male ethics.”⁹⁰ As a result, the relational aspect of hospitality may be attractive to feminist-leaning scholars. Moreover, many feminist theologians emphasize “life” as the “key word” as the norm for evaluating “religious traditions in interfaith dialogue” wherein words such as “‘life-affirming,’ ‘life-enhancing,’ ‘survival-centered’” often appear.⁹¹ Concurrently, protective hospitality has, at its center, a dedication to the value and preservation of life, particularly on behalf of those who are threatened.

In some contexts, religious diversity is closely linked to liberation theology in that denying the need for diversity and insisting upon uniformity is to restrict life and “the right to full human and religious flourishing.”⁹² Likewise, feminist theology emphasizes both the global and the local as it is “trans-national, trans-regional, trans-cultural and trans-religious,”⁹³ it

⁸⁹ Ursula King, “Feminism: The Missing Dimension in the Dialogue of Religions”, Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo, Digital Archive, <http://www.tf.uio.no/lo/king0198.html> in Helene Engell, “Dialogue for Life: Feminist Approaches to Interfaith Dialogue,” in *Theology and the Religions: A Dialogue*, Viggo Mortenson, ed., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 249. Another version of the article can be found in *Pluralism and the Religions: The Theological and Political Dimensions*, John D’Arcy May, ed., (London: Cassell, 1998), 40-57.

⁹⁰ Engell, “Dialogue for Life...,” 255.

⁹¹ Engell, “Dialogue for Life...,” 256.

⁹² Peter C. Phan, “Living for the Reign of God: Liberation, Cultures, Religions: A Theology of Liberation for the Asian Churches,” a paper given at *Liberation Theology: Movement or Moment* Conference, Milltown Institute, Dublin, Ireland, (3-4 October 2008) 18. See also Peter C. Phan, *Being Religious Interreligiously: Asian Perspectives on Interfaith Dialogue*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004).

⁹³ Namsoon Kang, “Re-constructing Asian feminist theology: toward a glocal feminist theology in an era of neo-Empire(s),” in Sebastian C.H. Kim, ed., *Christian Theology in Asia*, 222 referred to by Phan, “Living For The Reign Of God...,” 49.

“recognize[s] the complex web of multiple oppression” and it “shift[s] from the politics of identity to the politics of solidarity.”⁹⁴

Additionally, solidarity with the suffering and oppressed in inter-religious spheres enables those “from diverse cultures and religions to come to shared conclusions about truth and value and action”⁹⁵ and it requires a “hermeneutical privilege” to be given to those who suffer.⁹⁶ The emphasis upon this commonality in approach is appropriate if the suffering are to be allowed to be a part of their own solution and the religious traditions represented truly seek to make effective changes against injustice.⁹⁷ In this way, then, “the questioning face of the suffering...enables religions to face and question each other and come to joint assessments of truth.”⁹⁸

Furthermore, as D’Arcy May points out, “suffering poses an ethical question, to which the only appropriate response is action.”⁹⁹ While what action is taken may differ depending upon the religious tradition, “the universal experience of suffering correlates with particular practical responses ... because it is mediated to us in markedly different ways – called ‘religions’ – in which the common human lot is symbolised.”¹⁰⁰

Concurrently, Knitter states that “religions call on what is more than human (at least the human as we now experience it) in order to transform or liberate the human” and that “to transform the human context will mean, generally, to oppose or resist the forces that stand in the way of change or newness.”¹⁰¹ Knitter also refers to the work of David Tracy who notes “religions are exercises in resistance...which reveal various possibilities for human freedom...[w]hen not domesticated by sacred canopies for the status

⁹⁴ Phan, “Living For The Reign Of God...,” 49 referring to further arguments made in Kang, “Re-constructing Asian feminist theology...,” 222-224.

⁹⁵ Knitter, “Responsibilities to the future...,” 85 referring to Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, “Theological and religious studies: the contest of the faculties’ in *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education*, Barbara G. Wheeler and Edward Farley, eds., (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 133-34.

⁹⁶ Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...,” 86.

⁹⁷ Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...,” 86.

⁹⁸ Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...,” 85.

⁹⁹ D’Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 94-95.

¹⁰⁰ D’Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 94-95.

¹⁰¹ Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...,” 76.

quo or wasted by their own self-contradictory grasps at power.”¹⁰² In the same vein, Knitter quotes Mohandas Gandhi’s proclamation: “those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means.”¹⁰³ Yet, it is this value of resistance that has been lost in mainstream Abrahamic traditions while still being so vital to its ethical framework, particularly on behalf of the poor, marginalized, and oppressed. It is this value of resistance on behalf of the threatened other that this research seeks to help rediscover and illuminate in the context of protective hospitality.

Within the emphasis upon the social relevance of an inter-religious hermeneutic, there is also the need to acknowledge the existence and authority of the subversive and prophetic in the foundations of the Abrahamic traditions, found particularly in the intra-communal discussions regarding meaning, ethics, and use of power.¹⁰⁴ All three of the traditions have had national might on their side at one point or another. Yet, all three traditions have also tasted the humility and disempowerment of being a threatened other, an oppressed and persecuted minority.

To welcome and admit the threatened other and provide protection is to subvert the powers that call for their exclusion or demise. To cry out for inclusion in society, many times against popular opinion, is to be prophetic as it provides a vision for what the community can or should be. In light of this, this research seeks to emphasize the voices in the Abrahamic traditions that challenge rather than collude with the powers and national might. It also looks for instances where the marginalized are subjected to rejection and

¹⁰² David Tracy *Plurality and Ambiguity: Hermeneutics, Religion, Hope* (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 84 in Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...”, in *Pluralism and the Religions*, 76-77.

¹⁰³ Mohandas Gandhi, *My Autobiography* (Boston: Beacon, 1957), 504 in Knitter, “Responsibilities for the future...”, 87-88, ftn 2.

¹⁰⁴ See works such as R. Scott Appleby’s *The Ambivalence of the Sacred*, (Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, 2000); Marc Gopin, *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Charles Kimball, *When Religion Becomes Evil*, (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002); Richard A. Horsley, *Religion and Empire: People, Power and the Life of the Spirit*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); and Gabriel A. Almond, R. Scott Appleby, and Emmanuel Sivan, *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms around the World*, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003) for discussions on social relevance of religion, particularly in relation to power, violence, and conflict, both for positive and negative impact.

oppression both in the halls of government and community as well as in the temples of religion.

This combination between the spiritual and political through the voice of the prophetic is reminiscent of Knitter's concept of the "*mystical-prophetic dipolarity*" that "vibrates and flows back and forth within all religious traditions."¹⁰⁵ This dipolarity

animates a two fold project, each aspect essential, each calling to and dependent on the other, to transform both the within and the without, to alter inner consciousness and social consciousness, to bring about peace of the heart and peace in the world, stirring the individual to an earnest spiritual praxis and also to a bold political praxis...The dynamic and call of this mystical-prophetic dipolarity is what tells Christians that they can love God only when they are loving their neighbour, or Buddhists that wisdom is not possible without compassion....Neither the mystical nor the prophetic is more fundamental, more important; each calls to, and has existence in, the other.¹⁰⁶

While Knitter's dipolarity speaks to intra-religious dialogue more than inter-religious dialogue, it is not without applicability. The mystical and prophetic in each tradition oftentimes finds itself mirrored in other traditions in very similar ways. The emphasis upon doctrine and right belief is countered by a comparable emphasis upon personal and communal responsibility. When the balance is not maintained, Knitter asserts, there are "mystics whose spirituality becomes self-indulgent, insensitive, or irresponsible...[and] prophets whose actions become self-serving, intolerant, or violent."¹⁰⁷

Testing this balance through exposure and cooperation with other traditions is beneficial as it tests the health of the religious tradition and its place in the world. Knitter explains this by arguing that if adherents from a variety of religious traditions "can agree in the beginning that [their faith] always promote greater eco-human wellbeing and remove the sufferings

¹⁰⁵ Knitter, "Responsibilities for the future...", 77.

¹⁰⁶ Knitter, "Responsibilities for the future...", 77.

¹⁰⁷ Knitter, "Responsibilities for the future...", 77.

from our world, then they have a shared reference point from which to affirm or criticize each other's claims."¹⁰⁸ In this way, "immediate solutions to interreligious disagreements" are not provided but a "path toward solutions" is made possible.¹⁰⁹

Similarly, inter-religious scholar Hendrik Vroom asks a pertinent question: Is right conduct the criterion for true religion?¹¹⁰ In working out answers to this question, Vroom refers to Knitter who names this particular criterion as being a "message [which promotes] the psychological health of individuals, their sense of value, purpose, [and] freedom...[promoting] the welfare, the liberation, of all peoples, integrating individual persons and nations into a larger community."¹¹¹ Furthermore, Vroom highlights Knitter's argument emphasizing liberation as "the possibility for religious traditions to understand one another [which] lies in a 'communion of liberative praxis'," making dialogue, then, a "'shared praxis' from which a 'communication in doctrine' is possible."¹¹²

Vroom's assertions concerning right conduct are valuable. In this approach, the test of healthy theology is based in how it is practiced and the effects it has not only on the believers themselves, but also on those around them. Therefore, if one were to form an inter-religious theology around the concept of protective hospitality, it can best be tested as it is formed into an inter-religious ethic.¹¹³ If a theology has no valuable, corresponding ethic, that theology is practically meaningless. Conversely, if an ethic has no underlying system of belief,¹¹⁴ it is often empty and simply duty for duty's

¹⁰⁸ Knitter, "Responsibilities for the future...", 85.

¹⁰⁹ Knitter, "Responsibilities for the future...", 85.

¹¹⁰ Hendrik M. Vroom, "Right Conduct as a Criterion for True Religion," in *Inter-Religious Models and Criteria*, J. Kellenberger, ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 107.

¹¹¹ Paul Knitter, *No Other Name?*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985), 231. Also referred to in Vroom, "Right Conduct...", 107.

¹¹² Knitter, "Toward a Liberation Theology of Religions," in *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*, John Hick and P.F. Knitter, eds. (New York: Orbis, 1987), 183. Also referred to in Vroom, "Right Conduct...", 107.

¹¹³ With 'ethic' being defined as the code of behavior one has toward others – both on an individual and societal/communal level.

¹¹⁴ Whether it be based in 'theology' per se – meaning a belief in God and a view of God's place in the world – or in humanism or some other similar value system.

sake.¹¹⁵ In this way, religious ethics are deeply rooted in spiritual belief and practice and to separate the two is to misrepresent both.¹¹⁶ Theory and practice, or theology and ethics, “mutually drive each other forward” and “do not belong in two different kingdoms,” but at the same time, they also “never wholly correspond with each other...[and] do not come to a unity in history.”¹¹⁷ Instead, as Jürgen Moltmann asserts, theology and ethics “constantly overlap so that theory must incorporate practice and practice must incorporate theory.”¹¹⁸

Furthermore, a cooperative ethical hermeneutic rooted in Abrahamic theologies takes into account and shows sensitivity to the diversity of traditions and approaches found in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. All three traditions uphold the imperative of “prophetic responsibility” when it comes to developing the links between theology and ethics,¹¹⁹ and yet each is particular in how that prophetic responsibility is carried out. As such, the effort toward pluralism in order to illustrate the positive potential for an Abrahamic theology and ethic of protective hospitality needs to consider those particularities and the “apparent mutual incompatibility of cultures and religions, presenting its ethical credentials precisely in its sensitivity to differences and its solidarity with the marginalised.”¹²⁰

While they are often unable to be uniformly changed, particularities can be “imaginatively transcend[ed]” when it is realized that “there are aspects of them which are philosophically limited or ethically unsatisfactory.”¹²¹ It is here where the cooperative and inter-religious nature of this ethical formation is useful, in that where there are weaknesses in one tradition, another tradition may be utilized in order to teach, challenge, and

¹¹⁵ However, duty for duty’s sake should not be summarily discounted, as it is a recognized value system stemming most familiarly from the work of Immanuel Kant and the development of deontological ethics. Despite its noble intent, it does not, nevertheless, point to the ideal of religiously-motivated ethics and lacks in authority to maintain practice, particularly in more dangerous or conflicted contexts.

¹¹⁶ D’Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 84-85.

¹¹⁷ Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, 107-108.

¹¹⁸ Moltmann, *On Human Dignity*, 107-108.

¹¹⁹ Farid Esack, *Qur’an, Liberation and Pluralism*, 17.

¹²⁰ D’Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 60-61.

¹²¹ D’Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 99-100

strengthen. D'Arcy May considers this in the context of inter-religious communication, noting interaction between traditions "can transform both persons and situations...[because] by acting together on behalf of the suffering ... religious people, no matter how different their backgrounds, truly come to know what they believe."¹²²

D'Arcy May's consideration of inter-religious communication necessitates a discussion related to the method of inter-religious hermeneutics in general. There are a variety of ways in which inter-religious communication takes place. Comparative theologian Catherine Cornille identifies them as the following:

- 1) the hermeneutical retrieval of resources for dialogue within one's own tradition;
- 2) the pursuit of proper understanding of the other;
- 3) the appropriation and reinterpretation of the other within one's own religious framework; and
- 4) the borrowing of hermeneutical principles of another religion.¹²³

The first approach identified by Cornille emphasizes the internal dialogue – or intrareligious dialogue – that occurs as a result of exposure to or desire to interact with the other. As a result, a number of hermeneutical tools may be utilized to examine the resources within one's own tradition that may inform and foster "greater openness toward other religions."¹²⁴ This research relies upon the conversations previously conducted within the boundaries of this approach in each of the traditions and upon the centuries of theological debate that has addressed issues of exclusivism and pluralism, and discussions of supercessionism, soteriology, revelation, and religious authority.

The second approach is, perhaps, the most common hermeneutic in inter-religious dialogue as it focuses upon learning about the other as a means of gaining understanding. The Qur'anic admonition that each tradition was created "so that you may know one another" encapsulates such an

¹²² D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 99-100

¹²³ Catherine Cornille, "Introduction: On Hermeneutics in Dialogue," in *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. (Eugene: Cascade, 2010), x.

¹²⁴ Cornille, "Introduction," xi.

approach.”¹²⁵ Yet, over the years, optimism has battled with pessimism as to whether or not such understanding can ever really be achieved. Cornille points out that the experimental and affective dimensions of inter-religious study where ideas and teachings that resonate with one’s experience are secondary to “rational comprehension or historical knowledge”¹²⁶ have been neglected.

Yet, comparative theologian Samuel Youngs argues such a process is becoming more popular as the global nature of “contemporary religious and secular pluralism...is having a marked influence on the ways in which academia studies religion and theology,” causing a move “beyond a typically Christian way of studying religion and theology in order to advocate a more sympathetic outlook and approach with regard to other religions.”¹²⁷ Youngs identifies this process as one whereby “a religious scholar or theologian reaches out from their own faith tradition – without denying that tradition – in order to intentionally and sympathetically interact and exchange with other systems of theological belief in a comparative way.”¹²⁸

The third approach looks to gain “not only proper understanding of the other religion but also mutual enrichment and growth in truth” through appropriation and reinterpretation.¹²⁹ It looks for the original meanings in the religious contexts from which certain truths and teachings arise, while utilizing those same teachings to enhance, challenge or integrate into one’s own religious tradition. In this approach, there is the acknowledgement that traditions borrow from, are in conversation with, and transform because of other traditions, both from within and without. Some find this approach disturbing, labeling such practices as syncretism, spiritual colonization, or

¹²⁵ Qur’an 49:13. Muslim scholar Reza Shah-Kazemi notes the Arabic meaning for *ta’arafu*, meaning “know one another” does not refer only to “knowledge in the ordinary sense, but to spiritual knowledge.” See Shah-Kazemi, “Light upon Light? The Qur’an and the Gospel of St. John,” in Cornille and Conway, *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, 121.

¹²⁶ Cornille, “Introduction,” xv-xvi. Cornille has written about this further in her book *The Im-Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue* (New York: Crossroad, 2008), 137-176.

¹²⁷ Byrne, *The Names of God*, 3 referring to the work of Samuel Youngs, “The frontier of comparative theology,” *Journal of Comparative Theology*, March (2010), 1-10.

¹²⁸ Youngs, “The frontier of comparative theology,” 4. Also referred to in Byrne, *The Names of God*, 3.

¹²⁹ Cornille, “Introduction,” xvii.

simple theft. The comparative theologian Francis Clooney writes of the “persistent colonialist tendency to co-opt...others, consuming them simply for our own purposes.”¹³⁰ His concern is valid and should serve as a corrective, ensuring appropriation is not consumption, but careful consideration, dialogue, and integration for shared benefit. However, from a more positive perspective, this particular inter-religious hermeneutic, Cornille asserts, also has a greater capacity to “lead to the rediscovery of certain forgotten, neglected, or implicit dimensions”¹³¹ in the traditions being explored and providing “opportunity for continuous growth.”¹³² Ricoeur’s version of linguistic hospitality most likely resembles appropriation¹³³ according to Ricoeur scholar Marianne Moyaert who notes appropriation is “never an act of ‘absorption,’ but rather the reception of the other as other” requiring a willingness on the part of the host “to undergo a form of alienation...[presuming] expropriation...[and] becoming oneself another.”¹³⁴

The final inter-religious hermeneutic appropriates particular skills and hermeneutical tools used in one tradition for use in another. Such an approach can be seen in the practice of applying the Jewish tradition of midrash to non-Jewish texts, or as is the case in this dissertation, applying the hermeneutical tools of Christian political theology to assist in interpretation of Jewish and Muslim sources as they pertain to the practice of hospitality.

Nevertheless, of the approaches explored here, the third inter-religious hermeneutic, which seeks to gain understanding of other traditions while using that understanding to sharpen and enrich one’s own, has the greatest resonance with the approach adopted here. While elements from the other approaches will be utilized, as has been noted, the majority of the

¹³⁰ Clooney, *Comparative Theology*, 52.

¹³¹ Cornille, “Introduction,” xviii.

¹³² Cornille, “Introduction,” xix.

¹³³ This will be discussed later in this chapter in the context of a hermeneutic of hospitality.

¹³⁴ Marianne Moyaert, “Absorption or Hospitality: Two Approaches to the Tension between Identity and Alterity,” in *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010), 85. See also Moyaert, “The (Un-)translatability of Religions? Ricoeur’s Linguistic Hospitality as a Model for Inter-Religious Dialogue,” *Exchange*, 37 (2008): 337-364.

work presented here seeks to rediscover the tradition of hospitality in the Christian tradition while utilizing the traditions of Judaism and Islam to identify the gaps that need to be addressed. This particular approach will, however, inevitably lead to further identification of complementarity present in the three traditions that provides material for meaningful dialogue, cooperative theological development, and faithful social action.¹³⁵

D'Arcy May helpfully sheds light on the cooperative nature of shared religious life together by exploring the language used. Borrowed from the language of science, inter-religious concepts of "complementarity" and "symbiosis" are necessary as they emphasize the role of imagining, theorizing, and building models where "two organisms need to engage in an exchange of life-giving substances with one another in order that both may survive."¹³⁶ Building upon this, D'Arcy May asserts two other ideas for inter-religious life borrow from science: "synthesis" in which "elements combine to create a substance which contains the old elements in a new form"¹³⁷ and, what D'Arcy May calls, a corresponding "osmosis of discourse"¹³⁸ in which religious ideas maintain individual identity but move through their self-identifying boundaries in order to borrow and use language, theological formulations, and ethics of other traditions that can provide new ideas and ways of being faithful.

Furthermore, D'Arcy May highlights the "danger of dualism" that can often be found in inter-religious dialogue where distinct entities enter into relationship under the auspices of "us" and "them."¹³⁹ To counteract this,

¹³⁵ I do, however, admit that the more orthodox or fundamentalist/conservative branches of Christianity, Judaism and Islam may take issue with some approaches and assumptions found in this research. As there is no monolithic expression of religious adherence, this is unavoidable. Nevertheless, all three traditions have theological traditions related to liberation and feminist theology which have more in common with one another than differentiation. See page 37, fn 88 in this chapter for a list of feminist and liberationist sources in Judaism and Islam.

¹³⁶ D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 57.

¹³⁷ D'Arcy May explains this further by giving examples: "Zen Christianity pioneered by Hugo Enomiya-Lasalle SJ...the universalist and peaceable Baha'i faith as a transmutation of Islam; the incorporation of traditional and Christian rituals in the African Independent Churches." D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 57.

¹³⁸ D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 58-59.

¹³⁹ D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 70-71.

D'Arcy May suggests dialogue not be "merely the reciprocal presentation of proposals for belief, but the profoundly religious act of making oneself able to welcome the stranger by facing the alien in oneself," as difference "becomes an agent of self-discovery and a source of mutual enrichment."¹⁴⁰ Indeed, D'Arcy May says, "[o]ur own spirituality is neither fully real nor genuinely autonomous until we acknowledge that other people's can be too" and, therefore, we "must be strong enough not only for the dialogue of like with like, but for the encounter of unlike with unlike."¹⁴¹

No religious tradition is monolithic and unchanging. Every religious tradition including Christianity's claim to *ecclesia semper reformando* undergoes reformation as it encounters new questions, challenges and contexts.¹⁴² Furthermore, inter-religious scholar James Heft concludes it "is the *responsibility* of each religion to correct itself, to perform the sacred task of self-criticism."¹⁴³ For this to happen, dialogue needs to take place and new ideas need to be disseminated, allowing for a "new consensus of authorities that will not tolerate" inherited claims to be developed.¹⁴⁴ As a result of this reformation in each tradition, it may very well come to light that those adherents who move toward justice-oriented theologies feel as if they have more in common with believers from other religious traditions "than they have with members of their own communities" who are not concerned with the same issues.¹⁴⁵ Such realities require further encounter with the religious other and dialogue in order to build stronger frameworks for shared action.

Welcoming the religious other is an essential premise of this research. This is exhibited not only in the approach by interacting with other traditions

¹⁴⁰ D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 80.

¹⁴¹ D'Arcy May, *After Pluralism*, 80.

¹⁴² Thomas E. Reynolds, "Improvising together: Christian solidarity and hospitality as jazz performance," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 43/1 (1 December 2008), 62.

¹⁴³ James L. Heft, "Introduction: Resources for Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity and Islam," in *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, James L. Heft, ed. (New York: Fordham, 2004), in 7. Italics added.

¹⁴⁴ Irving Greenberg, "Religion as a Force for Reconciliation and Peace: A Jewish Analysis," in *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, James L. Heft, ed. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 101.

¹⁴⁵ Selwyn Gross, O.P., "Religious Pluralism in Struggles for Justice," *New Blackfriars* 71 (841), 2 in Esack, *Qur'an, Liberation and Pluralism*, 1.

in the theological analysis of protective hospitality, but also in the case studies which will provide examples where the religious other was welcomed and given refuge in a context of conflict. On a theoretical level, however, some find this welcome difficult particularly in relation to exclusivist truth claims. Nevertheless, welcome should not be dependent upon these claims. Instead, the welcome of religious others acts as “subversive presences” where traditions “embark [with one another] on a dialogue of life and of thought, a theological and philosophical negotiation.”¹⁴⁶ In light of this, Catholic inter-religious scholar Joseph Stephen O’Leary speaks of the unavoidability of complementary theological dialogue by stating:

Radically to separate the religions is impossible. Their roots intertwine. Their lights are always ready to blend, even across thick veils of language...Thus any attempt to judge, or reject, the other religions in the light of a single one elevated to normative status comes undone. A religious tradition is not a cathedral which contains everything, but a crossroads open to everything. Every religion...has a police which guards its frontiers; this theological vigilance is a necessary precaution, but of uncertain effect, for spiritual movements are characterised by great permeability, so that [each religion] is incessantly transforming itself in response to the pressure of all the currents of the surrounding culture and of newly encountered foreign cultures.¹⁴⁷

Likewise, the differences between each religious tradition are changing. Each generation sees what differentiates one faith from another in disparate ways. Those changes, in turn, then have the potential to “challenge even our most treasured assumptions about interreligious hermeneutical methods and possibilities.”¹⁴⁸ As such, this research seeks to voice some of those challenges and highlight new possibilities.

¹⁴⁶ Joseph Stephen O’Leary, *Religious Pluralism and Christian Truth*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 1.

¹⁴⁷ O’Leary, *Religious Pluralism and Christian Truth*, 14-15.

¹⁴⁸ Werner G. Jeanrond, “Toward an Interreligious Hermeneutics of Love,” in *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, Cornille and Conway, eds. (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010), 45

b. Towards an Abrahamic Approach

The use of the term “Abrahamic” is widespread, most often applying to the traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.¹⁴⁹ It refers to the religions that look to a common spiritual ancestor in the person of Abraham, whose narrative is found in the Torah, the Bible, and the Qur’an, and that claim to worship the God of Abraham and follow his spiritual tradition of monotheism also referenced in these texts.¹⁵⁰

There are several practical reasons why I choose to use the term “Abrahamic.” Firstly, using “Abrahamic” is a stylistic convenience. To refer each time to the traditions highlighted in this research as “Judaism, Christianity, and Islam” is unwieldy. The only other shorter term used to refer to these three traditions is the blandly generic “monotheist traditions,” which lacks the convenient and applicable emphasis upon Abraham and the impression of common roots and heritage. Secondly, to embrace all religions would be too broad for the scope of this research. Furthermore, by using the term, there is recognition of a level of debate that already exists as to what *Abrahamic* entails and a decision to follow the common usage, which refers to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as the primary Abrahamic family of faith.¹⁵¹ Thirdly, the person of Abraham in these three traditions is emphasized and is a “point of reference” by which each community “can and must be measured

¹⁴⁹ There are other traditions that also see themselves as Abrahamic, such as Ba’hai, Druze and Rastafarianism. However, usage within this research restricts itself to (what so far are) the more widely-used categorical definition which restricts Abrahamic to Judaism, Christianity and Islam as found in works such as David Burrell, ed. *The Abrahamic Dialogues* series (New York: Fordham Press) and developers of the Scriptural Reasoning movement Peter Ochs and his shared work with William Stacy Johnson, eds., *Crisis, Call and Leadership in the Abrahamic Traditions*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); and Michael L. Fitzgerald, “Relations among the Abrahamic Religions: A Catholic Point of View,” in Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds. *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Martin Goodman, Geurt Hendrik van Kooten, and J van Ruiten, *Abraham, the nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic perspectives on kinship with Abraham*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

¹⁵¹ Cf. Lewis Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility: The Promise of Dialogue Among Christians, Jews, and Muslims*, (New York: Continuum, 2008), and Leonard Swidler, “Triologue: out of the shadows into blazing “desert” sun,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 45/3 (1 June 2010): 493-509.

critically,”¹⁵² particularly in relation to conversations about hospitality that will be the specific focus of this research.

In the vein of O’Leary’s statement about the intertwined roots of religious traditions, the intertwined relationship between the three monotheistic Abrahamic traditions has been chosen for three reasons. First, to concentrate solely on Christianity would give a myopic view of a rich tradition – that is, hospitality - found in a variety of religious cultures that has transformative potential worldwide. Second, ecumenical and Abrahamic scholar Lewis Mudge points to the Abrahamic traditions as being “among the worst religious troublemakers through the centuries” despite the fact that “these three faiths are historically interrelated and look to overlapping scriptures... [suggesting] that there is potential...among them for something new.”¹⁵³ Last, to focus on the specific commonalities of the Abrahamic traditions have regarding hospitality – especially when the common patriarch of Abraham is held up as an example of one who gives hospitality – provides a good test case for the development of an Abrahamic theology and ethic of protective hospitality that will hopefully be a model for further values and practices in religious traditions for common social benefit.

The role these Abrahamic traditions play in the public, globalized sphere have tremendous importance in the societies in which they are found. Unfortunately, the impression the traditions and their respective adherents have created has been largely negative.¹⁵⁴ Since the Abrahamic traditions are, to reiterate Mudge’s assertion, “among the worst religious troublemakers through the centuries,”¹⁵⁵ it seems only right these three traditions also cooperate with one another in order to address particular

¹⁵² Karl-Joseph Kuschel, *Abraham: Sign of Hope for Jews, Christians and Muslims*, (London: Continuum, 1995), 204.

¹⁵³ Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility*, 4 quoting Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 10-11, 157-158. While the Abrahamic traditions are very similar in many ways, Judaism, Christianity and Islam are still very different religions. Therefore, this work treads a fine line as it seeks to highlight common belief and practice while honoring each tradition’s particularity.

¹⁵⁴ Particularly in light of current events as seen in global terrorism, the liberal vs. conservative religion wars in U.S. culture and politics, and issues related to Israel/Palestine, all of which are arguably caught up in one another.

¹⁵⁵ Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility*, 4.

grievances. Much needs to be done to heal the wounds that have been inflicted over the centuries; yet, one must start somewhere constructive. Cooperating with one another, particularly in areas that have the potential to heal and reconcile such as the practice of protective hospitality, has tremendous power to provide an alternative vision of religious life together.

Conflict and competition are not the sole means of relating to one another. This research seeks to examine complementarity, collaboration, and cooperation as transformative and effective methods for the Abrahamic traditions. This complementarity, collaboration, and cooperation has the positive potential to enable the Abrahamic traditions to be in relationship with one another, seeking the welfare of the other through welcome, sustenance, dialogue and the provision of safe space.

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam each consider Abraham to have been a friend of God¹⁵⁶ who embraced his identity as a “stranger and sojourner, a displaced person whose homeland lay elsewhere.”¹⁵⁷ The friendship between God and Abraham was not characterized as one of exclusion, but as one rooted in Abraham’s identity as a stranger wherein he was “impelled by his trusting relationship with God to intercede for those who are in need...someone who is open to the needs of his brothers and sisters.”¹⁵⁸ To be called the children of Abraham implies the same devotion to caring for others.¹⁵⁹

In Islam, the Arabic name for Abraham is *Ibrahim* and later tradition interpreted the name to mean *ab Rahim*, which translates to “compassionate father.”¹⁶⁰ This interpretative tradition sees Abraham and his wife Sarah as the parents of those in need of parents in paradise.¹⁶¹ Abraham is the “father

¹⁵⁶ II Chron 20:7; Isa 41:8; Jas 2:23; Qur’an 4:125.

¹⁵⁷ Kuschel, *Abraham*, 14.

¹⁵⁸ Michael L. Fitzgerald, “Relations among the Abrahamic Religions: A Catholic Point of View,” in Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds. *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005), 75

¹⁵⁹ Michael L. Fitzgerald, “Relations among the Abrahamic Religions...”, 75.

¹⁶⁰ Mahmoud M. Ayoub, “Abraham and His Children: Reply,” in *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*, Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds., (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005), 122.

¹⁶¹ The Qur’an version of the story of Hagar does not depict Abraham turning his back on her and casting her off as the Torah does. Instead, he leaves, trusting God to take

to those who have no father...[and] is the embodiment of the Qur'anic injunction to care for the orphans and the needy."¹⁶²

As such, the Abrahamic traditions require its adherents be their brothers' and sisters' keepers. One is bound to another and religious practice is made more relevant when attention is given to "the insights, symbols, ethical demands and religious practices of other religions and alternative movements," not in an effort to replace one's own but to complement, enrich and challenge it.¹⁶³ Given the inter-relatedness of these traditions, Mudge noted "there is potential, some of it already beginning to be realized, among them for something new, for what Hannah Arendt calls 'natality,' to arise on the stage of history."¹⁶⁴ This research builds upon that natality, to offer a possible model from which other complementary theologies and cooperative ethics from these traditions can be born.

c. Towards a Hospitable Approach

A distinctive aim of this dissertation is to explore the traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam and their theology and practice of protective hospitality, but it also is an endeavor in hospitality in itself. The work is rooted in a self-consciously Christian theological tradition. Yet, to be hospitable in its approach, this research also requires a certain level of openness, accessibility, and welcome in one's method, structure, and language. This is particularly necessary as this research addresses the belief and practices of other traditions beyond Christianity, while seeking to give a voice to the needs of the threatened stranger, and generate shared interest in growing alongside others through cooperative efforts of protective

care of her and she acknowledged that if what he was doing was because of the bidding of God, that would happen. She has more agency in the Islamic tradition than in the Jewish and Christian versions.

¹⁶² Mahmoud M. Ayoub, "Abraham and His Children...," 122.

¹⁶³ Hans Kung, *Islam: Past, Present and Future*, John Bowden, trans., (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 651-652.

¹⁶⁴ Arendt describes natality as the state where each birth represents a new beginning, and as such, the potential for newness and novelty to enter the world with each birth. Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility*, 4 quoting Arendt, *Human Condition*, 10-11, 157-158.

hospitality. Therefore, this work will be an exercise in Christian hospitality in the spirit of philosopher Paul Ricoeur's idea of linguistic hospitality as discussed by inter-religious scholar Marianne Moyaert, where the foreign is welcomed and aims of perfection in translation and interpretation are set aside for greater meaning and context.¹⁶⁵

One could proceed along the route whereby religious identity is protected and preserved,¹⁶⁶ and inter-religious contact is for the benefit of strengthening one's own identity.¹⁶⁷ Philosopher Paul Ricoeur referred to this need to protect identities, namely by withdrawal into one's own linguistic tradition, as the "theological exemplification of a resurgence of sectarianism and tribalism...[wherein the] protective withdrawal is prompted by a fear of otherness."¹⁶⁸ In contrast, a Christian theology of hospitality can reach out to other traditions by means of mutual encouragement, challenge, and integration as an act of hospitality.

Ricoeur looks to hospitality as "a model for integrating identity and otherness", recognizing the practice of hospitality is embedded in the recognition that "we all belong to the human family" and is encapsulated by "showing concern for a concrete other because she or he is human."¹⁶⁹ As such, hospitality is antithetical to sectarianism or tribalism.¹⁷⁰ Furthermore, Moyaert claims that where "tribalism locks the community safely into a given tradition, the praxis of...hospitality calls for another approach: 'that of taking responsibility in *imagination* and *sympathy*, for the story of the other.'¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Paul Ricoeur, *On Translation*, Eileen Brennan, trans. (London: Routledge, 2006).

¹⁶⁶ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 64.

¹⁶⁷ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 67 referring to George A. Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 54-55, 61-62.

¹⁶⁸ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 75, referring to Paul Ricoeur, "Universality and the Power of Difference," in *On Paul Ricoeur: The Owl of Minerva*, Richard Kearney, ed. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 146.

¹⁶⁹ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 83. Moyaert says this in the context of discussing Ricoeur, "Reflections on a New Ethos for Europe," in *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action*, Richard Kearney, ed., Philosophy and Social Criticism, (London: Sage, 1996), 4-6.

¹⁷⁰ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 83.

¹⁷¹ Ricoeur, "Reflections on a New Ethos for Europe," 7 in Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 85.

In the context of the inter-religious nature of this research, the applicability of Ricoeur's idea of "linguistic hospitality" is appropriate. As one considers examining the traditions of the religious other, such approaches are, in essence, "translating the untranslatable, commensurating the incommensurable, and comparing the incomparable."¹⁷² Ricoeur's idea of linguistic hospitality accepts the need for the other in development of religious traditions and that the "denial of translation equals the refusal to recognize what is foreign as a challenge and a source of nourishment for one's own 'religious identity.'"¹⁷³

Instead of being "one more form of colonizing the other," this dissertation seeks to hold to Ricoeur's argument that the "model of hospitality implies a reciprocal process: 'it is really a matter of living with the other in order to take that other into one's home as a guest.'"¹⁷⁴ For Ricoeur, linguistic hospitality "is the act of inhabiting the word of the Other paralleled by the act of receiving the word of the other into one's own home, one's own dwelling."¹⁷⁵

As such, the hope is that a prevailing hermeneutic of hospitality is visible in this research. Rather than absorption or colonization,¹⁷⁶ where ideas, texts or traditions are taken without regard for their original context or meaning to its followers, this research instead seeks to take the texts and traditions of Judaism and Islam pertaining to protective hospitality into my Christian "home"; to treat them as guests; to question, find complementarity with, recognize the humanity in, and accept gifts from them as they challenge and add to my own as a result of this interaction.

¹⁷² Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 84.

¹⁷³ Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 84, referring to Ricoeur's ideas presented in both "New Ethos for Europe," 4 and *On Translation*, 4.

¹⁷⁴ Ricoeur, "Reflections on a New Ethos for Europe," 5 in Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 85.

¹⁷⁵ Ricoeur, *On Translation*, Eileen Brennan, trans., *Thinking in Action* (London: Routledge, 2006), 10 in Moyaert, "Absorption or Hospitality," 85.

¹⁷⁶ For significant work on the issue of colonization, see Edward Said, *Edward Said: A Critical Reader*. Michael Sprinker, ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackball, 1992).

Conclusion

This research does not exist in a vacuum. It is real, endeavoring to address real issues, real contexts, real belief, and real dangers in relation to protective hospitality as it is practiced among the Abrahamic traditions.

The two currents in contemporary Christian theologies presented in this chapter have provided the framework for what is to follow. The two brief case studies of Le Chambon and the Sanctuary Movement and the reality of protective hospitality they present have offered an initial reference point for the discussions in Chapters Two - Five ahead of the extended case study of Bosnia presented in Chapter Six. By focusing upon the tools in political theology, and more specifically in liberation and feminist theology, the work has emphasized a contextual and political approach to theology. By exploring the inter-religious and Abrahamic dimensions of this debate, the approach has highlighted the complementary and cooperative nature of this research and its applicability within Christian theology in a pluralist world. Moreover, by striving to be a practice of hospitality itself, this research has sought to embody the methodology it advocates, to give a theological voice to Abrahamic protective hospitality that interrogates its tradition, while also being creative and constructive in its analysis.

**CHAPTER TWO:
EXTENDING HOSPITALITY: HOSPITALITY AS ETHICAL PRACTICE**

...to be moral is to be hospitable to the stranger.

- Thomas Ogletree¹

Introduction

Before undertaking theological analysis and reflection of protective hospitality, there needs to be an examination of what hospitality is and is not. This chapter explores the various understandings and discussions about hospitality and details the contributing factors that inform ideas and convictions regarding its practice. The first section of this chapter will investigate the meanings of hospitality. More specifically, it will analyze the linguistic roots and etymological dimensions of hospitality and then consider the various tensions found in it that lend further meaning to the practice of hospitality.

The second section will identify overarching themes – from the more obvious themes of food and drink, to the lesser-identified but equally important themes around intellectual welcome and provision of protection - found in the practice of hospitality. This section will draw the links between hospitality in general and the particular issues of protection that will be examined later in this research.

The third section will make connections with regards to corresponding relationships and values in hospitality that inform its understanding and practice, particularly as this will set the stage for the Abrahamic traditions and their understanding of hospitality. Specifically, the relationship between hospitality and politics, tolerance, solidarity, and honor will be identified, building an analytic foundation for subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

¹ Thomas W. Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger: Dimension of Moral Understanding*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 1.

1. The Meaning of Hospitality

The literature on the subject of 'hospitality' offers no single definition. The discussions within the literature do, however, offer some commonalities in that all seem to use terms such as 'stranger', 'other', and 'welcome'. Exactly how those terms, in turn, are defined and connected together with some form of action makes defining hospitality all the more difficult. Meanwhile, there are consequences to the fact that there is no single definition, mainly found in the variety of ways in which hospitality is discussed while lacking a cohesive sense of authority and practice in communities. Therefore, instead of looking for a definition of hospitality, it is more beneficial to explore the meaning of hospitality.²

In general, hospitality connotes ideas of welcome and openness to others. However, the full extent of this welcome and openness is difficult to define. Is hospitality simply the act of welcoming or is it welcoming *in* of others? Of what does 'openness' consist and how does one practice it? Furthermore, there are questions related to the issue of space and mastery over that space, as well as factors to be determined in order to differentiate genuine hospitality from superficial hospitality. Lastly, to whom should hospitality be extended and what boundaries, if any, are necessary? Questions such as these would be helpful to consider in order to understand the meaning of hospitality in the context of this research.

Deconstructionist philosopher John Caputo problematizes the understanding of the word "hospitality." He describes it as one of those "words that promise something that they do not quite deliver."³ He states that "[w]hat hospitality means seems simple enough: welcoming the other, welcoming the coming of the other into the same," but he remarks that when

² In contemporary understandings, 'hospitality' carries ideas of entertainment, reception, generosity, and friendliness. Out of these understandings arise the current uses that bring to mind what is known as the "hospitality industry," referring to hotels, restaurants, and other similar customer-service based businesses where food, drink, or accommodation is provided. Hospitable establishments greet guests (i.e., customers) with a smile and friendly service. Nevertheless, hospitality has a much wider meaning that does not necessarily involve business transactions or industrial standards.

³ John Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 75.

most try to be hospitable, one usually invites friends and those “whose company we enjoy and from whom we can expect reciprocity...or else people whose favor we are currying.”⁴ Caputo argues that when hospitality is practiced in this manner “there is a good deal of inhospitality built into our hospitality” as it tightens the “circle of the same” and only welcomes those “who are welcome to begin with, not those who are unwelcome.”⁵

Secondly, it can be ascertained from a variety of sources that interaction with the “other”⁶ is the hinge upon which hospitality swings. Welcome is irrelevant if there is no one to whom it is extended. But who, then, is the other in this context? Furthermore, in light of Caputo’s observations above, is hospitality or one’s imperfect, limited, and short-sighted practice of it being defined? Liberation theologian Leonardo Boff asserts hospitality is “always defined by the other,” and gives the following outline as to who the other is:

- 1) the other who is unknown, and who knocks at the door; (2) the other who is a foreigner, who comes from another country, speaks another language, has different habits and culture; (3) the other who belongs to a different social class and lives in poverty; (4) the other who has been snubbed by society, who is in need, tired, and starving; (5) the other who is the radical Other, who is God hidden behind the figure of two wandering people.⁷

For Boff, hospitality “applies to all kinds of the other.”⁸ Furthermore, Boff argues hospitality implies “overcoming certain attitudes, which are loaded with reserve and fear, that are present in people who are extremely cautious

⁴ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, 75-76.

⁵ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, 76.

⁶ In the literature, the use of the word “other” refers to anyone other than oneself, usually connoting a sense of strangeness or something that is not completely known. It can be understood as simple or as complex as one chooses as it is a very broad term. At times, it is capitalized – “Other” – and many refer back to Emmanuel Levinas as the one who has informed their understanding of what “Other/other” means. For simplicity and consistency’s sake, I will use the lowercase version. For more information, see Emmanuel Levinas’ *Time and the Other*, Richard A. Cohen, trans. (Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987) or *Humanism of the Other*, Nidra Poller, trans. (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2005).

⁷ Leonardo Boff, *Virtues: For Another Possible World*, (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011), 48-49.

⁸ Boff, *Virtues*, 48-49.

and suspicious.”⁹ Constantly questioning if people can be trusted and suspecting threat upon an encounter with the unknown stranger does not embody the practice of hospitality according to Boff.¹⁰

To further complicate matters, Caputo expands his earlier question by asking “if hospitality is what we say it is – that is, welcoming the other – then ought it not be a matter of welcoming those who are unwelcome...[and] extended beyond our friends to our enemies?”¹¹ This inclusion of enemies as the other is an important, as well as often overlooked, factor in the consideration of hospitality. Caputo’s admonition that one should extend welcome to those who are unwelcomed is a demanding prospect for most, and rightly so. Questions related to risk and violence are appropriate and the harsh realities of welcoming the unwelcomed and uninvited will be explored later.¹² Nevertheless, the definition of hospitality calls one to consider the extent to which one welcomes those outside of one’s comfort zone, those who are not the same and are among those who make one uncomfortable.¹³

Thirdly, a continued exploration of the definition of hospitality leads to the consideration of space.¹⁴ The practice of hospitality involves inextricable links to the space in which it is expressed; to practice hospitality is to welcome others into what will become a shared space with the presence of another. The limits on such space are few, however. It can be real or imagined, public or private, permanent or temporary, and yet common space

⁹ Boff, *Virtues*, 49.

¹⁰ Boff, *Virtues*, 49.

¹¹ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, 76.

¹² This will be analyzed in more detail in Chapter Four.

¹³ Leonardo Boff refers to the understood others, particularly during the Crusades (i.e. Muslims) and the colonial era (i.e. indigenous peoples), but he also refers to the Earth as being a “new other” in our current context. Where peoples were once exploited, in the last few centuries, humanity has moved to the Earth as the resource to be exploited, making it the new other. He states “[t]his understanding of the Earth as the other who should be subjugated broke up the natural alliance between the human being and nature and the Earth. By breaking up this natural pact we placed ourselves above nature and the Earth and as such we are no longer with and within nature and the Earth. We have exiled ourselves from the Earth and we have separated ourselves from the community of life, of which we are but a link and a representative among others.” Boff, *Virtues*, 77.

¹⁴ This will also be given more detailed analysis in Chapter Four in the context of place, home, and boundaries.

is necessary in that it creates an environment where welcome and freedom can dwell.¹⁵

Tending to space that is potentially shared in order to encounter others is part of the essence of hospitality.¹⁶ With it comes a need for intentionality and responsibility with regards to practicing hospitality, creating spaces where the other – the stranger, foreigner, enemy, the oppressed and marginalized, the unwelcome - is welcomed.¹⁷ In this response to the other, “one’s ultimate calling and obligation...is to provide the space and hope for that Other to unfold and reveal his or her naked identities – while still remaining an Other – a distinct, autonomous being.”¹⁸ Similarly, one might say hospitality is “primarily the creation of a free space where the stranger can enter and become a friend instead of an enemy...not to change people, but to offer them space where change can take place.”¹⁹ Similarly, Boff argues that hospitality “is to welcome the stranger just as the stranger presents itself...without need to place the stranger within the acceptable framework of the community.”²⁰ Such an assertion echoes Nouwen’s claim that hospitality is not about changing the other, but securing space where “openness, courage to face and overcome strangeness” is allowed to transform “fear, suspicion, disconnection, and even rejection of the other.”²¹ In this way, it appears true hospitality is then contingent upon space and the possibility of transformation, as well as the other and welcome.

Likewise, the relationship to justice, truthfulness, and courage in the practice of hospitality is essential if there is to be space for transformation. In order for the other to feel safe to reveal one’s “naked identity” and to be heard, justice, in the form of being given the status of a valuable “equal

¹⁵ Arthur Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger: A Christian Theology of Hospitality*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 2006), x.

¹⁶ Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger*, x.

¹⁷ Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger*, xiii.

¹⁸ Peter Admirand, “Healing the Distorted Face: Doctrinal Reinterpretation(s) and the Christian Response to the Other,” *One in Christ*, 42/2, 2008, 303.

¹⁹ Henri Nouwen, *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 51.

²⁰ Boff, *Virtues*, 68.

²¹ Boff, *Virtues*, 68.

partner,” as well as truth-telling and courage to submit oneself to another are required.²² Adherence to these values “indicates a receptivity and generosity of spirit that ‘welcomes’ the different” and “embodies an openness or availability to the other that lies at the core of...genuine communal solidarity.”²³ As such, Christian theologian Thomas Reynolds notes hospitality is “an ethical prescription built into the fabric of dwelling together” as it “acknowledges another as one’s neighbor, a potential brother or sister.”²⁴

a. The Linguistic Roots of Hospitality

While Caputo’s explorations of what hospitality means are valuable, it is also necessary to consider the linguistic roots of hospitality and how it has evolved in both perception and interpretation over the centuries. Oddly, it is only in the scholarship of French linguist Emile Benveniste, and its corresponding dissemination by literature scholar Tracy McNulty that the most detailed exploration of the linguistic roots of hospitality can be found.²⁵ Therefore, this section will focus upon their arguments, and will call on other sources where appropriate.

Benveniste begins by delineating the two original strands of contributing roots that make up “hospitality.” The first, *hostis*, implies “guest” or “host”²⁶ and, the second, identified as *pet-* or *pot-*, implies “master” and carries with it connotations of identity. The Latin *hospes* is formed from these two roots, put together as “*hosti-pet-s*.” It is from this

²² Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 54-55.

²³ Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 55.

²⁴ Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 55.

²⁵ In my research, these two sources are the most significant places where this information has been found. Jacques Derrida refers to Benveniste’s work in *Deconstruction in a Nutshell*, 110-112, but McNulty’s exploration is much more thorough. Unfortunately, Benveniste’s work is only available in French and, therefore, I am reliant upon McNulty’s references to it. Emile Benveniste, “L’hospitaite’,” in *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-europeennes*, vol.1 (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1969), 87-101 in McNulty, *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007). Other sources, such as George Newlands, *Hospitable God: The Transformative Dream*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), 29 mention the linguistic roots, but do not go into as much detail as Benveniste, Derrida or McNulty.

²⁶ As does the French term *hôte*.

construction that modern usage arises.²⁷ Consequently, this later Latin root is where most scholars begin without considering what contributed to its development.

One implication McNulty points out in her own research is that “before [a master] had any subjects, the master was his own subject, a subject properly speaking: the roots *-pet-*, *-pot-*, and *-pt-*, (Latin *-pte*, *i-pse*), originally signified ‘personal identity.’”²⁸ Therefore, in order to extend welcome to a guest, McNulty argues, one must have an identity, and, in ancient connotations, be linked in with a concept of home, the place from which “the master makes the law” or where the master “resides within an identity...[and] gathers together and disposes of what is proper to him.”²⁹ As a result, the “master is eminently himself [and] offers hospitality from the place where he is ‘at home.’”³⁰ In the spirit of McNulty’s argument, one could make a similar argument that if *hostis* is also used for “guest,” then in order to receive welcome, one must also have an identity that is linked to one’s home.

Yet, addressing the former primary root – *hostis* – is more complex than just “guest” and “host.” According to McNulty and Benveniste, the original idea of *hostis* “is that of reciprocity, or equality by compensation; *hostis* is he who compensates a gift with a counter-gift.”³¹ Because of this reciprocity, *hostis* “comes to designate both the host and the guest, who become identified as reciprocal positions by virtue of the obligation to counter the initial act of hospitality with gifts or later compensatory deeds.”³²

²⁷ Benveniste, “L’hospitaite’,” 87-101 in McNulty, viii-ix.

²⁸ McNulty, *The Hostess*, ix. While it goes beyond the remit of this thesis, McNulty’s related discussion of *ipseity* has been discussed more widely in the work of Paul Ricoeur. See John W. Van Den Hengel, “Paul Ricoeur’s Oneself as Another and Practical Theology,” *Theological Studies* 55/3 (1 September 1994): 458-480; Paul Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, Kathleen Blamey, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); and Seán Hand, “Working out interiority: locations and locutions of ipseity,” *Literature and Theology* 17/4 (2003): 422-434.

²⁹ McNulty, *The Hostess*, x.

³⁰ McNulty, *The Hostess*, x.

³¹ McNulty, *The Hostess*, x.

³² McNulty, *The Hostess*, x. This practice of compensating one for hospitality seems, however, to contradict an earlier assertion by McNulty where she states that “in religious myth, the hospitality act was forbidden to have any economic dimension.” (viii) How one can

Similarly, the French term *hôte* indicates “one who gives, *donne*, and the one who receives, *reçoit*, hospitality” and to forget the dual nature of the term “would be to erase the demand made by hospitality.”³³

Furthermore, McNulty argues that when *hostis* and *potis* are linked, what is found is a “union of two somewhat contradictory notions: a social or legal relationship defined by reciprocity and exchange, and despotic power, mastery and personal identity,” she further argues that it “implies not only the power of mastery, but power *over* the guest, by virtue of his debt or obligation to the host.”³⁴ With this linkage, further tensions are identified within hospitality wherein “notions of reciprocity or exchange and mastery or power” are explored which have the possibility of provoking instances of “anxiety, rivalry, or hostility, in which the host’s power over the guest is conceived in a threatening manner, or in which the guest threatens to overtake the host’s place as master by usurping his home, personal property, or social position.”³⁵

An evolution of definition and usage is visible from this point as one explores *hostis* in more recent contexts. Under Roman law, *hostis* was used to refer to “a resident foreigner invested with the same rights as Roman citizens, ‘equal’ under the law,” and whereby “it no longer names the stranger in general...[it does identify the] resident alien who has been recognized by and inscribed within the state...as having certain rights.”³⁶

But with this codification of Roman law related to strangers, McNulty details how *hostis* began to take on more negative meanings. Whereby previously *hostis* implied “an unlimited obligation” on the part of the host to

compensate for hospitality and yet hospitality was forbidden to have an economic dimension is unclear. Perhaps it is somehow related to when the guest is known to the host (as opposed to the unknown/divine stranger, beyond the initial aspect of hospitality there is no relationship)?

³³ Anidjar, “A Note on ‘Hostipitality,’” in Jacques Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, Gil Anidjar, ed., (New York: Routledge, 2002), 356. Anidjar writes the forward to Derrida’s *Acts of Religion* where Derrida coins the term “hostipitality” which is meant to capture this juxtapositional nature of hospitality as will be explored later and raise “in a radically new way the question of the subject of hospitality.”

³⁴ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xi.

³⁵ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xi. This possibility of anxiety or hostility is particularly of interest if the host/ess is providing protection for his/her guests.

³⁶ Benveniste, “L’hospitaite,” 93 in McNulty, *The Hostess*, xi.

extend welcome to the guest who was “upheld by sacred rites and protected by the vigilance of potent divinities,”³⁷ its usage evolved and later began to be “applied exclusively to ‘enemy’ and no longer names the guest.”³⁸

Concurrently, McNulty points out that the Greek term *xenos* came to be more popularly used “to mean ‘stranger’ to the exclusion of ‘guest.’”³⁹ Signaling a change in “civic or national attitude toward the stranger,” McNulty asserts, “explains how *hostis* became the linguistic root of ‘hostility,’ an affect that otherwise seems at odds with the institution of hospitality.”⁴⁰

In light of this evolution and eventual contradiction in meaning, the practice of hospitality as the conversion from “*hostis* to *hospes*” holds more weight if one sees it as the act whereby one cultivates safe spaces in which people can live lives free from fear and where transformation from enemy to guest can take place.⁴¹

b. The Tensions within Hospitality

When exploring the various understandings of hospitality, the seemingly contradictory nature of it and its practice begin to attract one’s attention. These understandings, however, are not contradictions as such, but more like juxtapositions that hold hospitality in tension with other related aspects of its practice. For example, the above exploration identifies links between hospitality and hostility, calling into question the balance of welcome and unwelcome, shaping identity and highlighting universality, inclusion and exclusion, embrace and coercion, protection and violence. How do the positive and negative co-exist within this realm of hospitality? It is this

³⁷ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xi.

³⁸ Benveniste, “L’hospitaite,” 95 in McNulty, *The Hostess*, xii.

³⁹ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xii.

⁴⁰ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xii. To further complicate things, McNulty also notes that from this, the “modern word ‘hostess’ is not a feminine form” of *hostis* in its original form.⁴⁰ Instead, it is a “corrupted form of ‘hostility.’” From this, she uses the biblical examples of Jael (Judg 4:17-5:27) and Judith (Judith 10-15) to illustrate the hostility of the feminine in a guest/host position. McNulty, xliii.

⁴¹ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 46. Such concepts are fascinating and will be explored in further detail in the following sections and in Chapter Four as the themes of violence and protection are given more specific attention.

tension that makes hospitality so difficult to define, and yet so powerful in its potential.

As conflicts related to identity formation are waged on both small and large scales throughout the world, McNulty's presentation of hospitality as "an act that constitutes identity"⁴² is informative. When home is being threatened, home can also be the place where the conflict can either be perpetuated or diminished. This contrasting idea of home is found in McNulty's research when she writes:

[Hospitality] is the act through which the home – and the homeland – constitutes itself in the gesture of turning to address its outside. But as an accidental encounter with what can be neither foreseen nor named, hospitality also insists on the primacy of immanent relations over identity. Hence, it both allows for the constitution of identity and challenges it, by suggesting that the home can also become unheimlich, estranged by the introduction of something foreign that threatens to contaminate or dissolve its identity.⁴³

In the end, it is how the foreign is considered and welcomed or unwelcomed that highlights some of the tensions within hospitality.

Similarly, McNulty explores the Israelite traditions of hospitality, based in the tent of Abraham and evolving to more exclusivist tendencies found in the development of Temple Judaism and some prophetic texts. The fact that both radical welcome and radical exclusivity are found in the Hebrew scriptures points to the duality that exists in the practice of hospitality. The tension "between the hospitable tent and the exclusive temple" is where the transformative power of hospitality lies, as "the tent persists and insists within the temple,"⁴⁴ always present and yet demanding change while continuing to define an individual or community through its practice.

Those walls, both loved and hated, along the interface areas of Belfast in Northern Ireland are a prime example of the duality of inclusivity and

⁴² McNulty, *The Hostess*, viii.

⁴³ McNulty, *The Hostess*, viii.

⁴⁴ McNulty, *The Hostess*, 35.

exclusivity in hospitality. Security can never be ensured until they are broken down; and yet, for those who live near them, the walls ensure their security (either real or perceived) each day they remain. Furthermore, the walls, for now, ensure enough separation to enable actors to take a step back and assess the conflict safely. The walls “persist and insist” within the peace – and, simultaneously, the ongoing conflict – in Northern Ireland. They are a constant reminder of the past while pointing out through their existence the work that still needs to be done in the present and future. The same might be said for similar walls built in Israel/Palestine or other areas of conflict. The reasons and uses for the walls coexist, equally true yet seemingly contradictory.⁴⁵

Such boundaries in the context of exclusivity and welcome not only form identity, but serve to illuminate universality through the practice of hospitality. The reversal of roles in the practice highlight the identities of those who participate while reflecting the universal needs, desires, and nature of those same participants. It may be counterintuitive, but as “the host gives to the guest, the host paradoxically receives something previously unexpected, becoming more than he or she was before.”⁴⁶ As such, the one who welcomes “becomes honored and enhanced by sharing space,” and “the vulnerable stranger who allegedly has nothing to offer becomes a source of enrichment to the household, reconfiguring and transforming it” as the boundaries between guest and host become more permeable.⁴⁷ The stories shared by a guest have the ability to gift the host with a new perspective, spark the imagination, and enrich the world one inhabits. As such, this reality illustrates “the theological root of hospitality: God blesses through the stranger.”⁴⁸

⁴⁵ See Neil Jarman, *Building a Peaceline: Safety and Segregation in Belfast* (Belfast: Factotum Publications, June 2007) and “Security and Segregation: Interface Barriers in Belfast,” *Shared Space*, No 6 (June 2008); Jennifer Hamilton, John Bell and Ulf Hansson, “Sectarianism and Segregation: Impact on Everyday Life,” *Shared Space*, No 6 (June 2008); and Community Relations Council, *Towards Sustainable Security: Interface Barriers and the Legacy of Segregation in Belfast* (Belfast: Community Relations Council, 2008).

⁴⁶ Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 59.

⁴⁷ Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 59.

⁴⁸ Reynolds, “Improvising together...,” 59.

Similarly, there is tension between hospitality's timing and intentionality. Jacques Derrida considers this when he writes:

Hospitality must wait *and* not wait. It is what must await *and still* [*et cependant*] not await, extend and stretch itself [*se tender*] and still stand and hold itself [*se tenir*] in the awaiting and the non-awaiting. Intentionality *and* non-intentionality, attention *and* inattention. Tending and stretching itself between the tending [*le tendre*] *and* the not-tending or the not-tending-itself [*ne pas se tendre*], not to extend this or that, or oneself to the other...Indeed, if we gather [*nous recueillons*] all these words, all these values, all these significations (to tend and extend, to extend oneself, attention, intention, holding [*tendue*], withholding [*retendue*]), the entire semantic family of *tendere* or of the *tendere* (Gr. *teinô*), we see this same contradictory tension at once working, worrying, disrupting the concept and experience of hospitality while also making them possible...⁴⁹

There is a tension inherent in the practice of hospitality, as Derrida has illuminated. That tension is, perhaps, the core reason hospitality is so difficult to define and practice. Is it intentional or unintentional? Is it risky or safe? Is it about drawing in or reaching out? Is it about anticipation or spontaneity? In hospitality, these tensions coexist, albeit precariously.

Furthermore, Derrida explores the intentionality of meditated invitation coupled with the element of surprise and welcoming the unexpected when he writes:

...‘to extend an invitation’: to tend or extend [*tendre ou etendré*] an invitation – and we will see or recall in a moment that if hospitality seems linked to invitation, an invitation offered, extended, presented, sent; if it seems linked to the act of invitation, to the inviting of invitation, one also make a note [*prendre acte*] of this: that radical hospitality consists, *would have to consist, in receiving without invitation, beyond or before the invitation...*⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 360.

⁵⁰ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 360. I am intrigued by Derrida's use of the term "radical hospitality" in this section. It is unclear if Derrida wishes to differentiate "hospitality" from "radical hospitality" through this willingness to "receive without invitation" or if Derrida is merely commenting on the radical nature of hospitality itself.

Such possibility of welcome without invitation carries with it substantial risk. The act of invitation itself is a sign of disarmament or approval, that the host acknowledges her or his position and welcomes the other who, while still possibly a threat, will abide by the rules laid down as part of the cultural practice of hospitality. To welcome without invitation opens one up to the unexpected.

This risk found in hospitality understandably hampers its practice. If *hostis* is perceived as negative in the form of “enemy,” the practice of hospitality becomes more difficult as the *hostis* is considered to be “someone who threatens to overtake the host, who must be excluded by reason of his potential similarity to the host and capacity for usurpation of his power.”⁵¹ The threat manifests itself in the “possibility of homelessness...[p]recisely because the home...is a figure for identity...[and] the failure to repossess this home or clear it of strangers can also result in a loss of identity,” resulting in the home becoming “unhomely, *unheimlich*, estranged by the introduction of something foreign that threatens to dispossess it of its self-identity; whence the continuum between hospitality and hostility.”⁵²

Nevertheless, opening one’s home to the other is the foundation of hospitality’s ethics.⁵³ The contrasts inherent in such ethics can be seen in the “challenge of sustaining relation as ‘impossible,’” and where there exists a “double bind” in which “the host must both take in the stranger and respect for its foreignness, name the stranger and acknowledge its unnameability, welcome the stranger there where he is at home and risk homelessness or dispossession at his hands.”⁵⁴

Ethics are formed in this seeming contradiction. McNulty also asserts “[o]ne might even argue that every ethics is fundamentally an ethics of hospitality, since the original meaning of *ethos* is ‘abode’ or ‘dwelling place.’”⁵⁵ It is the concept of the “home” or “abode” where the basis of ethics

⁵¹ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xii.

⁵² McNulty, *The Hostess*, xiv.

⁵³ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xiv.

⁵⁴ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xv.

⁵⁵ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xv.

is formed, according to the philosopher and ethicist Martin Heidegger.⁵⁶ As the home is where one is best equipped to encounter strangeness, ethics is, in turn, “the opening of what is familiar to man to the unfamiliar.”⁵⁷ The Jewish thinker Emmanuel Levinas placed home as essential to hospitality as it is “what makes the ethical possible.”⁵⁸ Similarly, Derrida builds on Levinas by likening home to culture and stating “hospitality is not merely one ethics among others, but the ethics par excellence.”⁵⁹

Derrida’s statements regarding culture and hospitality reflect the final juxtaposition to be explored here. He writes:

on the one hand, hospitality must wait, extend itself toward the other, extend to the other the gifts, the site, the shelter and the cover; it must be ready to welcome [*accueillir*], to host and shelter, to give shelter and cover; it prepare itself and adorn itself [*se préparer et se parer*] for the coming of the hôte; it even develop itself into a culture of hospitality, multiply the signs of anticipation, construct and institute what one calls structures of welcoming...[as] there is no culture that is not also a culture of hospitality....Hospitality – this is culture itself.⁶⁰

While Derrida and many cultures view the practice of hospitality as central to culture, Christian ethicist Christine Pohl argues the practice of hospitality is

⁵⁶ Martin Heidegger, “Letter on Humanism,” in *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell, (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), 234 referenced in McNulty, *The Hostess*, xvi.

⁵⁷ Heidegger, “Letter on Humanism,” 234 in McNulty, *The Hostess*, xvi.

⁵⁸ Claire Elise Katz, *Levinas, Judaism, and the Feminine: The Silent Footsteps of Rebecca*, Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Religion (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003), 59.

⁵⁹ Derrida “Hospitality and Hostility,” in McNulty, xvii. Derrida has written and spoken extensively on the subject of hospitality, particularly in relation to aspects such as politics, law and ethics from a philosophical perspective as well as critically engaging with Emmanuel Levinas’ ideas on hospitality as well. While both men profess to be secular Jews, their religious tradition does seem to have significant impact on their ideas regarding hospitality. Unfortunately, to address their work more systematically would be a dissertation in and of itself and, therefore, will not be dealt with in depth here, but will only be referenced in relation to specific points. For more information, see Jacques Derrida and Anne Dufourmantelle, *Of Hospitality: Cultural Memory in the Present* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000); *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, Thinking in Action series (New York: Routledge, 2001) or *Acts of Religion* (New York: Routledge, 2002); and Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, Alphonso Lingis, trans. (Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1999) or *Humanism of the Other*, Nidra Poller, trans. (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2005).

⁶⁰ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 360-361

countercultural.⁶¹ This dichotomy could be confusing unless one either looks at ancient versus contemporary contexts or frames it in the same tension found in defining hospitality in the first place, namely in the recognition that there are both impersonally superficial and intentionally meaningful ways in which hospitality is practiced. Is the countercultural practice of hospitality *true* hospitality and cultural tradition a false one? Perhaps the aspects of culture and countercultural practice of hospitality are found more in a spectrum, where the extremes on each side form more inauthentic, or dangerous, expressions of hospitality.

The extremes on each side of the spectrum of hospitality point to the demarcation and implementation of boundaries. Appropriate boundaries must be present and maintained, as either their absence or, on the other side, inappropriate boundaries are formed through excessive hardening. Either option has the potential to complicate and contaminate the practice of hospitality. Any activity, be it hospitality or some other identity-forming enterprise, has the potential to serve “to harden boundaries [but] can also be in other circumstances a legitimate and necessary means of building, nurturing, or maintaining identity.”⁶² Therefore, when home and its corresponding hospitality becomes synonymous with one’s own identity to the exclusion of others, when walls no longer provide protection but serve to keep people separate, or when so much is given that gifts of hospitality no longer hold any value, then boundaries have been hardened or diminished and, in conjunction, hospitality is extinguished.

While this potential is inherent in the practice of hospitality, it is not a weakness necessarily; *the fluidity of and tension within hospitality is its genius*. Its adaptive nature to culture, identity, and context is what enables it to be a tool, particularly in times of conflict, for the common good. In hospitality’s mystery and tensions lies its power to transform.

⁶¹ Christine D. Pohl, “Building a Place for Hospitality,” in *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*, no. 25, “Hospitality,” (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2007), 35.

⁶² Joseph Liechty and Cecelia Clegg, *Moving Beyond Sectarianism*, (Dublin: Columba Press, 2001), 247.

2. Practices of Hospitality

As a further attempt to define and describe hospitality, an exploration of what it entails is useful. Pohl describes hospitality's components as "[w]elcoming strangers...and offering them food, shelter, and protection."⁶³ Further instances of hospitality include the welcome of and sharing in different ideas, and encountering one another in an environment of safety and mutual respect.

In light of these descriptions, the next section will explore the three main practices through which hospitality is offered. The first, table fellowship, is the most obvious as it entails the offering and/or sharing of food and drink. This aspect of hospitality is the first that most people think of when hospitality is mentioned. The second, intellectual welcome, is perhaps the most obscure and yet, in the historic practice of hospitality by the Abrahamic traditions, equally important. Seen in the centuries of collaborative dialogue and debate, intellectual welcome between scholars provides an additional vision for the practice of hospitality beyond the norm of table fellowship. The third aspect, the provision of protection or sanctuary, is more accepted than intellectual welcome. Yet protective hospitality is perhaps the most difficult to document as there is little research on the topic, and what is written is dispersed in a variety of disciplines. Accounts of atrocities committed are numerous; accounts of those who provided sanctuary for the threatened and protected them from violence or annihilation are harder to come by. Linking their motivations to the practice of hospitality or their religious belief is even more difficult, and yet, it is there. Hospitality makes its presence known in even the most dangerous of places, as the case studies will show later.

⁶³ Christine D. Pohl, *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1999), 4.

a. Table Fellowship

The sacramental nature of sharing food and drink is the first example of hospitality most consider when the topic arises. There is a mysterious, but tremendous, power in the role of food and drink among people and the recognition of that power and its accompanying rituals signal its significance in the exploration of hospitality.

On a personal level, sharing a meal or a cup of coffee invites a level of encounter that is difficult to induce without it.⁶⁴ There is something very basic, very human, very egalitarian to the act of eating or drinking together. To sit at the same table – on the same level with and next to another person – invites a particular level of intimacy that is difficult to replicate in other contexts. On a more communal scale, the examples and exhortations in the Abrahamic traditions and their sacred texts to sit at a table together, to provide guests with food and drink, and to welcome the stranger into one's home and community are shockingly prolific, as will be explored in more detail in the next chapter.

Furthermore, there is a common value in these traditions of sharing and abundance. Primarily as a metaphor for God's own abundance toward God's people and by extension, the abundance of the people of God toward others is expressed through hospitality. The obligation to provide more food than is necessary is common in cultural traditions married to the Abrahamic faiths; and these traditions are inextricably linked to values of honor, dignity, and generosity. Furthermore, the ritual of eating and drinking together is documented throughout the Abrahamic traditions as a reconciling and remembering activity, encouraging the adherents to live in peace and cooperation with their neighbors. The process of *sulh* or feasts of the *Eid* in the Islamic tradition; the observance of the Eucharist and feast days in the

⁶⁴ See James L. Watson and Melissa L. Caldwell, eds., *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005); Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterick, eds. *Food and Culture: A Reader*, (New York: Routledge, 2007); Martin Jones, *Feast: Why Humans Share Food*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); and Michael Dietler and Brian Hayden, *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*, (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010).

Christian tradition; and the Passover Seder, Shabbat, and other holy days in the Jewish tradition all illustrate the importance of hospitality - with particular emphasis upon food and drink - in religious observance.

Miroslav Volf, a Christian theologian, recounts a true story of a Bosnian man whose three-year-old daughter was shot by a sniper while playing outside of her home during the siege of Sarajevo in the 1990s. Recorded by a television camera as he brought his daughter into the hospital, the crying father stated he would like to invite the man who shot his daughter "to have a cup of coffee with him so that [the sniper] can tell him, like a human being, what has brought him to do such a thing."⁶⁵ Instead of seeking revenge, the Bosnian father invites the man who shot his daughter to "participate in a ritual of friendship,"⁶⁶ and to reaffirm each other's humanity by sitting together over a cup of coffee and hearing what each other has to say. This vision Volf provides is hospitality at its messiest and most profound.⁶⁷ One cannot expect to walk away from such an encounter unchanged.

There is something almost indescribable about the effect a cup of coffee or a meal has on those who share it and yet it is something ingrained in Abrahamic tradition and culture. The fact that this man made an immediate connection to such an act is telling. Eating or drinking together, inviting others into personal space, is an intimate act with sacred connotations. It is not always comfortable or entertaining; sometimes it is very difficult or contentious as Volf's scenario suggests. Yet, this practice of hospitality

⁶⁵ Miroslav Volf, "A Cup of Coffee," *Christian Century*, (15 October 1997), 917.

⁶⁶ Volf, "Cup of Coffee," 917.

⁶⁷ It is important to make note of those who would be inhospitable to this idea as well. For many, the father's invitation might be inappropriate given issues surrounding justice, guilt and forgiveness. Similarly, the expression of inhospitality on the part of the sniper by targeting a child raises questions related to invitation and force. To highlight this scenario is not to hold up an ethical ideal for others in similar circumstances, but to give attention to how some people perceive the power of hospitality. The relationship between hospitality and violence and the corresponding boundaries of protective hospitality will be considered in greater detail in Chapter Four. Furthermore, the issue of hospitality being "messy" is explored in more detail in the same Chapter Four in the sections related to purity and risk. See Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, Vol. II, Mary Douglas Collected Works (London: Routledge, 1996); Richard Beck, *Unclean: Meditations on Purity, Hospitality, and Mortality*, (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011).

requires one to face the other, to see the other's humanity staring back, and to invite the divine into this sacred space.

b. Intellectual welcome

Intellectual welcome is, perhaps, not what someone would consider a practice of hospitality, but discussions in scholarship address the importance of creating spaces where a variety of opinions can be expressed. The diversity of opinion, as well as the ritual of coming together to discuss and to disagree, point to a further practice of hospitality. The ritual of dialogue carries with it connotations of spiritual practice. Within the Abrahamic inter-religious dialogue that is often marked by such divergent opinions, the fact that a variety of ideas are allowed to exist and are treasured as part of the theological spectrum is remarkable.

Historically, the Abrahamic traditions took pride in the practice of discussion, debate, and dissent in such a way as to honor it as a religious discipline. As such, it could easily be called "a holy rite of disagreement."⁶⁸ Those considered most faithful and authoritative were those who engaged in dialogue with others – not as an attempt to convert but in the deep belief that God was so great that merely one person could not grasp the entire truth. There was the recognition that one needed the other to test one's ideas, and welcoming the other into one's space was part of this desire to know God more fully. To disagree was not to reject but to engage with the other, and in that engagement there is the recognition that one could not walk away unaffected.

The Jewish rabbinic tradition is particularly well-known in this regard. The spirituality of debate and disagreement has been honed over the centuries in Judaism. Examples given of Maimonides participating in this rabbinic tradition debating how God created the world illustrate this point.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ I have coined this phrase in an attempt to emphasize the importance of dialogue and inevitable disagreement at one point or another as a spiritual practice or ritual that was held sacred at various points in history.

⁶⁹ Marvin Fox, *Interpreting Maimonides: Studies in Methodology, Metaphysics, and*

This concept stands in Islam as well, although it may not be as well known. The importance of education and knowledge of the methodology of theological thinking was highly emphasized, teaching its thinkers such as Abu Hamid Muhammad Al-Ghazali to offer an opinion that takes into consideration the ideas that have gone before them. Omid Safi, a contemporary Muslim theologian, details this process as comparing a variety of schools of thought and then situating oneself within a tradition. This may seem elementary but Safi points out that it is refreshing to see intellectual honesty practiced by summarizing “the perspectives of various schools of thought, to legitimize a range of opinions and to acknowledge a spectrum of interpretations!”⁷⁰

Christian theologian Henri Nouwen details a similar process, making overt links to hospitality. In his detailing of hospitality as seen in the relationship between a teacher and a student, he says “hospitality can be seen as a model for a creative interchange between people [and i]f there is any area that needs new spirit, a redemptive and liberating spirituality, it is the area of education.”⁷¹ Moreover, Nouwen equates teaching with “the commitment to provide the fearless space where...questions can come to consciousness and be responded to, not by prefabricated answers, but by an articulate encouragement to enter into them seriously and personally.”⁷² He continues, stating “[w]hen we look at teaching in terms of hospitality, we can say that the teacher is called upon to create for his [or her] students a free and fearless space where mental and emotional development can take place.”⁷³

These three traditions come together when one considers the cooperation of scholars from each of the three Abrahamic traditions and their reliance upon one another in the development of one’s own theology. At

Moral Philosophy, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism series, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 262ff.

⁷⁰ Omid Safi, “Introduction: *The Times They Are A Changin’* – A Muslim Quest for Justice, Gender Equality, and Pluralism,” in *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*, Omid Safi, ed. (Oxford: Oneworld, 2003), 19.

⁷¹ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 58.

⁷² Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 60.

⁷³ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 60.

various points over the centuries, the Abrahamic traditions have utilized cooperation in theological exploration. One account of such encounters is as follows:

On countless evenings, the court [of Harun al-Rashid who ruled the Abbasid caliphate from Baghdad] was transformed into an arena for theological debate. Muslim men of learning, schooled in sharia, the law derived from the Quran, offered their wisdom and drew on the philosophical tradition of the ancient Greeks. The works of Aristotle and Plato were translated into Arabic and used not only to enrich Islam but to create new science and new philosophy. And the caliph was not content simply to take the world of his learned men. He wanted to see how their ideas met opposing theologies, and he invited scholars and preachers of other faiths to his court. Jews, Christians, Buddhists, and Muslims engaged in spiritual and spirited jousts, and each tradition was enriched by knowledge of the others.⁷⁴

The same can be said for the intellectual hospitality found in medieval Iberia, “where the Jewish polymath Maimonides, the Sufi mystic Ibn ‘Arabi, and a phalanx of Christian monks helped one another unravel the meaning of God and the universe.”⁷⁵ This practice of welcome accompanied by holy debate and disagreement has been largely forgotten.

While the much of the theological debate in the early and medieval periods was intra-religious, it and the corresponding inter-religious discussions still provide an authoritative basis upon which this holy rite could be reclaimed. In the contemporary context, this discipline of welcoming others of different opinions and beliefs has become threatening. In many Abrahamic communities, certainty is valued and there is little desire to be affected by the other. The practice of hospitality in welcoming others who disagree has been lost in the larger context of religious life.

Yet, welcoming the ideas of traditions other than one’s own in order to enhance one’s understanding is an act of hospitality. Efforts to recover the

⁷⁴ Zachary Karabell, *Peace Be Upon You: Fourteen Centuries of Muslim, Christian and Jewish Conflict and Cooperation*, (New York: Vintage, 2007), 4.

⁷⁵ Karabell, *Peace Be Upon You*, 6. See also Maria Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2002).

medieval traditions are being made in a variety of inter-Abrahamic relationships, not least of which is the rise in the discipline of scriptural reasoning under the influence of Jewish scholar Peter Ochs. While Lewis Mudge argues the actual practice of scriptural reasoning is a particularly Jewish tradition, it has been made available and encouraged as “an act of hospitality” to the other Abrahamic traditions in order “to form pragmatic hypotheses for guiding shared action toward the ‘repair’ of the ‘failed logic of modernity.’”⁷⁶

Responding to the need for shared action that arises from shared understanding and conviction is where relationships between the Abrahamic traditions will flourish, transform society, and help to create a more peaceful future. Furthermore, it is this capacity for intellectual welcome of the religious other that this dissertation seeks to examine as it uses the practice as the basis for illustrating the positive potential for a cooperative theology of protective hospitality.

c. Protection

The final theme of hospitality to be noted in this research is the theme upon which the majority of this work will concentrate. It is the practice of hospitality exhibited through the taking in of others, not only in simply providing accommodation but also in providing protection, sanctuary or safe haven.

Providing accommodation is simple enough. As with the theme of table fellowship, providing a warm bed for a tired guest is thought of as a common expression of hospitality and, for the most part, is not debated. All three Abrahamic traditions agree on this value. It carries with it some risk – as any expression of hospitality usually does – but most Abrahamic adherents do not argue about the ethical value of taking in a guest for a night or two, or even providing shelter for the homeless in most cases.

⁷⁶ Lewis S. Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility: The Promise of Dialogue Among Christians, Jews, and Muslims*, (New York: Continuum, 2008), 123.

Instead, the riskier and more debatable expression of hospitality would be the taking in of guests who are in need of safe shelter. Creating safe places, whether for ideas to be shared without judgment or condemnation, or for physical safety such as in the case of Le Chambon or the Sanctuary Movement mentioned previously, has also been an exhortation from the Abrahamic traditions. In these sanctuaries, in whatever form they take, a dedicated space where witness can be borne to truth is important. A sense of safety is difficult, if not impossible, to sustain without truth. Deception and silence as a means of differentiation do nothing but destroy any attempt to welcome others and create a sense of safety and community. Instead, an environment that fosters hospitality must be one that supports openness and honesty and affirms values that contribute to life for all. In this way, “truth-telling has to be a spiritual practice”⁷⁷ and becomes important to the wider practice of hospitality which encompasses it.⁷⁸

While not explicitly considered in the literature, the inclusion of hospitality as provision of space – particularly safe space – appears in several sources. Christine Pohl echoes Henri Nouwen by implying that giving people “a safe place” is synonymous with hospitality. As Pohl discussed what hospitality means with a particular practitioner, the gentleman emphasized the safe place he provides for his guests as an important factor. Pohl uses Nouwen’s argument regarding space to affirm such actions are, indeed, hospitality.⁷⁹ For Pohl, the inclusion of protection is automatic, and she states “hospitality involves sharing food, shelter, protection, recognition, and conversation.”⁸⁰

⁷⁷ bell hooks, *Remembered Rapture: The Writer at Work* (London 1999), 120-121 in Pamela Sue Anderson, “A Feminist Ethics of Forgiveness”, *Forgiveness and Truth: Explorations in Contemporary Theology*, Alistair McFadyen and Marcel Sarot, eds. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 151.

⁷⁸ Reinhold Hütter wrote an excellent essay on hospitality and its relationship to truth - “Hospitality and Truth: The Disclosure of Practices in Worship and Doctrine,” in *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life*, Miroslav Volf and Dorothy C. Bass, eds., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). Such a topic deserves further exploration and could be its own dissertation.

⁷⁹ Pohl, *Making Room*, 3 referring to Nouwen, 66.

⁸⁰ Pohl, “Building a Place for Hospitality,” 27.

Pohl also echoes the Jewish tradition's understanding of inclusion, and she cites the laws that provide protection to strangers and resident aliens⁸¹ referring to "the stranger, the widow, and orphan" as "not simply metaphorical...[but instead are those] individuals [who] require our attention because of their very real circumstances – they lack protection and support of any kind."⁸² Extending welcome to those who are in need of protection is rife in the sacred texts of the Abrahamic traditions.

Christian feminist theologian Letty Russell takes a similar route. Russell begins with a discussion of the term "hot-house", which arises from the context of Japan where mothers with children affected by deformities caused by industrial pollution gathered together and set up "special place[s] of safety, comfort and care."⁸³ From this example, Russell builds her ecclesiology of sanctuary and makes vital links to hospitality. She articulates that "the vision women have for the church is that it could be a sanctuary [a hot-house], a place of safety for all who enter, and especially for those who are the most marginal, weak or despised of any community."⁸⁴ Yet, not only is this applicable to the Christian Church, but could also be said by scholars from the other two traditions as well. There is nothing distinctly Christian about this vision; it is only Christian when worked out in a particularly Christian theological manner – and even then there is still much room for agreement and cooperation between the Abrahamic traditions.

Russell declares that both the Jewish and Christian traditions have "acknowledged the need for sanctuary and protection of the one seeking a refuge or home...[and this idea] is rooted in the tradition of the 'cities of refuge'...[which] were a holy or sanctified place, often a temple, where God and the people of Israel protected those who seek refuge."⁸⁵ Such concepts

⁸¹ Pohl, "Building a Place for Hospitality," 28.

⁸² Katz, *Levinas, Judaism, and the Feminine*, 58.

⁸³ Letty M Russell, "Hot-House Ecclesiology: A Feminist Interpretation of the Church," *Ecumenical Review*, 53/1 (January 2001): 48.

⁸⁴ Russell, "Hot-House Ecclesiology," 48. Brackets are Russell's.

⁸⁵ Russell, "Hot-House Ecclesiology," 49. The issue of the 'cities of refuge' per se is not part of the Islam tradition. However, there is emphasis placed upon refuge in the tradition due to the historic significance of the early followers of Prophet Muhammad's flight from Mecca to Medina, where they found refuge from persecution for a period of time in

of refuge are not the property only of Judaism and Christianity, however. Islam has this value as well, albeit with different historical precedents and exhortations. Yet, the underlying concept is the same and is applicable to all three traditions when Russell goes on to say “[t]his right of protection of all persons is derived from God’s holiness and provides the basic theological understanding of hospitality...[that h]uman beings are created by God and are to be holy, and to be treated as holy or sacred.”⁸⁶

While Chapter Four of this dissertation explains protective hospitality in more detail, it will be helpful to consider the aspects of hospitality that inform it as an ethical practice first. Therefore, the following sections will explore hospitality as ethics by considering factors such as political practice, tolerance, solidarity, and honor.

3. Hospitality as Ethical Practice

Historically, hospitality as the practice of welcoming the stranger is connected to an overarching religious belief found in Mediterranean traditions that equated welcoming the other to welcoming the divine. As seen in “classic hospitality legends,” as McNulty calls them, common stories are found in Greek and Roman mythology as well as regional religious traditions where “a deity or its emissaries appear to human beings in the guise of an unknown stranger, challenging the host to prove his character by offering food and shelter.”⁸⁷ Therefore, “hospitality is motivated by the potentially sacred nature of the guest,” since the host is, in these cases, unaware of the identity of the guest.⁸⁸ As the principal divinity depicted in the narratives holds hospitality as its “special domain,” that same divine character “evaluates the character of human hosts by appealing for

Abyssinia under the protection of the Christian king (alternately known as Ashama Ibn Abjar, Negus, or al-Najashi) in 615 CE/7BH. This narrative is particularly reflected upon in inter-religious circles as evidence of inter-religious understanding and cooperation and is held up as an ethical and religious ideal. This narrative will be explored later in Chapter Three.

⁸⁶ Russell, “Hot-House Ecclesiology,” 50.

⁸⁷ McNulty, *The Hostess*, 8.

⁸⁸ McNulty, *The Hostess*, 8-9.

hospitality disguised as a supplicant.”⁸⁹ Not surprisingly, ancient Greece considered one’s religion to be the practice of hospitality as it was the “defining social ethics of *Zeus Xenios*, Zeus god of strangers.”⁹⁰

Therefore, there are implications that hospitality’s importance as a spiritual discipline is part of its original meaning, and yet it seems to be rarely stressed in current religious circles, or when it is practiced it generally lacks deeper elements of intentionality. This reality coincides with the increasing privatization of faithful life and a seemingly unrelated socio-political reality. The tension between these two aspects when one is to relate to others both within and without one’s religious community in a way that is reflective of one’s beliefs and religious adherence, and yet it is rarely taught or emphasized in the current context.⁹¹ Nevertheless, it has many implications for life today as it speaks to concepts of political life and cultural diversity.

Just as Derrida stated that hospitality is “ethics par excellence”, Christian ethics scholar Thomas Ogletree similarly notes that “to be moral is to be hospitable to the stranger.”⁹² This emphasis upon morality fuels the practice of hospitality in times where the stranger is in need and is unable to reciprocate. When one looks to the gifts of guests and hosts, there is an assumed equality in many cases. However, there are instances when “the stranger stands before me in his vulnerability, there is...an inequality of power in our relationship” as the stranger “has need of...recognition and service” and the potential host has at her/his disposal “support systems which already suffice for [her/his] needs.”⁹³ In such cases, the ethical choice comes to bear. Boff writes that hospitality “is connected to minimum human needs: to be welcomed with no reluctance, to be given shelter, food and

⁸⁹ McNulty, *The Hostess*, vii.

⁹⁰ McNulty, *The Hostess*, vii.

⁹¹ This dichotomy can be found, most alarmingly, in a recent survey conducted by the Pew Forum on Religion and the Public Life in the U.S. where 54% of Americans who attend church at least once per week support the use of torture compared to the 32% who never attend. The concentration is higher (62%) when white evangelical Protestants are focused upon in the survey. Pew Forum on Religion and the Public Life, “The Religious Dimensions of Torture Debate,” available at <http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=156>, accessed on 12 May 2009.

⁹² Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 1.

⁹³ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 3.

drink; and to be able to rest” as he acknowledges “[w]ithout the bare minimum nobody lives or survives.”⁹⁴ Boff likens this physical and material minimum to a “spiritual bare minimum,” and declares it is “that which makes us human, which is that capacity of unconditional welcome of the other, of being charitable, cooperative, and communal.”⁹⁵

The morality of hospitality is based upon the concept of home, in that “to be oppressed is to be virtually without a home” where one’s self definition is oftentimes “determined by definitions, priorities, and interests of the oppressor,”⁹⁶ and therefore, to provide hospitality is to provide a space where one can define oneself as one chooses and be at home. The morality of hospitality requires both guest and host to “take into account another center of meaning and valuation, another orientation onto the world, in making [one’s] own decisions and in carrying out [one’s] own actions,”⁹⁷ and in so doing, create a home where both can exist.⁹⁸ As such, these ideas regarding hospitality have connections with political practice as well as with concepts related to tolerance, solidarity, and honor that require closer exploration and analysis.

a. Hospitality as a Political Practice

Hospitality as a political practice begins to gain meaning when one considers how a community should function and what comprises the

⁹⁴ Boff, *Virtues*, 50.

⁹⁵ Boff, *Virtues*, 50.

⁹⁶ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 4-5.

⁹⁷ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 35.

⁹⁸ This concept in hospitality reminds me of Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s *ubuntu* theology wherein he asserts “My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours” and that “a person is a person through other persons” as detailed in his book *No Future Without Forgiveness*, (New York: Image Doubleday, 1999), 31ff. Both indicate the value of finding meaning, identity and existence in the presence of others. See also Julius Mutugi Gathogo, “African philosophy as expressed in the concepts of hospitality and ubuntu,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 130 (March 2008): 39-53; Mbulelo Mzamane, “Building a new society using the building blocks of ubuntu/botho/vhuthu,” in *Religion and spirituality in South Africa*, (Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009), 236-248; and Berrisford Lewis, “Forging an understanding of black humanity through relationship: an ubuntu perspective,” *Black Theology* 8/1 (April 1, 2010): 69-85.

common good, particularly in relation to how the community treats those who are outside of its defining boundaries.

According to biblical scholar Andrew Arterbury, the stranger in the ancient world “did not always find a hospitable reception.”⁹⁹ Travelers through foreign lands were extremely vulnerable to criminals who laid in wait along the sparsely populated transit routes. There was also the idea in the ancient world (and continues in the contemporary world as well, albeit in different forms) that “mysterious strangers” were a potential threat and, in turn, the community “sought to shun, abuse, or eliminate these outsiders before they could harm the community.”¹⁰⁰

In the Greco-Roman world, hosts who took in strangers were thought to be more likely to be “motivated by fear of an ominous stranger, by fear of Zeus, the god of hospitality, or by a desire to create politically advantageous alliances with powerful counterparts.”¹⁰¹ But later, communities marked by Abrahamic traditions were more likely to have different motivations; the impetus to provide hospitality in these communities “more often grew out of the desire to please God.”¹⁰² Nevertheless, in many cases of earlier eras, key members of the community “often bore the primary responsibility for hosting strangers”¹⁰³ since it had such political potential in relation to forming alliances or providing for the health of the community by absorbing the threat of the stranger. Furthermore, out of this expression of hospitality a principle of reciprocity was established. When someone was hosted in another’s home, it became customary to vow “to provide protection and provisions for their counterpart whenever the other was traveling in one’s region.”¹⁰⁴

According to Boff, hospitality, “by its own nature, presupposes reciprocity” as it is “a *duty* that must be practiced by all, and a *right* that all

⁹⁹ Andrew Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke and Acts 20,” in *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*, no. 25, “Hospitality,” (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2007), 20.

¹⁰⁰ Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...,” 20.

¹⁰¹ Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...,” 21.

¹⁰² Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...,” 21.

¹⁰³ Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...,” 21.

¹⁰⁴ Arterbury, “Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...,” 21.

enjoy.”¹⁰⁵ Similarly, Volf argues the role reversal between guest and host that takes place in the practice of hospitality, when “in an embrace a host is a guest and a guest is a host,” highlights that reciprocity is required. He goes on to argue that while “one self may receive or give more than the other...each enter the space of the other, feel the presence of the other in the self, and make its own presence felt.”¹⁰⁶ As such, Volf concludes, “there is no embrace,” there is no hospitality, “[w]ithout such reciprocity.”¹⁰⁷

Yet, because of this principle of reciprocity, the political dimensions of hospitality start to take form. With reciprocity comes recognition; and it is the desire for recognition that many political and ethnic conflicts take place in our current global context. Henri Nouwen speaks of hospitality as the provision of safe spaces and gives particular reference to the need for space for strangers to express their culture and language, to “sing their own songs, speak their own languages, [and] dance their own dances.”¹⁰⁸

In a similar way, Christine Pohl echoes Nouwen’s sentiments, but builds upon the work of philosopher Charles Taylor and others on the issue of multiculturalism and the politics of recognition.¹⁰⁹ Since recognition entails “respecting the dignity and equal worth of every person and valuing their contributions,”¹¹⁰ discussions related to equality and human rights are a natural by-product. Furthermore, Pohl asserts some religious adherents are suspicious of issues related to human rights, equality, and recognition since they assume that these notions “have been imported from secular philosophies, political theory, and sociology.”¹¹¹ Instead, Pohl insists such ideas are instead deeply rooted in the practice of hospitality as exhibited in historic Abrahamic convictions.¹¹²

¹⁰⁵ Boff, *Virtues*, 59.

¹⁰⁶ Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 143.

¹⁰⁷ Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 143.

¹⁰⁸ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 51.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

¹¹⁰ Pohl, *Making Room*, 61.

¹¹¹ Pohl, *Making Room*, 63.

¹¹² Pohl, *Making Room*, 63. Pohl focuses upon the Judeo-Christian traditions, rather than being inclusive of Islam in her writings. However, her statement regarding human rights

Perhaps more controversially, Pohl looks at hospitality's power of recognition as an act of resistance. Rather than being a "tame and pleasant practice," Pohl asserts it has a "subversive, countercultural dimension."¹¹³ Citing ideas from a Catholic Worker perspective, Pohl points to hospitality as "a different system of valuing and an alternate model of relationships."¹¹⁴ The subversive power, according to Pohl, resides in the act of welcoming those who are "socially undervalued" and in understanding that the recognition of "their equal value can be an act of resistance and defiance, a challenge to the values and expectations of the larger community."¹¹⁵

For example, the northern Bosnian village of Gunja, situated on the border with Croatia, is known for its hospitable resistance during the years of the war.¹¹⁶ Comprised of a Croatian Catholic priest, a Serb Orthodox priest, and a Bosnian imam, the religious leaders of the village made a point to be seen together throughout the conflict. As the war waged around them, the clerics publicly walked together through the streets and sat together over coffee to show their adherents a political and religious alternative. To welcome one another, ensure each other's safety, and show solidarity to a splintering world beyond them was, indeed, an act of defiant hospitality. In the same way, Boff argues that to live hospitably is "to subscribe to the political cause of...[those] who have been humiliated and ignored, so that they can be heard and included."¹¹⁷ Likewise, theologian Amos Yong argues "interpersonal and international hospitality are important components that can contribute to a just and peaceful world."¹¹⁸

Hospitality as resistance is applicable in societies where exclusion and denigration are systematized. Therefore, to consider hospitality as a political

and hospitality is equally true for Islam as well as for Judaism and Christianity.

¹¹³ Pohl, *Making Room*, 61.

¹¹⁴ Pohl, *Making Room*, 61.

¹¹⁵ Pohl, *Making Room*, 62.

¹¹⁶ As far as I am aware, this case is not documented anywhere, but while I resided in Croatia, I had a chance to speak with the imam and hear his telling of these events and encounter others who were aware of them.

¹¹⁷ Boff, *Virtues*, 67. It is here where one can particularly see liberation theology at work in the context of hospitality.

¹¹⁸ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 146.

practice, for Immanuel Kant, relies upon a belief that hospitality makes possible a world where “people from different cultures ‘can enter into mutual relations which may eventually be regulated by public laws, thus bringing the human race nearer and nearer to a cosmopolitan constitution.’”¹¹⁹ Kant’s explorations of hospitality were written in the context of building or sustaining “peace between states,”¹²⁰ building upon concepts that are equated with modern conceptions of human rights.

Lastly, the work of theologian and ethicist Elizabeth Newman explores other political implications of hospitality. Describing hospitality as both “*ecclesial and public*,” Newman asserts its practice embodies “a politics, economics, and ethics at odds with dominant cultural assumptions...[highlighting our temptation] to resist living out the conviction that our Host will provide.”¹²¹ For Newman, the classical understanding of politics as “how a community, a *polis*, is ordered to produce a common good” is used in order to say that hospitality uses this framework since “[t]he politics of Christian hospitality looks to the good of the Body of Christ.”¹²²

However, such an assertion should be broadened. Understandably, Newman writes from the perspective of a Christian theologian and ethicist who seeks to revitalize the Christian community through the practice of hospitality. Yet, the practice of hospitality is neither the property of nor unique to the Christian tradition, nor can it be used solely by Christianity for theological purposes. To articulate it as such is to do a disservice to the common theological values and ethical imperatives found in many of the world’s religions and, more specifically, in the Abrahamic traditions.¹²³

¹¹⁹ Immanuel Kant, “Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch’ in *Kant: Political Writings*, trans. H.B. Nisbet, ed., Hans Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 106 in Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 126. Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” will be explored more in Chapter Four’s discussion related to hospitality’s relationship to violence.

¹²⁰ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 118 quoting Kant’s “Perpetual Peace,” 105-106.

¹²¹ Elizabeth Newman, *Untamed Hospitality: Welcoming God and Other Strangers*, The Christian Practice of Everyday Life series, (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007), 14.

¹²² Newman, “Untamed Hospitality,” in *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*, (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2007), 17-18.

¹²³ However, it is acknowledged that the majority of the literature regarding hospitality does, indeed, come from the Christian tradition, so it can easily appear to the unfamiliar that Christianity is the only tradition familiar with hospitality. One desired

Instead, it would be appropriate to say the politics of hospitality, in general, looks to the good of humanity, or, in a more specific context, the good of one's neighbors. In this way, being one another's keeper is a political act.

b. Hospitality and Tolerance

In addition to the idea of hospitality as politics, Newman's work also asserts that "hospitality as inclusivity" is a distortion.¹²⁴ One might say the practice of hospitality is synonymous with popular negative views of tolerance, sometimes depicted as a lack of conviction, mere coexistence, or a failure to draw limits or highlight expectations. Yet, some argue that this manner of practice is not true hospitality. In this vein, Newman asserts in her Christian understanding of hospitality that "Jesus's inclusivity is not without expectations" and in the Johannine story of the woman about to be stoned (8:1-11), "[h]e loves and accepts her but also calls her to a different way of life."¹²⁵ Newman argues that to celebrate diversity as an "internal good of hospitality is to distort it" since the "'good' of hospitality as diversity ends up underwriting a consumeristic and aesthetic way of life" which is basically noncommittal.¹²⁶ According to Newman, diversity for diversity's sake is not a mark of genuine hospitality, but instead turns guests into decoration or a consumable product.

Similarly, theologian and ethics scholar Luke Bretherton contrasts hospitality and tolerance. For Bretherton, "tolerance is the most common way of conceptualizing relations with an 'other' with whom one disagrees"¹²⁷ and, therefore, it is not congruent with the aims of genuine hospitality. Instead, Bretherton argues hospitality "constitutes a better way of framing relations with strangers than tolerance."¹²⁸ He defines tolerance as involving "the willingness to accept differences (whether religious, moral, ethnic or

outcome of my research is to show this is not the case.

¹²⁴ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 31.

¹²⁵ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 31.

¹²⁶ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 31.

¹²⁷ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 5.

¹²⁸ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 5.

economic) for which, at whatever level, one might, as an individual or as a community, disapprove.”¹²⁹ Furthermore, Bretherton details three conditions that need to be met in order for a group or individual to be tolerant:

First, there must be some conduct about which one disapproves, even if only minimally or potentially. Second, although such a person or group has power to act coercively against, or interfere to prevent, that of which they disapprove, they do not. Third, not interfering coercively result from more than acquiescence, resignation, indifference or a balance of power. One does not tolerate that which one is not concerned about; nor is it tolerance simply to accept what one cannot, or is not willing to, change (either because one lacks power to effect change or because, for whatever reason, one fears to use one’s power)...toleration is particularly important and problematic when it involves a principled refusal to prohibit conduct believed to be wrong.¹³⁰

Bretherton identifies tolerance as an “early modern period” phenomenon that “overshadowed the notion and practice of hospitality,”¹³¹ and asserts hospitality is “founded on more explicitly biblical and theological imperatives” than tolerance.¹³² Moreover, Bretherton appropriates the argument by philosopher John Gray, stating that “[l]iberal toleration presupposed a cultural consensus on values even as it allowed for differences in beliefs...[making tolerance] an inadequate ideal in societies in which deep moral diversity has become an established fact of life.”¹³³

Hospitality’s influence has heavier potential than tolerance in shaping society and social interaction, and has significant political implications as it can often mean the giver of hospitality finds oneself “actively opposed by those who would be...inhospitable to the vulnerable stranger.”¹³⁴ Here explorations of the boundaries of hospitality are necessary in light of the realities that accompany the need to protect those who are vulnerable. As

¹²⁹ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 122.

¹³⁰ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 122.

¹³¹ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 125.

¹³² Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 125.

¹³³ John Gray, “Pluralism and Toleration in Contemporary Political Philosophy,” *Political Studies*, 48:2, (2000), 323 in Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 126.

¹³⁴ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 141.

opposed to toleration, the host cannot be “uncritically welcoming of everyone...[as] a proper evaluation must be made of who, in any particular instance, is the stranger to be welcomed.”¹³⁵ This requirement, of course, leads to an unavoidable tension. Bretherton identifies this tension as being torn

between greeting every stranger...and discerning who would genuinely benefit from care, the tension of establishing institutional...forms of hospitality and the need for hospitality to be personal...and the tension between provision and the capacity to provide wherein the integrity and resources of the community can be overwhelmed by the abuse of, or extensive need for, hospitality.¹³⁶

Compared to tolerance, hospitality provides a much more meaningful framework as it has a greater capacity to enact and ensure social peace and security. Yet, both are needed. Hospitality cannot and should not replace tolerance, but instead should be recognized as something greater, a next step, and take tolerance further into actual engagement with the concrete other. Tolerance is limited because it does not encourage “active engagement and concern in the life of others” and does not foster as much of an impetus “to dialogue [and commit] to collaborative truth-seeking and the enrichment of life through the insights of others” as does hospitality.¹³⁷ In contrast, hospitality seeks “to welcome those with the least status,” actively working to support and address the needs of “the suffering-dying...who are likely to be neglected or oppressed because they lack the means to protect themselves.”¹³⁸ Since tolerance does not include a command “to attend to and actively help those without a

¹³⁵ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 141.

¹³⁶ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 142.

¹³⁷ Ian Markham, *Plurality and Christian Ethics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995), 188 in Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 147. Bretherton remarks in a footnote that Markham provides no justification for why there is a need to move beyond tolerance.

¹³⁸ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 148.

place or a voice in society," a tolerant society can [still], in some ways, "be deeply oppressive for many of its members."¹³⁹

c. *Hospitality and Solidarity*

As one considers hospitality's political dimensions, it is appropriate for its relationship with solidarity to be explored. The practice of hospitality, particularly on behalf of the threatened or oppressed other, and acts of solidarity certainly overlap.

The French term *solidarité* was first recorded in 1841 with the birth of communism, socialism, and anarchism as political ideologies, and, therefore, seems to have arisen out of a political and sociological context. In contemporary English usage, it connotes a "unity (as of a group or class) that produces or is based on community of interests, objectives, and standards"¹⁴⁰ and carries with it ideas of mutual responsibility and interdependence.

The relationship between hospitality and solidarity is somewhat ambiguous, but is present nonetheless. Christian theologian Thomas Reynolds writes about both as if they are music being made, different notes that form a song. He views solidarity as an interactive praxis that is "hybrid, boundary-transgressive, and self-differentiating...unstable and opens outward from the inside" and is brought into the fabric of a community by hospitality.¹⁴¹ He describes the relationship between hospitality and solidarity further by stating:

Hospitality nourishes a community precisely because it is disposed ...toward what lies beyond the conventional margins of a group's identity...[and] recognizes solidarity and kinship with what is unconventional and other. Put succinctly, hospitality acknowledges another as one's neighbor, a potential brother or sister. It is, thus, generous and courageously uncalculating, willingly granting by credit

¹³⁹ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 148.

¹⁴⁰ Its root is the Latin term *solidum* connoting entirety and from which the English term "solid" arises. Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/solidarity>, accessed on 8 March 2011.

¹⁴¹ Reynolds, "Improvising together...," 54.

a solidarity with what comes unexpectedly and unannounced—the stranger, one who does not belong and who comes from "outside" the zone of the familiar and expected. This requires both courage and justice: the former because one cannot forecast the outcome of the encounter, and the latter because one presumes the worth and dignity of the stranger. In fact, it is the presumption of worth that ennobles the risk of welcoming another. It willingly grants that another also possesses the moral characteristics of justice, humility, courage, and truthfulness, an assumption that could turn out in the end to be wrong. Thus, welcoming the stranger could mark one's undoing, but such welcoming is a risk that communal solidarity cannot avoid taking.¹⁴²

Therefore, to welcome another is to be open and available to the needs of the other and this welcome "lies at the core of genuine communal solidarity."¹⁴³ And through hospitality, the identities of the guest and host become "transposed through the encounter, each becoming an other for one another...[which creates an] enlarged sense of solidarity...[or] being at home with others – having a shared identity."¹⁴⁴ As such, Reynolds asserts hospitality "is the fulcrum for cultivating solidarity, the moral fabric of a community's ongoing sense of itself."¹⁴⁵

While the term solidarity is not present in the sacred texts, according to Golden and McConnell it is a "sacred act" that "captures the essence" of the Abrahamic traditions in their struggle to "maintain solidarity with their God and with the poor."¹⁴⁶ One could go so far as to say solidarity "is the modern equivalent of [the] covenant bond made with God."¹⁴⁷ Therefore, if solidarity is the bond, is hospitality then the action that honors the bond? If solidarity is the contract, perhaps hospitality is the actions and attitude that bring the contract of solidarity to life. While further research needs to be conducted on the connection between hospitality and solidarity, there

¹⁴² Reynolds, "Improvising together...", 54-55.

¹⁴³ Reynolds, "Improvising together...", 54.

¹⁴⁴ Reynolds, "Improvising together...", 56.

¹⁴⁵ Reynolds, "Improvising together...", 56.

¹⁴⁶ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 188.

¹⁴⁷ Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 188.

appears to something similar to a chemical catalytic relationship whereby their interaction causes a reaction and transformation into something new. In this case, that something new is the willingness to put oneself at risk to seek the benefit of the other.

In contexts of oppression and marginalization where solidarity is the most appropriate response, the “challenge is to secure social space within which an alternative world of meaning can be established and nurtured, generating resistance to oppression.”¹⁴⁸ The creation and maintenance of that space is an act of hospitality. Yet, hospitality on its own cannot be the sole moral response in this context. Ogletree argues hospitality practiced by those who benefit from structures of inequality sets in motion “a movement of awareness which leads to repentance,” or “a deep turning of mind away from the familiar world toward the possibility of a new order of the world,” which in turn informs and feeds solidarity and enables a reciprocal relationship to be formed.¹⁴⁹ In some cases, to show hospitality and solidarity to those who are under threat is to “surrender altogether the location which gives [one] power and privilege” that most likely will cause oneself to then be counted among the threatened as well.¹⁵⁰ As such, hospitality and solidarity come at a price.

¹⁴⁸ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 5.

¹⁴⁹ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 6

¹⁵⁰ Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger*, 6

d. Hospitality and Honor

As will be explored further in Chapter Four of this dissertation in the specific context of the Abrahamic traditions, a central contention of this argument is that the practice of hospitality is inextricably linked to concepts of honor. While there has not been any significant research conducted specifically on the relationship between hospitality and honor, there is enough in the research that exists on each independently to suggest the connection is of importance to what is being explored in this dissertation.¹⁵¹

Honor, as considered by philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah, is closely connected with other key concepts such as identity and recognition.¹⁵²

As such, Appiah asserts honor is given when “others...respond appropriately

¹⁵¹ On concepts of honor as it informs this discussion on hospitality, see Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, 1st published 1946, (Boston: Mariner Books, 2006); J.G. Peristiany, ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (University of Chicago Press, 1974); Paul Friedrich, “Sanity and the Myth of Honor: The Problem of Achilles,” *Ethos* 5 (1977): 281-305; Julian Pitt-Rivers, *Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in Anthropology of the Mediterranean*, Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 19, (1977): 94-112; Michael Herzfeld, “Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems,” *Man* (Royal Anthropological Institute) 15 (1980): 339-351; David Gilmore, ed. *Honour and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987); J.G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers, eds., *Honor and Grace in Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Douglas Cairns, *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); William Ian Miller, *Humiliation: and other essays on honor, social discomfort, and violence* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1993); Bernard Williams, *Shame and Necessity*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1993); Richard E. Nisbett and Dov Cohen, *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South* (Westview Press, 1996); Ken Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History: A Narratological and Anthropological Analysis*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 234, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); Anton Blok, *Honour and Violence*, (New York: Polity, 2000); and Louise Joy Lawrence, *An ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew: a critical assessment of the use of the honour and shame model in New Testament studies*. Doctoral thesis (Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

¹⁵² Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2010), xiii. Appiah’s connections between honor, identity and recognition seem similar to Paul Ricoeur’s idea of politics of recognition in *The Course of Recognition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007). Appiah also refers to George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s idea of *Anerkennung* (“recognition”), which are compiled and explored more fully in Robert R. Williams, *Hegel’s Ethics of Recognition*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000). See Allen J. Frantzen, *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice, and the Great War*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004) for an exploration of the relationship between chivalry (which reads remarkably similar to honor) and concepts of sacrifice for a greater good as an expression of heroic masculinity through a context of violence. Protective hospitality has the potential to provide an alternative vision of honor which embraces risk (instead of heroism), egalitarian practice, and nonviolence as a means of honoring all life.

to who we are and to what we do” and, therefore, it must have “a crucial place...in our thinking about what it is to live a successful human life.”¹⁵³ In turn, Appiah makes the connection between the role of honor in a successful human life and the role of flourishing in Aristotle’s concept of *eudaimonia*, upon which the study of ethics is based.¹⁵⁴ Therefore, according to Appiah, honor is integral to ethical behavior and accordingly honor plays “a central role” in moral revolutions,¹⁵⁵ as morality “is an important dimension of ethics.”¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, he asserts honor is “an engine...that can drive us to take seriously our responsibilities in a world we share” and, as such, honor makes integrity, or “caring to do the right thing,” public.¹⁵⁷

However, Appiah differentiates honor and morality in an important way. He states:

A grasp of morality will keep soldiers from abusing the human dignity of their prisoners. It will make them disapprove of the acts of those who don’t. And it will allow women who have been vilely abused to know that their abusers deserve punishment. But it takes a sense of honor to drive a soldier beyond doing what is right and condemning what is wrong to insisting that something is done when others on his side do wicked things. It takes a sense of honor to feel implicated by the acts of others.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵³ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, xiii-xiv. Similarly, the pursuit towards justice in liberation and feminist theologies could be construed as primarily a pursuit for recognition and honor, shown by allowing those who are often left out to be heard, valued, protected and given hospitality. Appiah notes the psychology and physicality of honor by noting it is “deeply connected with walking tall and looking the world in the eye...when able-bodied people with a sense of honor remember they are entitled to respect, they literally walk with their heads held high...Humiliation, on the other hand, curves the spine, lowers the eyes....shame’s face is the face of a person with eyes cast down...” (xvii-xviii).

¹⁵⁴ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, xiii-xiv. This connection to flourishing, honor and ethics complements Jacques Derrida’s assertions related to ethics and hospitality as discussed earlier in this chapter.

¹⁵⁵ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, xii, xiii. Moral revolutions for Appiah are dramatic shifts in cultural values that move toward honor and respect for the flourishing of human life. In his book, he focuses upon the stigmatization of what were at one time acceptable cultural practices such as foot binding, slavery, and “honor” killings.

¹⁵⁶ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, xiv. Appiah differentiates ethics from morality by stating “morality...is an important dimension of ethics: doing what I should for others is part of living well.” Appiah sees ethics as that concept of living well, and therefore, morality appears to be that which is done to enable one to live well.

¹⁵⁷ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 179. This public aspect of honor will be a necessary element in the formation of protection as a form of hospitality in later chapters.

¹⁵⁸ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 204.

Conversely, honor without morality leads to practices of honor codes that encourage its adherents to “do things that are actually immoral.”¹⁵⁹ It cannot be ignored that honor has been used as a means to sustain oppressive power and authority, and provided justification for horrific abuse throughout the centuries on both interpersonal and systemic levels. To counteract this, Appiah argues that honor and morality must be partners if a more just and inclusive society is to be developed.¹⁶⁰

Appiah also discusses the outward manifestations of honor and respect by stating that when one loses respect, others are inclined to treat that person more poorly.¹⁶¹ Conversely, when honor is gained and enacted, it “powers the global movement for human rights” and also “allows communities both large and small to reward and encourage people who excel...[and] motivate citizens in the unending struggle to discipline the acts of their governments.”¹⁶²

So what about hospitality, and where does it meet honor? Writer and theologian G.K. Chesterton wrote “the most obvious expression of honour [is] hospitality.”¹⁶³ How then do they relate to one another? One way in which one can ascertain the relationship between honor and hospitality is to consider it anthropologically. Tone Bringa, an anthropologist who studied

¹⁵⁹ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 177. Appiah gives the example of honor killings, but his arguments would apply to all manner of actions that were once acceptable but have now been stigmatized in many circles as immoral such as torture, blood feuds, and child labor, among others.

¹⁶⁰ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 175-204.

¹⁶¹ Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 180-195. This is not a neutral state, however. Such an exhibition of “losing honor” is found in so-called “honor killings” which Appiah addresses. In truth, however, David Tombs notes honor in the South Asian context (where honor killings are carried out) usually “reflects mainly male interests” and that of the family, instead of specifically the woman’s honor. Tombs, “‘Shame’ as a Neglected Value in Schooling,” *The Journal of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*, 29/1, 1995, 24. See also Saima Jasam, *Honour, shame and resistance*, (Lahore : ASR Publications, 2001) and Amir H. Jafri, *Honour Killing: Dilemma, Ritual, Understanding*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 18-33 who also refers to the following sources: S.D. Lang, *Sharaf politics: Constructing male prestige in Israeli-Palestinian society*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 2000; S. Ortner, “The virgin and the state,” *Feminist Studies*, 4, 19-35; J. Schneider, “Of vigilance and virgins: Honor, shame, and access to resources in Mediterranean societies,” *Ethnology*, 10, 1-24; and P. Friedrich, “Sanity and the myth of honour: The problem of Achilles,” *Ethos*, 5, 281-305.

¹⁶² Appiah, *The Honor Code*, 195

¹⁶³ G.K. Chesterton, *The Collected Works of G.K Chesterton*, vol. 29, (London: Ignatius Press, 1988), 381.

villages in central Bosnia, noted hospitality “is a form of social exchange” where actions such as “ceremonial gift-giving, voluntary work, ritualized hospitality and institutionalized visiting patterns” illustrate the strong relationship between honor and hospitality as a cultural ethos.¹⁶⁴ She noted that the provision of hospitality is “closely related to the reputation of individual households” and illustrates the connection in Bosnian for “the verb for offering hospitality (*častiti*) [as having] the same etymology as the word for honor (*čast*).”¹⁶⁵ She also noted that “a household, which outsiders always see as a unit and therefore reflecting on men and women equally, gains social standing (“honor”) from the way it receives a guest.”¹⁶⁶ As a result, the economic struggles of the 1980s in then-Yugoslavia “often made it difficult (or of lower priority) for people to honor (*častiti*) guests as they believed they should” as there was “a sense of shame and inadequacy in not being able to offer guests much in the way of food” in a context where “lavish hospitality is...an expression of both the moral superiority of the host and the political potential of the guest.”¹⁶⁷

Anthropologist Anne Meneley noted similar findings in the context of Yemen.¹⁶⁸ The Islamic idea of *adab*, translated as manners or “correct comportment,” refers to one’s “social personhood,”¹⁶⁹ carries within it connotations of honor and hospitality. According to Meneley, in order for the elite to maintain their position in society (i.e. their honor), they “must display, consume and distribute their wealth in a way that indicates a willingness to engage with others in the community, through acts of generosity and hospitality” as the values of “generosity, hospitality and charity are...shared

¹⁶⁴ Tone Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way: Identity and Community in a Central Bosnian Village*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 68.

¹⁶⁵ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 69.

¹⁶⁶ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 69. Bringa also refers to the work of Michael Herzfeld who pointed out the link between hospitality and honor in Crete society. Herzfeld notes that “social worth [*filotimo*, ‘sometimes glossed as honour’] is hospitality.” Herzfeld, “‘As in Your Own House’: Hospitality, Ethnography, and the Stereotype of Mediterranean Society,” in *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, D. Gilmore, ed., (Washington: American Anthropological Association, 1987), 75-8.

¹⁶⁷ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 69. Bringa refers again to the work of Herzfeld in relation to the moral and political implications of “lavish hospitality.”

¹⁶⁸ Anne Meneley, “Living Hierarchy in Yemen,” *Anthropologica* XLII (2000), 61-74.

¹⁶⁹ Meneley, “Living Hierarchy in Yemen,” 67.

by all.”¹⁷⁰ Those values are perpetuated throughout society, however, by the “daily negotiation, contestation and competition” of hospitality where “neglecting a guest in one’s own home only hurts one’s own reputation” and “honour accrues to those who are visited, who are thereby acknowledged as socially significant and morally sound, and those who are allowed to give (or give back) rather than receive.”¹⁷¹

When considering honor and hospitality historically, one finds further evidence of their relationship in the context of ancient Greece. *Aidos* was the Greek goddess or personification of modesty, humility and shame, and as such *aidos* was a value and emotion in Greek culture that kept one from doing wrong through the power of reverence or shame, enabling one to abide by accepted ethical codes of behavior.¹⁷² As a result, *aidos* dictated that “abuse of another’s hospitality...[was] disgraceful” and “both abuse of hospitality and failure to protect a guest...as inappropriate and unseemly”¹⁷³ as “protection of strangers was...[in the context of ancient Greek literature] a Homeric ideal.”¹⁷⁴

Likewise, New Testament scholars Carolyn Osiek and David Balch assert the context of the early Christian church points to the relationship between honor and hospitality by noting that “receiving a stranger as a guest...creates a bond...whereby the stranger is welcomed as fictive kin.”¹⁷⁵ Furthermore, honor plays a role in this expression of hospitality in that “the host violates the rules of hospitality by allowing the guest to be dishonored or

¹⁷⁰ Meneley, “Living Hierarchy in Yemen,” 67.

¹⁷¹ Meneley, “Living Hierarchy in Yemen,” 68. The importance of the value of hospitality and honor within Arab societies has been documented elsewhere. One example is the work of Sammy Smooha, who looks at the culture differences and perceptions of hospitality between Israeli Jews and Arab Palestinians that serve to feed stereotypes and ongoing conflict. See Smooha, *Israel: pluralism and conflict*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978) 199-200, 380.

¹⁷² *Aidos* could be considered as similar to conscience as it is a self-regulating ethical mechanism. See Bernard Williams' book on *Shame and Necessity*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993) for a discussion of honor and shame as determiners of modern moral categories.

¹⁷³ Douglas Cairns, *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 110 referring to Homer's *Odyssey* 20. 294-295.

¹⁷⁴ Cairns, *Aidos*, 113.

¹⁷⁵ Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*, (Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1997), 39.

harmed...[and] the guest violates the rules by dishonoring the host or anyone in his household.”¹⁷⁶

Another historical example of honor and hospitality that continues to be applied in the current day is seen in The Kanun of Lekë Dukagjini, a fifteenth century codified collection of laws related to honor and hospitality often referred to as *besa*, in Albanian culture. As an ethical code, it relies upon the fictive kin relationship as well as it calls upon its adherents to “treat strangers as if they were family...and guard them with their lives.”¹⁷⁷

Accordingly, abiding by the code of *besa* brings honor to the family, and those who do are described as being “full of *besa*.”¹⁷⁸

The relationship between hospitality and honor is not a one-to-one relationship, but as evidenced thus far, it does illustrate that each has an impact upon the other. How this relationship plays out in the practice of protective hospitality has been alluded to here, but will be presented in much greater detail in Chapter Four.

¹⁷⁶ Osiek and Balch, *Families*, 39. This concept of dishonor as a result of the guest being harmed will be important in the development of the practice of protective hospitality in the following chapters.

¹⁷⁷ CBS News, “The Righteous”, 8 November 2009, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/11/08/sunday/main5574960.shtml>, accessed on 15 October 2010. The code of *besa* would be attributed as the reason why so many Jews found refuge in Albania during World War II. See Norman Gershman, *Besa: A Code of Honor: Muslim Albanians who Rescued Jews During the Holocaust*, (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008) and Eboo Patel, “When Muslims Saved Jews”, part of The Faith Divide series of *The Washington Post*, 25 June 2009 (http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/eboo_patel/2009/06/besa_world_war_ii_re-told.html), accessed on 15 October 2010.

¹⁷⁸ David Tombs explores the concept of *izzat* (honor) in Hindi/Urdu speaking South Asian communities in England in his article “‘Shame’ as a Neglected Value in Schooling.” The usage of the word *izzat* and its corresponding *bei’izzat* (shame/dishonor; sometimes shortened to *behzti*) in the context of discussion of honor sounds remarkably similar to the Albanian *besa*, albeit one is negative and the other is positive. Yet, one could see how a code of dishonor/shame could easily morph into a code of honor as culture, geography and language changed. Unfortunately, there has been no research on this possible linguistic connection as of yet and merits further attention at a later date.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how hospitality is understood, discussed and enacted in a variety of ways that give meaning to it as a cultural practice. It has introduced some of the tensions in hospitality, including: exclusion and inclusion, embrace and coercion, violence and protection, invited and uninvited, honor and shame. These serve to define its meaning and practice in their in-between spaces. Derrida's assertion that hospitality is "the ethics par excellence"¹⁷⁹ points to its complexity, potential power and role in one's life and community if given meaningful consideration and effort.

This chapter has examined the semantic range of hospitality in an effort to ascertain its meaning. It has sketched three important ways hospitality is expressed, in the provision of food and drink, intellectual welcome, and protection. It has also considered the relationships hospitality has with political power, tolerance, solidarity and honor.

Ogletree asserts that "[t]o offer hospitality to a stranger is to welcome something new, unfamiliar, and unknown into our life-world" and requires "a recognition of the stranger's vulnerability in an alien world...[where they are in need of] shelter and sustenance."¹⁸⁰ This assertion – that hospitality requires showing welcome to the unknown other and a sensitivity and willingness to meet the needs of that other in a hostile world – will be explored in more detail in the following chapter, as it pertains to the Abrahamic traditions in particular.

¹⁷⁹ Derrida, "Hospitality and Hostility," in McNulty, xvii.

¹⁸⁰ Ogletree, *Hospitality to Strangers*, 2.

CHAPTER THREE: HOSPITALITY AND THE ABRAHAMIC TRADITIONS

Are we not of interest to each other?
- Elizabeth Alexander¹

Introduction

This chapter will build upon the preceding chapter, which extended hospitality and analyzed its contributing factors, to focus upon hospitality in the theology and practices of the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Foundations of the Abrahamic traditions that inform the practice of hospitality will be explored, namely in the original geography and cultures in the traditions' development, as detailed in the first section that addresses shared origins. This exploration will be made with an acknowledgment that "universal truth is worth more than local particularisms."² The universality in this case is found in the commonalities that exist within the traditions, that upon which hospitable life has been built.

In addition, as each tradition is considered in turn in the following sections, their common history of exile and persecution in formational periods; the role of prophets and models as examples of personified hospitality; common values such as dignity, generosity and honor, and other particular factors that inform hospitality as an ethic will also be analyzed. In addition to these commonalities, specific understandings and resources available in each tradition – that which makes them particular – will be highlighted and considered. Each section will conclude with an analysis of challenges in the contemporary context of each tradition as it relates to the practice of hospitality.

¹ Elizabeth Alexander, from her poem "Ars Poetica #100: I Believe" in *Crave Radiance: New and Selected Poems 1990-2010*, (Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2010), 185.

² Emmanuel Levinas, *Difficult Freedom: Essays on Judaism*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 179. Also referred to in Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 367. Levinas makes this statement in reference to Islam and how he thinks it understands this principle better than any other religious tradition.

The final section of this chapter will highlight emphases that are currently missing in the contemporary Western Christian scholarship.³ Through consideration of the practice of hospitality in Judaism and Islam and the particular resources available within the tradition, Christianity will be examined in order to identify aspects that have perhaps been forgotten over the centuries. This section will serve as a means of reflection and exercise of the dialogical method utilized in the body of this research.

1. Shared Origins: The Abrahamic Traditions and the Practice of Hospitality

In order to provide an overview of resources in the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam that contribute to a theology and ethic of hospitality, it is first important to consider some common themes in each tradition that inform hospitable practice.

Over the last century, the relationship between Judaism and Christianity has been increasingly accepted and the term “Judeo-Christian” has been used quite frequently to describe certain theological and ethical similarities between the two religious traditions. The use of this term refers to an acceptance that these traditions are similar enough as they have common bonds, common heritage, common scripture and common understandings. Nevertheless, Islam’s inclusion is necessary in this research, particularly as it also finds its root in Abraham, is increasingly acknowledged in global relations, shares common values, geography and reverence for religious figures such as Moses and Jesus, as well as its strong tradition in the practice of hospitality. Moreover, Jewish philosopher Jacques Derrida advocated the inclusion of Islam in the discussion of what has been called “Judeo-Christian spirituality” as Islam presents itself “as a religion, an ethics,

³ Again, because of the limitations of this research, the emphasis here (unless noted otherwise) is upon English-speaking, Western Christian scholarship, while also noting that western Christian thought is not all there is to Christianity, and at the same time acknowledging Western Christianity does not equal contemporary Christianity.

and a culture of hospitality.”⁴ As such, in each instance Derrida discusses religion in his work, his focus is “always on the Abrahamic.”⁵

To refer to the traditions as *Abrahamic* implies an overarching common theme in that each tradition finds its spiritual roots in the person and narrative of Abraham.⁶ The term “Abrahamic” has been widely adopted to refer generally to the three traditions that look to Abraham as a founding patriarch and over the years has been appropriated as a term that originated from language used in primarily Islamic religious discourse.⁷ Nevertheless, it is how the three traditions perceive this person of Abraham and the respective narratives attributed to him that lend authority to commonality and practice of hospitality.

Lewis Mudge found importance in the gift of responsibility that God gave to Abraham as a result of God’s promise that Abraham and his descendents would be a “blessing to the nations” as that which binds the traditions together.⁸ Mudge asserts Abraham “comes to know that true obedience to God requires him responsibly to exercise the gift of discernment of what obedience requires...[and t]his...gift of responsibility...[is] at the origin of all three Abrahamic faiths.”⁹ Furthermore, Mudge argues that as a result of this promise, adherents to Abrahamic traditions are to “do those things that make [them] free to be instruments of the promise of ‘blessing’ extended to all human beings....[and] this ‘blessing’ is both an act of giving

⁴ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 365.

⁵ Gil Anidjar’s “Introduction” in Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 3.

⁶ The use of the term “Abrahamic” can be construed in two different ways: Either it can be considered a marker of the “original and gathering root of the three major monotheistic faiths or, more pervasively, as the (three) branches of one single faith. It suggests the reclaiming of territorialized roots, the reoccupation and gathering of a site of welcoming togetherness, where old fallen branches can come back to life: as Paul writes, ‘God is perfectly able to graft them back again’ (Romans 11:23)...it also institutes the possibility of comparison under the allegedly unified figure of Abraham, whose name appears in the three scriptural traditions.” Anidjar, “Introduction,” in Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 3.

⁷ Gil Anidjar refers to the work of Jonathan Z. Smith, “Religion, Religions, Religious,” in Mark C. Taylor, ed., *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 276 in the Introduction to Derrida’s *Acts of Religion*, 3.

⁸ Genesis 17:16, 18:18, 22:18, 26:4; Qur’an 2:124, 3:33, 14:36. The Qur’anic interpretation of the covenant of blessing with Abraham is most often interpreted as conditional and based upon whether or not Abraham’s descendents obey God and live righteous lives.

⁹ Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility*, 8-9.

and a gift that conveys the responsibility to be what we will be, in [oneself] and for others.”¹⁰

a. Model: Abraham

Since the traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam are collectively known as “Abrahamic” traditions, the person of Abraham is a foundational character to each tradition’s formation. The perception of him as a model whereupon the traditions find authority and inspiration for the practice of hospitality is no coincidence.

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam considers Abraham a patriarch who “came to this earth as a ‘stranger, a hôte, *gêr*,’ and a kind of saint of hospitality” and a pilgrim who “left his own”¹¹ to go where God directed him for the purpose God had in mind. Each tradition looks to Abraham and his descendents as the “center of the paradigmatic hospitality narratives”¹² for the foundation of their faith and hospitable practice. Abraham is the archetype for both the practice of hospitality as well as “nomadic, national, and exilic experiences”¹³ which marked “the first time in human history in which the divine world was seen to side with ‘outlaws, fugitives and

¹⁰ Mudge, *The Gift of Responsibility*, 9.

¹¹ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 369 quoting and referring to Louis Massignon’s work “The Three Prayers of Abraham Father of all Believers” in *Testimonies and Reflections: Essays of Louis Massignon*, ed. Herbert Mason (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 3-20. See also F.E. Peters, *Children of Abraham: Judaism, Islam, and Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982); Karl-Josef Kushchel, *Abraham: A Symbol of Hope for Jews, Christians and Muslims*, (London: SCM, 1994); Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds. *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish and Christian Relations*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005); Joan Chittister, O.S.B., Murshid Saadi Shakur Chishti, and Rabbi Arthur Waskow, *The Tent of Abraham: Stories of Hope and Peace for Jews, Christians and Muslims*, (Boston: Beacon, 2006).

¹² Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 109. Genesis 18, 19, 24, 29; Acts 7; Hebrews 11; Qur’an 11, 15, 51.

¹³ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 109. Yong refers to the work of Thomas M. Bolin, “A Stranger and an Alien Among You’ (Genesis 23:4): The Old Testament in Early Jewish and Christian Self-Identity,” in *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, ed. Julian V. Hills (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 57-76. Also, the “national” aspect of this would most likely not strictly apply in the case of Islam, but certainly would in the case of Judaism and Christianity.

immigrants' rather than with the political structures whose policies and use of power made such social types inevitable."¹⁴

The manner in which the three Abrahamic traditions perceive their shared patriarch differs, however. Since the Christian tradition appropriated much of the Jewish tradition, particularly in relation to narratives in the Hebrew Bible, the role of Abraham as a model of behavior for these two traditions is virtually identical.¹⁵ Among other factors, Jews and Christians see Abraham as the first wanderer, the first sojourner. As such, the power of Abraham in this context lies in his narrative highlighting the idea "that no one, neither people nor individual, really has a home in world history, that no one is finally secure, that we are all pushed about, that we are all- eternal strangers, since it is only in God that we are finally at home and secure."¹⁶ Yet, in contrast to Judaism and Christianity's additional and heretofore unmentioned interpretations of Abraham as the "father of nations," Muslim theology related to Abraham does not carry the connotations of "a special history of revelation for a particular people" as is present in Judaism and Christianity.¹⁷ Instead, Muhammad understood Abraham "a priori as the model of true faith, which anyone can practise, quite independently of belonging to a people or having a place in salvation history."¹⁸

¹⁴ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 109-110 quoting from 332 in Frank Anthony Spina, "Israelites as *gerim*, 'Sojourners,' in Social and Historical Context," in Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, eds., *the Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 321-335.

¹⁵ The obvious exception to the Abraham narrative in the Hebrew Bible as told in Judaism and in Christianity is the identity, and, therefore, the importance, of the guests Abraham entertains. In the Jewish tradition, the guests are angels or messengers of God. In Christianity, there are some who interpret the three guests as a theophany but also physical manifestations of the Trinity, primarily based upon a Trinitarian interpretation of the Hebrews 7 text as well as Genesis 18; 19:24 and John 8:56. It is also depicted in Orthodox iconography as Trinitarian, with famous icons such as Andrei Rublev's 1410 icon that is called a variety of names, including "The Old Testament Trinity" or simply "The Trinity."

¹⁶ Barth, *Church Dogmatics* III/3, G. W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance, eds. and trans. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960), 224-225 in Sutherland, *I Was a Stranger*, 37.

¹⁷ Kuschel, *Abraham*, 163. In the interest of Gentiles (in Muhammad's case, Arabs), the issue of God's covenant with Abraham and blessing of a particular group of people is unhelpful.

¹⁸ Kuschel, *Abraham*, 163. The apostle Paul argues similarly in Romans 4 and Galatians 3.

As a model of behavior regarding the practice of hospitality, Abraham's narrative is powerful. Referred to by the sacred texts of all three traditions, the account of Abraham's (and his wife Sarah's) hospitality to the three strangers carries fundamental weight.¹⁹ From the originating text found in Genesis 18, the Abrahamic traditions develop their particular theologies and ethic related to hospitality²⁰ in light of Abraham's response to the unexpected visit from what were considered to be messengers from God. Arterbury notes other texts, such as the Septuagint,²¹ Philo's *De Abrahamo*,²² Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*²³ and other later texts by Clement (75-110 CE),²⁴ Rabbi Nathan (later 3rd century CE),²⁵ and the *Genesis Rabbah* (c. 400 CE),²⁶ also make reference to the hospitality narrative of Abraham,

¹⁹ Genesis 18:1-33; Acts 7; Hebrews 11; Qur'an 11:72; 15:51; 51:24.

²⁰ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 371. Derrida also asserts that "it is indeed the hospitality of the hôte Abraham that is placed at the center of Islam and that makes of Islam the most faithful heir" as within the Qur'an, the Genesis text is referenced and shows "that Islam has deduced the principle of *lqra* (*dakhalk, jiwar*), right of hospitality, *ikram al dayf*, respect of the human person, of the hôte, sent by God." Derrida, 371 quoting from Pierre Roclav, *Louis Massignon et l'islam* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1993), 33.

²¹ Andrew Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in its Mediterranean Setting*, New Testament Series Monographs, 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), 61 references the work of Samuel Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature* (New York: Ktav, aug. edn, 1971), 181 wherein he notes the differences between the Masoretic text and the Greek Septuagint text of Genesis 18, which seem to cater to the hospitality preferences and rituals of a Greek audience rather than a Hebrew one.

²² Peder Borgen, 'Philo of Alexandria,' in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 233-282. See also Sandmel's work reference above.

²³ *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV*, H.St.J. Thackeray et al., trans., (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935). Cf. Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. III. *Judean Antiquities 1-4: Translation and Commentary*, S. Mason, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

²⁴ Kirsopp Lake, "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," in *The Apostolic Fathers*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912 [repr. 1977]) 1-122. Arterbury (66) notes that for later Christian interpretations of the hospitality of Abraham, see *Apocalypse of Paul* 27, Origen's fourth homily on Genesis, and John Chrysostom's forty-first homily on Genesis.

²⁵ *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan*, Judah Goldin, trans., Yale Judaic Series, 10, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955). See also Jacob Neusner, ed., *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan: An Analytical Translation and Explanation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

²⁶ Jacob Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis, A New American Translation*, 2 vols. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). Arterbury (61-70) references each of these texts as noted above, comparing and contrasting the Jewish traditions with the Greco-Roman traditions of hospitality and the language used to describe them.

establishing a paradigm in the development of the merits of welcoming the other in religious thought and practice, as well as in social duty, over the centuries.²⁷

b. Ethics Based in Culture

The contribution of geography and cultures prevalent in the region of the Mediterranean and Near East are a common factor in the development of a theology and ethic of hospitality in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Although these respective traditions have spread throughout the world over the centuries and continue to be shaped by a variety of local contexts even today, they all arose from a particular place and cultural milieu that necessitated hospitality as a social, religious, and political practice.²⁸

When considering hospitality in the Abrahamic sacred texts, it is helpful if one understands the cultural approach to hospitality in antiquity instead of importing contemporary concepts that may or may not be relevant to the original context. Therefore, the following two sections will deal with two specific cultural aspects of the practice of hospitality that inform the Abrahamic traditions: Mediterranean/Near Eastern and desert contexts.

i. Mediterranean/Near Eastern Societies

The majority of research on hospitality in antiquity has been in the area of Greco-Roman practices of hospitality found in the Mediterranean and the Near East.²⁹ Albeit hospitable practice existed long before Greco-Roman

²⁷ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 70. Cf. John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

²⁸ It is a generally accepted anthropological truism that the greatest influence upon the shaping and practice of religion and social ethics is local culture. For more information on how this works, the work of anthropologist Clifford Geertz is useful. For general anthropological work in this area, see Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, (New York: Basic Books, 1973) or *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983). For his work in comparing Islam as "a single creed...in contrasting civilizations," see *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971).

²⁹ Cf. Herzfeld, "As in Your Own House," 75-89. See also J.G. Peristiany, ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (University of Chicago Press, 1974).

culture became prevalent in these areas, the practices were undoubtedly appropriated, assimilated, and developed further into the colonized context and were recorded for posterity into the literature and social practices still being analyzed today. Examples such as Ovid's myth of Baucis and Philemon, Homer's *Odyssey*, or Heliodorus' *An Ethiopian Story* along with several other works give significant insight into the practice of hospitality in the region of the Mediterranean and the Near East in antiquity.

In general, however, when hospitality is considered in antiquity in this context, it is usually defined "as the kind treatment of travelers or strangers, which included welcoming, feeding, lodging, protecting, and aiding the traveler...[but also] hinges upon the identity of the persons involved."³⁰ How and why that hospitality is expressed, however, is varied.

Arterbury refers to the work of antiquities scholar Ladislaus Bolchazy who delineates five motives for hospitality according to the customs found in Mediterranean and Near Eastern antiquity:

1) "Medea" hospitality (based on Euripides' *Medea*) finds its motivation through "'magico-religious xenophobia'" which required kindness to strangers in order that they might be disarmed of any ill will or occult powers that could be used against the host or his/her community.³¹

2) Theoxenic hospitality is the expression of hospitality whereby the motivation derives from the conviction that "gods or their representatives often visited humans in the form of beggars or strangers."³² Because of the ability to hide their divinity under the

³⁰ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 16. Arterbury alludes to the work of Gabriel Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 10 where Herman notes hospitality is a reciprocal relationship "between individuals originating from separate social units" (Herman, 10) and, therefore, "the recipient of hospitality in antiquity was a person who was traveling outside of his or, more rarely, her home territory." (Arterbury, 16).

³¹ Ladislaus Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1977), 8-10 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 24.

³² See Bolchazy, 11-14 as referred to in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 24. This

guise of human form, the gods or their emissaries were able to test their human subjects regarding their character and capacity for hospitality, determining if they were morally upstanding. Understandably, cultures that adhered to this particular belief were then motivated to treat the other with kindness and hospitality because to welcome the other was to possibly welcome the divine.³³ Such an idea – that the gods test humanity on the merits of their provision of hospitality – then makes it reasonable to ascertain that “hospitality is the attribute or special domain of the principal divinity (YHWH, Zeus, Jupiter Capitolinus, the Holy Trinity,” and that in ancient Greece “one [may] even argue that hospitality is religion, the defining social ethics of *Zeus Xenios*, Zeus god of strangers.”³⁴

3) *Ius hospitii, ius dei* is translated as “right of the guest, right of god” manifests itself in the motivation to provide hospitality to strangers because “the host believed hospitality was in accordance with the desires of the gods.”³⁵ This motivation for hospitality is very simple in that a host welcomed others because that is what he/she felt was what was expected in order to please the gods.

4) Contractual hospitality is based on the principle of reciprocity and is motivated by “personal advantages that [are] accrued to both parties” as part of a reciprocal relationship.³⁶ For this reason, hosts desired to develop new relationships and therefore offered hospitality to guests in order that during future travels, the host “could expect the same kind of blessings, provisions, and

same justification is seen in the motive found in Christianity, particularly in reference to the idea that to entertain strangers would be to entertain Christ himself or angels unaware.

³³ McNulty, *The Hostess*, 8.

³⁴ McNulty, *The Hostess*, vii, xiv-xv.

³⁵ See Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 14-16 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 27.

³⁶ See Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 16-18 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 27.

protection from their guests.”³⁷ Arterbury clarifies this elsewhere in his work by noting hospitality in this context depends upon “the foreignness of the two parties” involved and that it is “a reciprocal relationship ‘between individuals originating from separate social units.’”³⁸

5) Altruistic hospitality is the final motivation to provide hospitality wherein one welcomed others not out of “fear of strangers, the fear of gods, the desire to please the gods, nor the desire for personal gain...[but instead it is] primarily motivated by one’s love for one’s fellow human being.”³⁹

Such a breakdown of classic motivations for the provision of hospitality is helpful in that it assists in delineating underlying issues, fears, risks and beliefs both in antiquity and in current contexts as several still apply. In the context of this research, the final three motivations – *Ius hospitii*, *Ius dei*; contractual hospitality; and altruistic hospitality – are the most relevant in the current context of Abrahamic protective hospitality. Despite the various monastic orders in the Christian tradition that exhort followers to

³⁷ See Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 16-18 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 27. Interestingly, Arterbury claims the principle of reciprocity was stronger in Greco-Roman contexts than in Jewish and Christian expressions of hospitality in antiquity. He compares the two by stating Greco-Roman culture endorsed the practice of selecting guests and/or hosts “whom they anticipated would create a personal benefit for them through the exchange of gifts and the like,” whereas Jewish travelers “avoided accepting hospitality from non-Jews...[by seeking] out a distant family member or tribesman if possible” and Christians acted similarly by offering hospitality “only to Christian travelers” (Mt. 25.31-46; I Pet. 4.9; 2 Jn 10-11; 3 Jn 5-8) despite exhortations from the apostle Paul and the author of Hebrews (Rom. 12:13b; Heb. 13:2) to do otherwise. (*Entertaining Angels*, 132) There are some problems with these claims Arterbury makes, however, as the proof he gives are based on pericopes in the sacred texts of the traditions that were most likely not set out to give an account of the full sociological phenomenon of hospitality. While he may be identifying trends, such sweeping statements seem unfounded given the proof he cites. He does not critically interact in the context of narrative purpose, if those seeking hospitality were avoiding others out of fear or religious exclusion, if they simply did not expect others to extend them hospitality, or if there are underlying issues of religious purity. Admittedly, with historical research one is limited in one’s view of what actually happened in antiquity by what is recorded, one cannot surmise the full extent and practice of hospitality just from the sacred texts.

³⁸ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 16 referring to Gabriel Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Green City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 10.

³⁹ See Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, 18-20 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 28.

welcome strangers *as* Christ, the primary motivation is closer to *Ius hospitii*, *Ius dei* rather than actually believing that the stranger *is* Christ.⁴⁰

Furthermore, Ovid's myth of *Baucis and Philemon* places an additional emphasis on the idea that while "whoever welcomes a pilgrim, a foreigner, a poor person, welcomes God...[also w]hoever welcomes God turns himself or herself into a temple of God."⁴¹

Love of God and love of humanity are the most obvious Abrahamic motivators for providing hospitality. Based in ethical practice at its most elemental state, loving God and neighbor should be inseparable according to the Abrahamic traditions.⁴² Yet, the importance of contractual hospitality should not be underestimated. This principle of reciprocity has tremendous power in both the ancient and modern context. While Arterbury portrays this type of hospitality, particularly as practiced by the Greco-Romans, as a way of getting a return on one's hospitable investment, the development of relationships as a result of contractual hospitality should be taken seriously for through these developments hospitality can go beyond the simple "love of God and love of neighbor" justification to a more accountable practice calling upon the contracted parties to be responsible to one another. In some ways, contractual motivation is more compelling and carries more ethical weight in its requirement that the adherent act on behalf of the other than the more ambiguous "love of God, love of neighbor" motif.

Simultaneously, contractual hospitality carries political weight. Either on an individual or communal basis, if one goes out of one's way, risking oneself, for the other, it then becomes more than just a single occurrence. Therefore, contractual hospitality has the potential for a social movement

⁴⁰ In our contemporary context, it seems as if we no longer expect God to appear in human form, but instead our religious practice and textual interpretation has changed in that the adherent is expected to treat the stranger *as if* he/she were God but, rationally speaking or out of concerns regarding monotheism and idolatry, are not expected to believe that the stranger could be or is, indeed, divine.

⁴¹ It is a similar connection, but also distinctly different which requires pointing out. Boff, *Virtues*, 42, referring to A.D. Melville, trans. *Metamorphoses* by Ovid, with an introduction and notes by E.J. Kenney, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 190-193.

⁴² Lev 19:18, 34; Deut 6:5; Matt 22:37-40; Luke 10:27; Qur'an 4:36; *Sahih Bukhari* vol. 8, bk. 73, no. 160.

and for cooperative action, as it is closely bound with understandings of honor as well as one is honor-bound to repay debts, particularly if they are incurred on one's behalf.⁴³ This potential could also extend to highlight obligations to identify with, increase solidarity among, and stand up for each other among the three Abrahamic communities. Such obligations would help to develop a partnership that begins to look out for the interests of the other, building an ever-strengthening relationship of respect, dignity and social justice.

ii. *Desert Climates and Cultures*

There is a variety of deserts found on Earth⁴⁴ and if there is human community that resides in them, their cultures seem to be particularly known for hospitality. Desert people, by necessity, are often nomads.⁴⁵ Therefore, concepts of home, place, and stranger carry different connotations than in cultures where communities remain fixed. In a desert climate, prevalent cultures are reminded daily of the inhospitality of the land that surrounds them - the baking sun, the dry earth, the scarcity of water and vegetation - and how these conditions make the division between life and death much more immediate.⁴⁶

⁴³ Ken Stone notes some anthropologists who have looked into the role of honor in Mediterranean and Near Eastern societies "suggest that the early analysts of honor and shame stressed the sexual aspects...of 'honor' in a one-sided manner and neglected thereby other important components of honor such as honesty, cooperation, and especially hospitality (Herzfeld 1987; Gilmore 1987b)." *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History: A Narratological and Anthropological Analysis*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 234, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 74.

⁴⁴ The general desert categories are trade wind deserts (Sahara in North Africa), mid-latitude deserts (Sonoran in North America), rain shadow deserts (Gobi in Mongolia and China), coastal deserts (Atacama in South America), monsoon deserts (Rajasthan in India), and polar deserts (Antarctica).

⁴⁵ An exception to this would be the Pueblo people indigenous to the southwest of North America, who built houses, water storage and irrigation systems that fostered an agricultural culture rather than a nomadic culture. One may speculate that the geology of the area (a mid-latitude desert) in which they settled lent itself to their permanent establishment, whereas shifting sand dunes on the Arabian peninsula and elsewhere make erecting and maintaining permanent structures virtually impossible without a significant amount of civil engineering.

⁴⁶ Leonardo Boff spends some time in his book *Virtues For Another Possible World* (2011) extolling the unconditional hospitality of Mother Earth – "We exist because we were welcomed without hesitation by the Mother Earth, of whom we are sons and daughters; by

Without romanticizing the life of desert nomads, it is important to note the cultural proclivity nomadic communities have to fold up tents and move on to another location. Whereas settled agricultural communities “give up part of their freedom, whether to the group as a whole or to...a ruler, in exchange for peace, security and the prosperity which order brings,”⁴⁷ desert cultures find security and prosperity in the tribe or clan and the community created in their particular non-geographical boundaries. Furthermore, life within this context is determined by “the principles of honor and integrity demanded by the free life of the desert... [and as such i]t was these very conditions of desert living which led to the cultivation and growth of the virtues of hospitality, bravery, mutual assistance, neighbor protection, and magnanimity.”⁴⁸

The virtues held dear by desert cultures reflect these foundational principles of hospitality and protection. In a hostile desert environment, a dependency is built between individuals and the tribe or clan. In sparsely populated environments, the sight of another human being is cause for celebration because fellow travelers often brought news, resources, and long-awaited company beyond the confines of one’s own tribe. As a result, hospitality is ritualized and guests are accepted into the households of clans, and protected as if they are family.

Within Bedouin practices, which became absorbed into Islam at a later date, it was customary to take complete strangers into one’s tent, feed and protect them for up to three days before being asked where the stranger has

nature, who was so good to us...”(50) To be sure, Boff’s emphasis upon the ecological aspects and practices of hospitality are needed, but Boff is unquestioningly positivist in his depiction of nature. Nature taking revenge for our exploitative endeavors over the centuries (as disturbingly implied in M. Night Shyamalan’s film *The Happening* (2008)) aside, Boff’s optimistic depiction of nature does not take into account inhospitable climates which have developed and informed human practices of hospitality in order to ensure survival as detailed here.

⁴⁷ Muhammad Husayn Hayka, *The Life of Muhammad*, translated by Isma'il Ragi al Faruqi (American Trust Publications, first print 1976, fourth print 2005), 13.

⁴⁸ Hayka, *The Life of Muhammad*, 13. While there may be some debate about whether or not Judaism and Christianity arose out of the same desert culture as Islam, there remains the experience of the Israelites wandering in the desert having been liberated as slaves from Egypt on which many of their motivations for ethical behavior are based, as seen in the deuteronomic code to care for the widow, orphan and stranger because God brought them up out of Egypt and into the land of Israel, as will be detailed in the next section.

come from or who he/she was.⁴⁹ There have also been observations that Muslim historians and poets have great similarity with pre-Islamic literature, particularly in relation to hospitality, noting “it is inevitable that the themes of Arab verse should recur constantly...[as] Beduin [sic] life varied little from generation to generation.”⁵⁰ The literature arising from this region reflected the reality that the Bedouins’ “horizon was bounded by deserts, and consequently camels and horses...[and] hospitality and tribal pride were constantly mentioned in song.”⁵¹ To trace the origin of this imagery and influence of hospitality would be next to impossible, but the themes present in pre-Islamic and Islamic literature appear in the visions of “the generous man who slaughters camels for the hungry guest in winter when the famine deprives even the rich of wealth, even when kinsmen refuse their help; the man who entertains when camels’ udders are dry; the cauldron full of the hump and fat of the camel” and so on.⁵²

Similar practices in the desert of the Australian outback among the Aboriginal people reflect the virtue of hospitality, at least in the beginning. In the period of the 1850-1860 Victorian gold rush, there were many initial accounts of hospitality and generosity by the Aborigines, who were “proud of their country’ and happy to establish friendly contact with [the white] strangers” while also affording “significant assistance and hospitality.”⁵³

⁴⁹ Cf. Clinton Bailey, *A Culture of Desert Survival: Bedouin Proverbs from Sinai and the Negev*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004) and *Bedouin Law from Sinai and the Negev: Justice without Government*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009); A. M. Abou Zeid, “Honour and Shame Among Bedouins of Egypt,” in *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, J. G. Peristiany, ed. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965), 245-259; Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 2nd ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2004); and *Sahih al-Bukhari*, vol. 8, bk. 73, no. 156.

⁵⁰ Guillaume, “Introduction,” in Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Isahq’s Sirat Rasul Allah*, A. Guillaume, trans and ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), xxvi-xxvii, ftn 2.

⁵¹ Guillaume, “Introduction,” ftn 2, xxvi-xxvii.

⁵² Guillaume, “Introduction,” ftn 2, xxvi-xxvii. See also Lila Abu-Lughod, *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in Bedouin Society*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988).

⁵³ Ian D. Clark, David A. Cahir, “The comfort of strangers’: Hospitality on the Victorian Goldfields, 1850-1860,” *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Annual 2008, 8. Available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb1385/is_15/ai_n31528120/pg_8/, accessed on 27 April 2011. This was, of course, prior to the exploitation and inhospitality shown by the goldminers and missionaries that upset the balance. The authors also cite there was the

Traditional proverbs and greetings in these cultures also reflect the virtue of hospitality. Throughout the Near and Middle East, the traditional greeting of “*ahlan wa sahlān*” in Arabic, meaning “may you be part of the family and may your path be easy,” reflects this cultural value of welcome to the guest or stranger. Likewise, there is a similar proverb attributed to the Mongols in the Gobi Desert: “Happy is the one who has guests; merry is the home boasting a tethering rail full of visitors’ horses.”⁵⁴

The collection of proverbs and greetings, as well as values that exist as a part of the geographical terrain of desert climates all contribute to the development of an ethic of hospitality in particular cultures. As a result, such common practices and values have a great deal to lend to a complementary theology and ethic of hospitality in the Abrahamic traditions.

2. Christianity

Unlike Judaism and Islam as will be discussed later, the practice of hospitality has had a renaissance in recent Christian theological scholarship. Therefore, what is covered in the next section is much more detailed since there has been more specific scholarship made available with regards to the Christian tradition and its theology and practice of hospitality.

This section divides into six different sub-sections. The first will consider the impact of the early experiences of persecution upon the prioritization of hospitality as a religious value while the second will look at the role of Jesus as a model of hospitable practice. The third section will explore hospitality as it was expressed in Christian antiquity, moving into the fourth section which will address the particular theological concept of “welcome others, welcome Christ” as practiced by the monastic communities. Finally, the fifth section will analyze the discussions related to hospitality in

possibility of other motivations for aboriginal hospitality (i.e. “access to the possessions of white people, hastening the departure of potentially dangerous sojourners, and ensuring that travelers avoided sites of spiritual significance”), but still maintain that the Aboriginal people “were generally highly regarded for their hospitality” (8).

⁵⁴ This proverb is unverifiable as to its origin, but is cited in several locations as a colloquial proverb in reference to the Mongol peoples inhabiting the Gobi desert.

contemporary Christian thought making way for the sixth section that will highlight the challenges to the theology and practice of hospitality present in contemporary Christianity.

a. Early Christian persecution

Development of the Christian tradition in its early days was rooted in the use of house churches, wherein hosts gave the fledging community protection from the persecution of the Roman Empire and safety in order to worship together.⁵⁵ The experience of persecution was valuable in the formation of Christianity and its practice of hospitality, both in its theology and ethical practice, as it rooted the identity of adherents as aliens or strangers.⁵⁶

According to theologian Amos Yong, it was “precisely because of [their]...precarious situation that they took hospitality seriously.”⁵⁷ Furthermore, the experience of persecution and self-identification with the powerless in society caused Christian hospitality not only to be “directed...to fellow believers but also to strangers” as commanded by the apostle Paul in Rom 12:13, which lies within the context of “blessing one’s persecutors and doing good to one’s enemies (12:14-21).”⁵⁸

In the periods of persecution for early Christians, many relied upon hospitality for survival. In the practice of hospitality as seen in the Mediterranean and Near East cultures at the time, a guest, either fellow Christian or not, becomes “fictive kin” and while under a host’s roof, a quasi-

⁵⁵ Those who are documented in the New Testament as house church hosts include the mother of John Mark (Acts 12:12), Priscilla and Aquilla (Rom 16:5; I Cor 16:19); Nympha (Col 4:15); Philemon (Phlm 2); and Lydia (Acts 16:15, 40). Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*, 97. See also Eusebius, *The History of the Church: From Christ to Constantine*, Penguin Classics, Andrew Louth, ed. (New York: Penguin, 1990).

⁵⁶ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 115. Of course, there was already a religious understanding among those who came from a Jewish background regarding an identity that was rooted in the experience of being a stranger, foreigner, or outsider and such an understanding would undoubtedly be used in the development of similar Christian ideas.

⁵⁷ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 115. Yong refers to I Pet 4:9; I Tim 5:10. He also notes it was important in this context of house churches for “guests...to conduct themselves in an honorable and blameless manner midst their hosts (e.g., I Pet 2:12).” Perhaps it was precisely because of this precarious situation that they took hospitality seriously.

⁵⁸ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 115.

familial bond is created whereby the host ensures protection at risk to his/her own reputation and honor if a guest is harmed.⁵⁹ Out of this practice, house churches grew and became stronger communities, mobilizing themselves in order to care for one another as a family unit and extending charity to many who were in need.

b. Model: Jesus

In Christianity, the preeminent role model who shifted the paradigm relating to hospitality is the person of Jesus of Nazareth.⁶⁰ Despite the debates regarding Jesus' nature, relationship to God, and his intercessory abilities both in Christian theology and in inter-religious conversations, Jesus' words and actions as depicted in the New Testament portray a person who welcomed the other and counted the other as one who mattered. In the life and work of Jesus as understood by adherents of Christianity, "the other has absolute precedence"⁶¹ since the other's opinions, care and well-being was thought to have direct impact upon one's own righteousness.⁶²

The paradigm of hospitality seen in the person of Jesus is radical and pervasive. His presence and work in the world as described in the New Testament, according to theologian Amos Yong, "represents and embodies the hospitality of God...[as he was] the exemplary recipient of hospitality" by being continually "dependent upon the welcome of others" and relying upon

⁵⁹ Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament word: households and house churches*, (Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1997), 39.

⁶⁰ It is worth noting Jesus is a model in Islam as well. In Arabic Jesus is called 'Isa. Additionally, the Gospels wherein Jesus' life is given the most attention in Christianity is referred to as the *Injil* in Islam and is considered one of the four holy books, in addition to *Zabur* (the Psalms), *Tawrat* (Torah) along with the most holy and uncorrupted, the Qur'an. Many Muslims regard the *Injil*/Gospels as corrupted, particularly in reference to statements about Jesus being the Son of God or the account of his crucifixion, death and resurrection, which are incongruous with how Muslims perceive Jesus and his purpose. The issue of corruption does affect the implications of authority in many Muslims' eyes, but nevertheless, the holiness of the *Injil* is not really disputed.

⁶¹ Boff, *Virtues*, 81.

⁶² Matt 5:23-24; Qur'an 2:177, 3:2-4.

“the goodwill of many,”⁶³ particularly as documented in the Gospel of Luke but also found throughout the Jesus narratives.⁶⁴

The Gospel of Luke, however, has a special focus upon the practice of hospitality.⁶⁵ From the earliest chapters of the gospel accounting the lack of hospitality given to Mary and Joseph in Bethlehem to the final chapters detailing the activity of the community on the road to Emmaus and in the upper room before Jesus’ ascension, the Gospel of Luke’s emphasis upon hospitality is profound. Particularly found in the parable of the Good Samaritan in 10:30-37, Jesus’ call to protective hospitality illustrates the sacrifice, risks, and unexpected nature of caring for the threatened other.⁶⁶

Additionally, the fluid movement between guest and host is seen in the stories of Jesus recorded in the New Testament through his exemplification of “the redemptive hospitality of God,” who is welcomed as a guest into a variety of homes but who ushers his hosts into the redemptive “banquet of God for all those who are willing to receive it...[as t]hose who welcome Jesus into their homes, in turn, become guests of...God.”⁶⁷

Of the Gospels, the Gospel of Luke mentions and emphasizes the aspect of hospitality in the life and ministry of Jesus most often. Throughout

⁶³ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 101. That dependency Yong sees in his conception and inhabitation of Mary’s womb, his birth in a manger, and his burial in a tomb owned by Joseph of Arimathea as basic, yet perhaps forgotten, elements of Jesus’ receipt of hospitality. Yong then connects this state of being for Jesus to his statement “the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head” found in Luke 9:58.

⁶⁴ Yong points out the hospitality thread pervasive in the Lukan narratives, giving examples of where Jesus partakes of hospitality (either as guest or host), such as being a guest of Simon Peter (4:38-39), Levi (5:29), Martha (10:38), Zacchaeus (19:5), and various Pharisees and other unnamed individuals (5:17; 7:36; 10:5-7; 11:37; 14:1; 22:10-14). Nevertheless, Yong also notes the Lukan hospitality narratives “can be supplemented by details in other Gospels – e.g., Mark 3:20; 7:17, 24; 9:28; 10:10; 14:3; and Matt 9:10; 17:25; 26:6, 18.” Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 101. Amy Oden also notes Jesus as host and the hospitality intrinsic in the stories where Jesus feeds thousands (Matt 14:13; 15:29; Mark 6:30; 8:1; Luke 9:10; John 6:1). See Amy Oden, ed. *And You Welcomed Me: A Sourcebook on Hospitality in Early Christianity*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), 13ff.

⁶⁵ See Brendan Byrne, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke’s Gospel*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000).

⁶⁶ This text is particularly applicable to the practice of protective hospitality in that it highlights the assumed norm of risk one should take on behalf of the other in contrast to the high risk the Good Samaritan took in stopping in his travels, subjecting himself to a possible ambush and robbery by being lured in through fake injury, in order to care for an unknown stranger.

⁶⁷ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 102.

the Gospel of Luke, Jesus is continually a guest in someone's home, sitting around a table eating a meal with followers, Pharisees and a range of others. Yet, throughout the book, it is also intriguing to note, as Yong asserts, that "the most eager recipients of the divine hospitality [of Jesus] were not the religious leaders but the poor and the oppressed."⁶⁸ Their affinity for his hospitality could be contributed to the fact that in their presence

Jesus frequently breaks the rules of hospitality, upsets the social conventions of meal fellowship (e.g., Jesus does not wash before dinner), and even goes so far as to rebuke his hosts. Luke thus shows that it is Jesus, not the religious leaders, who is the broker of God's authority, and it is on this basis that Jesus establishes...the inclusive hospitality of the kingdom [of God].⁶⁹

While Jesus relied upon the hospitality of others, there is also an element whereby he is portrayed in the Gospels as a stranger, even among his own family. Having left his home,⁷⁰ he took up the vocation of itinerant preacher that, in turn, shamed some among his family who attempted to dissuade him from his endeavors or rejected him outright.⁷¹ Therefore, as a result of Jesus' model, rejection and strangeness even among those who would be most familiar is intrinsic in the Christian understanding of life and functionality in the world, making the role of hospitality all the more necessary.

⁶⁸ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 102.

⁶⁹ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 102.

⁷⁰ One would be correct to read in allusion to Abraham who was also commanded by God to leave his home and "go to the land which [God] would show him" (Genesis 12:1). Such a call to leave homeland and be a sojourner and stranger is a running theme in both the Hebrew Bible and New Testament.

⁷¹ referring to Matt 10:35-38, 19:28-30; Mark 3:20-25; Luke 2:47-49, 14:25-27; John 1:11. Boff, *Virtues*, 68.

c. Hospitality in Christian Antiquity

The foundation of hospitality in the Christian tradition shares a common heritage with Judaism and some of the texts explored above.⁷² For non-Jews, hospitality as practiced by Greco-Roman society would have been the accepted cultural norm. Therefore, the practice of hospitality already existed and was developed within the religious and cultural consciousness of the new adherents of Christianity.

However, Christian practice of hospitality takes on its own characteristics in the New Testament. The previous section noted the role of Jesus of Nazareth as modeling the importance and practice of hospitality. However, other factors outside of Jesus' example point to its evolution in thought and practice.

One factor that makes Christianity unique among the Abrahamic traditions is its focus upon love.⁷³ As such, the two commandments to love God and to love one's neighbor reiterated from Jewish tradition⁷⁴ in Matt 22:34-40 and echoed in Luke 10:26-28 are consolidated into one

⁷² The Christian tradition on the whole, however, does not find authoritative the rabbinic tradition upon which much of the systematization of the practice of hospitality in Judaism is based. Instead, its focus would be more on scripture and the established traditions of various parts of the Church, such as the Benedictine Rule or hospitality as seen in Trinitarian theology as expressed most fully by the Eastern Orthodox.

⁷³ This is not to say that Judaism and Islam do not emphasize love, but it is to say that the overarching story in Christianity (compared to Judaism and Islam) is based upon the repeated allusions to God's love and the commandment for followers to reflect that same love: that God "so loved the world" (John 3:16), God is love (1 John 4:16); love your enemies (Matt 5:43-45; Luke 6:26-26; Rom 12:9-21), the greatest thing is love (1 Cor 13: 1-13), love fulfills the law (Rom 13:8; Gal 5:14, Jas 2:8). See also Augustine, *De Trinitate*, VIII, 10; Leonardo Boff, *Virtues*, 80-81. However, there is debate within Christianity about just how love is expressed, seen particularly in debates about God's judgment and in the furor over the recent publication of Rob Bell's *Love Wins: A Book about Heaven and Hell and the Fate of Every Person Who Ever Lived* (New York: HarperOne, 2011) where more universalist teachings about love rather than judgment and punishment were espoused. Nevertheless, there are strands in both Judaism and Islam that do emphasize love, particularly in the mystic traditions. In Islam, Sufism's strong emphasis upon love is analyzed in Rusmir Mahmutćehajić's book *On Love: In the Muslim Tradition*, (Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 2007). For Judaism, see Abraham Joshua Heschel's work *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976). See also Anna Strhan, "And who is my neighbour? Levinas and the commandment to love re-examined," *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue* 19/2 (2009), 145-166.

⁷⁴ Interestingly, the law to love one's neighbor is in the levitical/priestly code (Lev 19:18, 34). However, the commandment to love God, usually worded as "Love your God with all your heart and soul" (and in Deut 6:5, "strength" is added) is found primarily in the deuteronomic texts as seen in Deut 6:5, 10:12, 11:13, 13:3, 30:6 and Josh 22:5.

commandment by Jesus and is the one law upon which Christian life should rest. Therefore, to love one's neighbor is to love God; to love God is to love one's neighbor. In turn, the practice of hospitality encompasses both; to welcome the stranger is to show love for God and for one's neighbor.

This duality was practically expressed in the use of space by the early church, where the home became "a new sort of sacred space, where the reign of God produces the community of grace, the house of God, *Beth-El*, where God dwells."⁷⁵ Love for God and love for neighbor were demonstrated through the shared meals and worship that took place in host homes where, in the book of Acts, "they enact and realize the meal fellowship of God that marks the reconciliation of the Jew, Samaritan, and Gentile, male and female, young and old, slave and free in the present life of the church."⁷⁶ Each took responsibility for the other, sharing resources, and the new Christian community distributed food daily in order to maintain equality.⁷⁷ As a result, the emphasis upon love and mutual responsibility built up an ethical framework of hospitality and mutual responsibility in the Christian tradition that provided the ideal example to which many communities over the coming centuries would aspire.⁷⁸

Moreover, the most obvious practice of hospitality in Christianity is found in the sharing of Eucharist, whereby followers are invited to God's table, to partake of God's generous abundance and welcome through the work of Christ, and to share table fellowship with other members of the community.⁷⁹ According to theologian Michelle Hershberger, the apostle

⁷⁵ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 105 quoting Carisse Mickey Berryhill, 'From Dreaded Guest to Welcoming Host: Hospitality and Paul in Acts' in *Restoring the First-Century Church in the Twenty-First Century: Essays on the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement*, ed. Warren Lewis and Hans Rollmann (Eugene, Ore: Wipf and Stock, 2005), 71-86, 85.

⁷⁶ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 105, referring to Acts 2:17-18, 44, 46; 4:32-37 and 5:42. This eradication of social divisions is also referred to by the apostle Paul in Gal 3:26-29.

⁷⁷ Acts 6:1. Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 105.

⁷⁸ The role of women – in particular Lydia – in hospitality as expressed in the early Christian church era is beyond the scope of this particular dissertation but is important and worthwhile nonetheless. Arthur Sutherland briefly explores it in his book *I Was a Stranger*, 41-56.

⁷⁹ The hospitable aspect of the Eucharist often gets pushed aside as theological debates about who can administer as well as receive communion are had in the Christian community. Some more conservative elements of Christianity restrict Eucharist to only

Paul in his first letter to the church in Corinth emphasizes hospitality and community as such “important elements” of the Eucharist and that “if hospitality was not practiced and community not nurtured, their gathering with the bread and wine [would not be considered] the Lord’s Supper at all.”⁸⁰ Hershberger asserts three things happen in the practice of the Eucharist: “socioeconomic barriers [come] tumbling down, discernment about the true nature of the believers [takes] place, and Christ [comes] as a guest bringing either grace or judgment.”⁸¹

Therefore, at its best, hospitality became “a feature of Christian life, [wherein it] is not so much a singular act of welcome as it is a way, an orientation that attends to otherness, listening and learning, valuing and honoring.”⁸² Similarly, Christian historian and specialist in hospitality scholarship Amy Oden argues hospitality plays an important role in moral development in the Christian tradition by stating:

Hospitality is characterized by a particular moral stance in the world that can best be described as readiness. Early Christian voices tell us again and again that whether we are guest or host we must be ready, ready to welcome, ready to enter another’s world, ready to be vulnerable. This readiness is expectant. It may be akin to moral nerve... Such readiness takes courage, gratitude, and radical openness. This moral orientation to life relinquishes to God both the practice of hospitality and its consequences.⁸³

There is some debate, however about whom exactly the early Christian was to be ready to welcome. On the whole, Arterbury notes Christians most often offered hospitality “only to Christian travelers”⁸⁴

professed and devout Christians, others to only members of that specific denomination, and other still to only members of that specific local church community. I would argue there is little hospitality in a closed communion as it invites and accepts only those who are similar, not usually the person or community who is the other.

⁸⁰ Michelle Hershberger, *A Christian View of Hospitality: Expecting Surprises*, (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999), 223 referring to I Corinthians 11:17-22.

⁸¹ Hershberger, *A Christian View of Hospitality*, 223.

⁸² Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 14. This development could be seen, among others, in the development of hospitals, hospitable support of pilgrimages, and growth of intra-communal as well as inter-religious scholarship and debate as noted in Chapter Two.

⁸³ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 15

⁸⁴ Matt 25.31-46; I Pet 4.9; 2 John 10-11; 3 John 5-8

despite exhortations from the apostle Paul and the author of Hebrews⁸⁵ to do otherwise.⁸⁶ Yong differs from this assertion, noting that “in the New Testament, the love of neighbor is never confined only to believers” and he credits Christianity with the influence that “extended the ancient Roman conception of hospitality so as to include the hospitable treatment of strangers.”⁸⁷ Yong continues this argument by noting the “ancient Hellenist xenophobia was gradually overcome by the indiscriminate application of the Golden Rule [to love God and neighbor] and the conviction regarding the common [humanity] of all.”⁸⁸

d. Welcome Others, Welcome Christ

As hospitality developed over the earlier centuries of Christianity, the theme of Christ coming as a guest became a primary motivator for hospitality in the Christian tradition. Jesus’ assertion in Matt 25:35-36 claims that on the day of judgment, Christians will be found wanting if they did not welcome the stranger (along with feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting those in prison) as if that stranger were Christ.⁸⁹ Out of this challenge made by Jesus, there arose expressions of Christianity that saw hospitality as a core ethic, namely found in monastic communities.⁹⁰ Again, love of God was found in the love (expressed in welcome and care) of the neighbor or stranger.

⁸⁵ Rom 12:13b; Heb 13:2

⁸⁶ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 132.

⁸⁷ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 107.

⁸⁸ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 107, ftn 32. Yong recommends Ladislaus J. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy’s Concept of Its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares, 1977), esp. ch. 3 for the argument. It is acknowledged, however, that this is a very idealized depiction of Christian origins and ethical practice.

⁸⁹ This is an example of theoxenic hospitality.

⁹⁰ While not monastic per se, the role of the Beguines and their beguinages established primarily in northwestern Europe from the thirteenth century, which were communities of lay women who did not take formal vows or separate themselves from society, also enacted the ethics of hospitality, taking in strangers, caring for the sick and hungry, and providing an example of faithful life for laypersons, particularly during the Middle Ages. While their contribution is less known, one would be remiss to not give them mention. For more information on the Beguines, see Fiona Bowie and Oliver Davies, *Beguine Spirituality: Mystical Writings of Mechthild of Magdeburg, Beatrice of Nazareth, and Hadewijch of Brabant* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990); Saskia Murk-Jansen, *Brides in the Desert: The Spirituality of the Beguine*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998); Walter

This theoxenic motivation for hospitality emerged as a result of Jesus' commandment being taken to heart. Within formational theological bodies and their corresponding edicts and texts, monastic communities took root and spread as the reach of Christianity extended. The first instance where this motivation for hospitality became more systemic appeared in the publication of the Rule of St. Benedict (ca. 529 CE) which reads:

Let all guests that come be received like Christ Himself, for He will say 'I was a stranger and ye took Me in.' And let fitting honour be shown to all, especially such as are of the household of the faith and to wayfarers. When, therefore, a guest is announced, let him be met (*occurratur ei*) by the superior or the brethren, with all due charity. Let them first pray together, and thus associate with one another in peace . . . In the greeting let all humility be shown to the guests, whether coming or going; with the head bowed down or the whole body prostrate on the ground, let Christ be adored in them as He is also received. When the guests have been received, let them be accompanied to prayer, and after that let the Superior, or whom he shall bid, sit down with them. Let the divine law be read to the guest that he may be edified, after which let every kindness be shown him. Let the fast be broken by the Superior in deference to the guest... Let the abbot pour water on the hands of the guests, and himself as well as the whole community wash their feet . . . Let the greatest care be taken, especially in the reception of the poor and travelers, because Christ is received more specially in them; whereas regard for the wealthy itself procureth them respect.⁹¹

This motivation for the practice of hospitality became further codified with a decree from the twenty-fifth Council of Trent (1563) that declares:

all who hold any ecclesiastical benefices, whether secular or regular, to accustom themselves, as far as their revenues will

Simons, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200-1565*, (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2001); and Richard Woodward, "A Lost World Made by Women," *New York Times*, 13 July 2008, TR3 (a travel article, but gives some history and sense of place) available at

<http://travel.nytimes.com/2008/07/13/travel/13journeys.html>, accessed on 1 June 2011.

⁹¹ *The Holy Rule of St. Benedict*, Boniface Verheyen, OSB, trans. 1949, chap. 53, available at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/benedict/rule2/files/rule2.html>. Accessed on 1 June 2011.

allow, to exercise with alacrity and kindness the office of hospitality, so frequently commended by the holy Fathers; being mindful that those who cherish hospitality receive Christ in the person of their guests.⁹²

As such, the understanding continues among many even in the contemporary context that to welcome others is to, indeed, welcome Christ into their midst.⁹³

e. Hospitality in Contemporary Western Christian Thought

An influential exploration on the importance of hospitality in contemporary Christian theology and spiritual practice was Henri Nouwen's 1975 book, *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life*.⁹⁴ Based on the three dimensions of life – one's relationships to oneself, others, and God – Nouwen links the discipline of hospitality with one's relationship to others, noting there should be conscious movement "from hostility to hospitality."⁹⁵ He assumes the development of hospitality as a spiritual practice is based on the other two corresponding movements of hospitality toward oneself and to God. Therefore, hospitality toward others is not a practice in isolation, but is an outward reflection of the "ever-changing relationship" of welcome and openness one has to oneself and to God, according to Nouwen.⁹⁶ Believing it is "one of the richest biblical terms that can deepen and broaden our insight into our relationships to our fellow

⁹² From the twenty-fifth session (4 December 1563), chapter 8, in *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent*, Ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), 232-89. Available at <http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct25.html>, accessed on 1 June 2011.

⁹³ Yet, a critique in this context may be that although Jesus, Benedict or other influential leaders in the Christian tradition encouraged (or commanded) the practice of hospitality does not mean that their followers practice it. Throughout this dissertation, there is a tension between the ideals set forth for hospitable practice and the reality that it is often neglected despite the religious imperatives. If it were carried out systematically, there would be no need for hospitality research that seeks to recover its practice.

⁹⁴ Henri Nouwen, *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975).

⁹⁵ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 45.

⁹⁶ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 46.

human beings,”⁹⁷ Nouwen calls for the practice of hospitality to be explored and renewed in our contemporary context. Nouwen goes on to define the concept of hospitality as follows:

Hospitality, therefore, means primarily the creation of a free space where the stranger can enter and become a friend instead of an enemy. Hospitality is not to change people, but to offer them space where change can take place. It is not to bring men and women over to our side, but to offer freedom not disturbed by dividing lines. It is not to lead our neighbor into a corner where there are no alternatives left, but to open a wide spectrum of options for choice and commitment. It is not an educated intimidation with good books, good stories and good works, but the liberation of fearful hearts so that words can find roots and bear ample fruit.⁹⁸

Elizabeth Newman, another Christian theologian and ethicist in the area of hospitality, argues hospitality is not about “generic friendliness or private service” because to describe it as such is “to domesticate it.”⁹⁹ Furthermore, domestication “distorts how extraordinary and strange...hospitality really is...[as it] names our participation in the life of God, a participation that might well be as terrifying as it is consoling.”¹⁰⁰ In this vein, she refers to the story of the burning bush in Exodus 3 wherein Moses becomes a stranger removing his shoes and crossing the threshold onto holy ground, and notes “in this instance, hospitality involves not our usual pleasantries but rather command, terror, and, not least of all, a puzzling call from God, a political calling through which God works to create and sustain the nation of Israel.”¹⁰¹

Newman’s contribution to the discussion of hospitality is helpful in that she refers to some “dominant cultural assumptions” that distort the practice of hospitality:

⁹⁷ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 47.

⁹⁸ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 51.

⁹⁹ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 13.

¹⁰⁰ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 13. Newman qualifies many of her statements regarding hospitality as being “Christian hospitality.” However, for the purposes of an Abrahamic tradition of hospitality, many of the explorations she designates as “Christian” are not antithetical to a Jewish or Muslim understanding of hospitality.

¹⁰¹ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 13.

1) that Christianity (and religion more broadly) is primarily about personal beliefs, 2) that ethics is primarily about private choices and values, 3) that politics is primarily the work of government and the nation-state, 4) that economics is only about money and ultimately defined by the market, and 5) that the church is basically a collection of like-minded individuals.¹⁰²

As has been noted previously, the practice of hospitality stands contrary to these assumptions. The practice of hospitality implies both public and private, political and subversive, communal and individual, diversity and commonality, life and risk.

Newman also looks at how hospitality takes shape in the Christian tradition. First, she makes connections between hospitality and Christian worship, stating that “worship is the primary ritualized place where we learn to be guests and hosts in the kingdom of God.”¹⁰³ Second, Newman discusses what it means to call hospitality a “practice,” pointing to concepts related to tradition, culture, communal action, internal good¹⁰⁴, and truth-telling.¹⁰⁵ Third, referring to the work of philosopher William H. Poteat, Newman explores the distinctions between “theory and practice,” while linking it with the literary work of author Flannery O’Connor and her narratives that set in the American South that emphasize the differentiation between thought and action.¹⁰⁶ Particularly in the case of O’Connor’s short stories, Newman points out that hospitality exists only in theory, as shown in superficial manners and niceness, “collapse[s] in the face of truly monstrous evil” and “fail[s] to produce true goodness.”¹⁰⁷ On the contrary, hospitality practiced in

¹⁰² Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 14.

¹⁰³ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 17. While Newman takes a very Trinitarian approach, wherein worship imitates the hospitality of God to God’s self as seen in (using classic language) the divine expressions of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, I would assert that this reality of ritual “where we learn to be guests and hosts” in God’s world is not just a Christian understanding but would be understood as such, albeit in a different manner, by Jews and Muslims as well.

¹⁰⁴ Newman refers to the work of the ethicist Alasdair MacIntyre and his book *After Virtue*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1984), 188 in this discussion of internal versus external good.

¹⁰⁵ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 19-24.

¹⁰⁶ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 21-24.

¹⁰⁷ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 25.

conjunction with theory, according to Newman, may not necessarily thwart evil but bears witness to courage and profound good.¹⁰⁸

Another contemporary theologian, Hans Boersma, also describes hospitality as a virtue. He goes further to detail hospitality as “sharing something of our lives with others” since both sides are to be edified in the experience.¹⁰⁹ Yet, for Boersma, hospitality, in a theological sense, is primarily “God’s work of reconciliation in Jesus Christ” exhibited in God’s “hospitality toward us in giving [God’s self] in Christ.”¹¹⁰ Boersma refers to the traditional Christian understanding of Jesus’ death and resurrection as a salvific act, whereby Christians are able to enter into God’s presence and “see the face of the divine host...the face of God” because of the sacrifice that was made on their behalf.¹¹¹

f. Contemporary Christianity and Challenges to Hospitality

Until the third century of the Common Era, hospitality had been primarily private, practiced by individuals, families, and early church communities reflected in the New Testament references.¹¹² However, as mentioned previously, with the adoption of hospitality in the monastic communities and codified by religious leadership as was done in the Council of Trent, the paradigm of private hospitality, according to Arterbury, shifted toward public or corporate hospitality. As a result, the practice was “placed under the authority of the bishop, and hospitality primarily became a charitable service for travelers collectively performed by entire congregations

¹⁰⁸ Newman, *Untamed Hospitality*, 25. This aspect of bearing witness to courage and profound good will be of benefit as protective hospitality is considered in the next two chapters.

¹⁰⁹ Hans Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality and the Cross: Reappropriating the Atonement Tradition*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 15.

¹¹⁰ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality and the Cross*, 15-16.

¹¹¹ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality and the Cross*, 15-16. Because of this understanding, the majority of Boersma’s work is centered on the traditions of atonement theories and hospitality’s relationship to violence, which will be explored in more detail later.

¹¹² Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 128.

and supported with the corporate funds that were available to these congregations.”¹¹³

While the formalization of hospitality can be seen as helpful in setting up systemic practice in the wider Christian community, it did have its drawbacks. Arterbury and Oden note that John Chrysostom exhorted his congregation not to neglect acts of private hospitality in lieu of corporate hospitality, believing both expressions are necessary.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, this movement shows a shift in the practice of hospitality from personal, private, individual expressions of hospitality to a more industrialized concept of hospitality, perhaps leading to the practice being lost on a personal level over the centuries. Through this shift, hospitality began to be considered as the responsibility of the local congregation, monastery or, in current day, a non-profit charity instead of individuals or private households.

Both private and public practice of hospitality is necessary; but with current systems in place, if a stranger were to appear at one’s doorstep and hospitality were to be extended, it would more than likely be civil or charitable authorities who would be called upon to address the stranger’s needs rather than an individual or household. Therefore, with the movement toward more public and industrial concepts of hospitality, the meaning and responsibility of private hospitality has been diminished or lost.

¹¹³ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 128. See also Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 215-279 for a collection of sources that point to the institutionalization of hospitality through Christian services under the authority of the state.

¹¹⁴ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 129; Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 248.

3. Judaism

Jewish religious and cultural tradition takes hospitality quite seriously understanding hospitality is not “simply a matter of good manners,” but is instead a “moral institution.”¹¹⁵ Furthermore, the sense of obligation to practice hospitality is strong in Judaism, both historically and in the contemporary context, as hospitality is one of the *mitzvot*, or acts that are sacred obligations as expression of religious devotion, and those who practice hospitality embody *chesed*, a quality in Hebrew that embodies mercy, compassion, and a willingness to go above and beyond the call of obligation. The practice of hospitality is itself called *hachnasat orchim* in Hebrew, meaning literally “the bringing in of guests.”¹¹⁶

In order to explore the role of hospitality in Judaism, however, certain themes need to be addressed. Therefore, this section will be divided into four sub-sections that emphasize the following factors: the role of exile, slavery and exodus in Jewish thought and practice related to hospitality; the realities of hospitality as practiced in Jewish antiquity; the role of honor as it applies to hospitality in Judaism; and the challenges to hospitality present in contemporary Judaism that make its practice more difficult.

a. Jewish exile, slavery and exodus

When one considers the contribution of persecution and exile to religious formation, the most obvious tradition where such a contribution is present is in Judaism. The experiences of exile, slavery, and persecution are foundational to Jewish identity and theological formation.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Anita Diamant, *Living a Jewish Life: Jewish Traditions, Customs and Values for Today's Families* (New York: Collins, 1996), 25.

¹¹⁶ Diamant, *Living a Jewish Life*, 25.

¹¹⁷ For more information on the formational experience of exile in Judaism, see James M. Scott, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, vol. 56, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997); Howard Wettstein, ed., *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002); and Ralph Keen, *Exile and Restoration in Jewish Thought: An Essay In Interpretation*, Continuum Studies In Jewish Thought series, (New York: Continuum, 2009).

The Jewish narrative tradition begins with exile as the first humans – Adam and Eve – experienced exile from the Garden of Eden because of sin.¹¹⁸ Later, due to a famine in the land, the descendents of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob migrated to Egypt in search of food and were, over the course of time, bonded into slavery by the Egyptians.¹¹⁹ In this experience – as well as the experience of being liberated from slavery and taken out of Egypt¹²⁰ – the levitical and deuteronomic ideas of hospitality to the stranger take form. Repeatedly throughout the Torah, God admonishes the Israelites to be hospitable to the stranger for they also were “once strangers in Egypt.”¹²¹

This experience in Egypt and the subsequent liberation that left the Israelites wandering in the desert for forty years¹²² embedded in their self-understanding a deep sense of being outsiders, strangers in a foreign land, inhabiting somewhere that was not their own, but given to them by God in the Torah as a result of a promise made through the covenants made by God to Abraham,¹²³ Jacob,¹²⁴ and Moses.¹²⁵

Therefore, it is no surprise the levitical and deuteronomic legal codes exhibit significant sensitivity to the vulnerability and experience of those who may be strangers and sojourners among the Israelites, providing specific protections and assurances for their fair treatment. Once the nation of Israel inhabited the promised land of Canaan, there were “responsibilities to the aliens and strangers in her midst: Israel is now no longer merely a guest but host to others.”¹²⁶

¹¹⁸ Gen 3:22-24.

¹¹⁹ Gen 47; Exodus 1.

¹²⁰ Exod 6:7; 12-13.

¹²¹ Exod 22:21, 23:9; Lev 19:34; Deut 10:19, 23:7.

¹²² Exod 16:35.

¹²³ Gen 15-17.

¹²⁴ Gen 28:12-15.

¹²⁵ Exod 19-24 is where the covenant is specifically given to Moses, however another covenant is documented in Deut 29:1-29, 30:1-10, which is considered an expansion of the Mosaic covenant given to the people of Israel. Later, a covenant is made with David (the Davidic covenant) in II Sam 7 wherein the establishment and reign of the kingdom and dynasty of David are promised, which has substantial importance in relation to the experience of the Jews in the context of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles as well as oppression at the hand of the Roman Empire.

¹²⁶ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 110.

This paradigm changes, however, when the monarchical system of Israel and Judah disintegrates, invading armies conquer the land and its inhabitants are driven into exile. Assyria defeated the northern kingdom of Israel and many tribes of Israel were deported in 740 BCE. Similarly, the Babylonian Empire defeated Assyria and the southern kingdom of Judah around 586 BCE, enacting similar deportations to Babylon.¹²⁷ Theologically, this experience of exile revised Jewish identity and belief, as noted in the prophetic exilic and post-exilic literature in the Tanakh and in later thought.¹²⁸

b. Hospitality in Jewish Antiquity

When Judaism is discussed as a tradition, particularly in a context such as this, it is important to note the locus of authority has shifted over the course of the centuries in relation to the practice of hospitality. As a Christian, this author is more familiar with the Hebrew scriptures, the *Tanakh*,¹²⁹ but it is important to note that with the emergence of Second Temple Judaism¹³⁰ and the development of an expansive corpus of rabbinic literature over the last two millennia, the center of authority has shifted.¹³¹

¹²⁷ It is generally thought there was no return from the Assyrian exile. However, after the defeat of Babylon by the Persian Empire, Cyrus the Great released the Jews to return to Judah in 538 BCE. For more information on this period of history, see Hershel Shanks, ed., *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*, (Washington, D.C.: Prentice Hall and Biblical Archeological Society, 1999) and Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE*, (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

¹²⁸ There is a great deal of overlap, however, related to the composition of deuteronomic law and histories and prophetic literature during this period of exile. During the Babylonian exile, the deuteronomistic literature is thought to have been redacted and codified, which, therefore, could have caused the theme of being hospitable to the stranger more pronounced as the Jews were, once again, in a foreign land. Unfortunately, there is no foolproof way to date and verify the evolution of thought regarding hospitality to the stranger without original texts. See Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, eds., *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on Deuteronomistic History*, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, vol. 8, (Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000) for more information on textual issues in this period.

¹²⁹ The *Tanakh*, derived from the root letters T, N, and K, is comprised of three sections: the *Torah* (the Pentateuch or first five books), the *Nevi'im* (the Prophets) and the *Ketuvim* (the Writings).

¹³⁰ Named as such as a result of the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE under Emperor Titus.

¹³¹ Marc Gopin, "Judaism and Peacebuilding," in *Religion and Peacebuilding*, Harold G. Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds., (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004),

Judaism as practiced today is referred to as “rabbinic Judaism - the Judaism of the rabbis.”¹³² Nevertheless, as it relates to building a culture and tradition of hospitality in Judaism, the Hebrew Scriptures, the Septuagint, various apocryphal writings, and earlier rabbinic literature established a foundation that has continued in rabbinic Judaism.¹³³

Hospitality in Judaism is regarded as the “kind reception of a stranger or traveler.”¹³⁴ A host was expected, first and foremost, to supply “both provisions and protection.”¹³⁵ As has been noted previously, Abraham served in Judaism as the ideal role model for this practice of hospitality¹³⁶ based primarily upon the Gen 18:1-33 passage where he and Sarah welcome three strangers, who in turn, give them news of the imminent birth of a son and heir according to Jewish tradition.

In his research on hospitality as expressed in antiquity, Arterbury details a few unique characteristics related to the Jewish practices of hospitality at that time. First, he asserts that when one wanted to find hospitality, one would often look to a “distant relative or kinsman...or fellow Israelite,”¹³⁷ and if needing to partake of the hospitality of strangers, it would be typical to “find a host at a well or source of water while in a rural area,¹³⁸ or at the city gate or the city-square in an urban area.”¹³⁹

111.

¹³² Reuven Firestone, “Judaism as a Force for Reconciliation: An Examination of Key Sources,” in *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, James L. Heft, ed., (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 77.

¹³³ This period (2nd century CE) marks the point where Judaism began to shift its self-identification from Hellenistic Judaism to rabbinic Judaism, and Christianity began to systematically define itself independent from Judaism, making them “other” to each other. Additionally, one might assert that hospitality’s decline in practice in Judaism reflects hospitality’s decline in practice throughout Western society and in Christianity as well. Furthermore, I would also suggest Judaism’s experience over the centuries with anti-Semitism on small and large scales has influenced Judaism’s practice of hospitality today in relation to how the faithful welcome the potentially threatening stranger.

¹³⁴ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 57.

¹³⁵ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 57. Arterbury refers to Genesis 19:1-23 and Judges 19:14-28, which will be dealt with in more detail in the fourth chapter of this thesis.

¹³⁶ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 58.

¹³⁷ Gen 24:15-27; Judg 19:12; Tob 5:6; 6:11; 9:5; Philo, *On the Life of Abraham* 116; Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 5.144 referred to in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 91.

¹³⁸ Gen 24:17; Exod 2:15; I Sam 9:11-13.

¹³⁹ Gen 19:1; 24:1-58; 29:1-14; Judg 19:14-15; I Kgs 17:10. Arterbury, *Entertaining*, 91.

Second, in order to ensure the reciprocity of hospitality through kinsmen, it was not uncommon for hosts to give their sister or daughter as a bride to a male guest.¹⁴⁰ Such an act formed a permanent bond between the guest and host that served to build a network of hospitality in the ancient community and marked a “code of reciprocity” whereby the men of households were obliged to treat guests well in order that when the householder himself traveled and needed hospitality, he would in turn be treated well. This code, however, did not serve only an interpersonal purpose; it was also “a village’s most important form of foreign policy.”¹⁴¹

Yet it is noted that although the giving of daughters or sisters as brides may be a valuable gift between a host and guest, such a gift also signals the expendability of women in this ancient world and its codes of hospitality. One can hypothesize such a gift was given in order to create filial bonds, neutralize threats, or to satiate a guest’s physical and sexual needs.¹⁴²

An exception to this is the story of Rahab in Joshua 2-6 where 1) a woman is the primary provider of hospitality, namely in the form of protection;¹⁴³ 2) she comes to no harm despite being labeled a “harlot”;¹⁴⁴ and 3) she remains with her family, under the reciprocal protection of the

¹⁴⁰ Gen 24:50-51; Exod 2:21; Tob 7:11; John Chrysostom, *Joseph and Aseneth* 4:8; 21:1-3 noted in Arterbury, *Entertaining*, 92. Arterbury explains the giving of gifts is quite common with Greco-Roman hospitality traditions, but they did not usually give this type of gift. Conversely, giving gifts in the Hebrew/Israelite/Jewish tradition was not common, but when it did happen, the giving of women as wives was notable.

¹⁴¹ V. Matthews and D. Benjamin, eds., *Social World of Ancient Israel: 1250-587 BCE*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 82-83. This text also notes villages “used hospitality to acknowledge their status on the land as guests of their divine patron. As hosts they did for others what their divine patron was doing for them...[as t]he Hebrews understood themselves as strangers....” Additionally, when it comes to foreign policy and the exchange of daughters, the narrative of Dinah and Shechem in Gen 34 illustrates a variety of factors at play related to power, hospitality, role of women, honor and fear of the other.

¹⁴² Particularly problematic, however, are the two cases recorded in Gen 19 and Judg 19 in which women are given over to people who threaten male guests to ensure protection for the host and his male guest(s). As there is not a proliferation of stories such as these, we cannot speculate as to whether or not this was common practice. Yet, since the stories do, indeed, exist, one does have the permission to consider the role of women in this particular type of hospitality, namely in providing protection. These texts will be considered more closely in Chapter Five.

¹⁴³ Josh 2:3-21

¹⁴⁴ Josh 2:1; 6:25.

Israelites after the destruction of Jericho.¹⁴⁵ Jewish tradition goes further to state that after the events in Jericho, Rahab converted to Judaism, was labeled *hasidot* ("the pious"), married Joshua, the leader of the military campaign against Jericho, and contributed to Jewish culture by becoming a forebear of eight priest-prophets, including Jeremiah, and the prophetess Huldah.¹⁴⁶

Interestingly, as seen in the hospitality of Rahab, the Hebrew scriptures and some related Apocryphal writings often praised subversion in the practice of hospitality. The subversive hospitality narratives are also almost exclusively highlight the actions women, as seen in the examples of Sarah laughing at her guests' proclamation in Gen 18:10-12; the murder of Sisera while a guest in Jael's tent in Judg 4:17-22; Abigail overriding her husband Nabal's lack of hospitality in 1 Samuel 25; and the murder of Holofernes in his own tent by his guest Judith to save her people in Jdt 13:1-10.¹⁴⁷ Intrinsic to these texts are the assumed codes of hospitality turned on their heads in order to defend and protect the survival of the tribe, family, or the women themselves. These narratives are rife with irony and sexual innuendo involving both consensual and forced relations, implying the authors as well as the readers know hospitality carries with it political machinations, certain dangers, and substantial potential for intrigue.

¹⁴⁵ Josh 6:26. Interestingly, the fate of Rahab is contested between the Jewish and Christian traditions. According to Christian interpretation, Rahab's hospitality is lauded and held up as an exemplary model (Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25; *I Clem* 12:1-3), but unlike other similar scenarios explored here she is neither taken as a bride nor as spoils of war after the events at Jericho. If she did get married later, the text makes no mention of it being due to an exchange or reward as a result of her act of hospitality.

¹⁴⁶ Meg 14b and Midr Tadshe, in Epstein, "Mi-kadmoniyot ha-Yehudim," Supplement, p. xliii.). Cited in entry "Rahab" in the Jewish Encyclopedia, found at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?letter=R&artid=71>. Accessed on 12 April 2010.

¹⁴⁷ The book of Judith was not canonized by the rabbis and is, therefore, not officially included in Jewish sacred texts although the narrative is still referred to and present in literature. The reasons why it was not canonized are fascinating, but unfortunately are beyond the scope of this research. See Andre' LaCocque's *The Feminine Unconventional: Four Subversive Figures in Israel's Tradition*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) for an exploration.

c. Honor

The golden rule found in the Torah (Lev 19:18) requires one to love others as one loves oneself. This concept of self-love in classical Judaism enables the devout to direct love toward others.¹⁴⁸ Rabbinic development of this levitical imperative to self-love was taught by Rabbi Akiva (c. 110-135 CE) as “the preeminent principle of Judaism.” Yet, Akiva and his contemporary Rabbi Ben Azzai debated that the self-love principle would allow for someone to make the assertion “‘since I have been abused, let my fellow human being be abused, since I have been cursed let my fellow human being be cursed.’”¹⁴⁹ In turn, Azzai asserted the highest principle was, instead, the belief “‘that every human being is created in the image of God, and is therefore invaluable.’”¹⁵⁰

Whether it arises from self-love, conviction of the divine image in each person, or a combination of both, honor plays an important role in Judaism. The concept of honor, the Hebrew root *kabed*,¹⁵¹ is found throughout

¹⁴⁸ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” in *Religion and Peacebuilding*, 116. Gopin notes, however, that this imperative to love others as one loves oneself is “one of the hardest things for members of a hated minority [such as Jews] to truly feel.”

¹⁴⁹ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 125, ftn 10, quoting *Genesis Rabbah* 24.

¹⁵⁰ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 125, ftn 10. Gopin uses this opportunity to shed light on the Jewish psyche in relation to the other and persecution endured, by stating: “R. Tanhuma adds [to the debate between Azzai and Akiva], ad loc., ‘If [God] made him’ [Gen 5:1]. We have here, in a nutshell, what might be the thought patterns of abused people the world over who, despite a good conscience, feel that, from the point of view of justice, if they have been unloved and abused, why should they treat others any differently? This statement by Ben Azzai is meant to contradict that tendency of feeling within the Jewish people of his time. It means that the only way a Jewish person could devalue another human being would be to consider him or her not really created in the image of God, not really human, which manifestly contradicts the sacred text.”

¹⁵¹ David Freedman notes that “[t]he word translated in most English translations as ‘honor’ comes from the Hebrew root *kabed*, which means ‘to be heavy.’ This word appears throughout the Hebrew Bible, though it is obscured in most of its occurrences because of translation.” from David Noel Freedman, Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, Michael M. Homan, and Astrid B. Beck. *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering a Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*, (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 68. Freedman also notes that it is a complex term as it is translated differently according to context, including references to severity (as in “the famine was heavy upon the land” found throughout Genesis), wealth (“Abram was very heavy in cattle, in silver and in gold” in Gen 13:2), sorrow (Gen 50:10) or even Pharaoh’s heart (translated as “hardened” in Exod 7:14). Furthermore, Freedman asserts that a derivative of the root *kabed* is *kabod* which is most often translated as “glory,” and is “used to express God’s presence among [God’s] people...God’s ‘heaviness’ or ‘weightiness,’ that is, [God’s] importance or...significance.” Freedman, 69. The concept of honor as it applies to rituals of hospitality is also *kabod*, but in these instances it implies

Tanakh, and as it applies to this research it is found in the levitical and deuteronomic codes of the Torah but also particularly in priestly and deuteronomic ideology and theology present in the major prophets.¹⁵² Yet, the Talmudic Rabbis articulated the idea of honor further as it related to hospitality and the guest/host relationship as Judaism evolved in the beginning of the rabbinic period. One honored oneself and others by abiding by the rabbinic mandate to “greet everyone with a loving, or literally ‘beautiful,’ face, ‘*sever panim yafot*’.”¹⁵³ Honoring the other was exhorted as one of the highest *mitzvot*, whereas shaming another was equated to murder that happens when “language and actions...make the face turn white with embarrassment...[or] literally the shedding of blood of the face.”¹⁵⁴

As it applies in current contexts, rabbi and conflict analyst Marc Gopin notes this emphasis upon honor and importance of face and draws a connection between acts of honor and the practice of hospitality as it relates to violence and conflict. Gopin understands that “[f]ace is a critical category in conflict analysis...[as c]ollective humiliation is one of the main reasons for the self-perpetuating cycles of numerous international and inter-ethnic

“heavy” with regards to respect, high regard, importance, and/or recognition rather than divine glory (Cf. Prov 3:35). Regardless, the antithesis of honor (i.e. dishonor/shame) in the Hebrew context seems to connote something important (one might say “heavy with import”) which has been ignored, neglected, cast aside or made light of with thoughtlessness.

¹⁵² See Saul M. Olyan, “Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 115/2 (Summer, 1996), 201-218; T. R. Hobbs’ response, “Reflections on Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116/3 (Autumn, 1997), 501-503; William J. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh: A Handbook of Biblical Law*, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2002); Johanna Stiebert, *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible: The Prophetic Contribution* (JSOTS 346; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); and Yael Avrahami, “כבוד in the Psalms — Shame or Disappointment?” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 34/3 (March 2010), 295-313. In short, while honor is found in both levitical and deuteronomic schools of theology and ideology, the motivation for honor is different between the two. Levitical ideology sees honor and its expression in social ethics as it relates to holiness particularly as it relates to cultic ritual, God or God’s presence in the world (Cf. Lev 19:2; Exod 14:4, 17). The deuteronomic ideology of honor is more humanity-centric in its social ethics and moral code and is particularly prevalent in the prophets of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

¹⁵³ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 116. The use of *sever panim yafot* is still in common usage, referring to a pleasant demeanor, kind greeting, or manner by which one is greeted. It is commonly attributed to the Talmud, *Mishnah Pirkei Avot* 1:15.

¹⁵⁴ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 116 and Micha Odenheimer, “Honor or Death,” *Jerusalem Report* IX:22 (1 March 1999), 25.

conflicts.”¹⁵⁵ As a Jew, Gopin asserts honor is an “underutilized strategy of conflict prevention and conflict resolution” and as such, “[a]ny Jewish methodology of conflict resolution would have to focus on honor and the necessary engagement with the face of the enemy.”¹⁵⁶ Moreover, encounter with the other, be they enemy or stranger, is a moral gesture that should be marked by honor and hospitality, risking oneself by entering into the other’s domain, providing food and drink, and truly encountering each other in order for transformation to take place. In this way, Gopin emphasizes honor becomes “contagious” and relationships increase in hospitality and cordiality as a result.¹⁵⁷

The contagion of honor and hospitality in Judaism are made known in both the home and the public sphere, according to Gopin, as the two contexts inform the practice of hospitality in each. Additionally, Gopin states there is a “strong sense of responsibility” to connect the two by “making one’s home and family open to some degree as a refuge from the inevitable harshness of the public sphere.”¹⁵⁸

To be welcomed into a home is to receive haven and protection from the dangers of the outside world. According to the Rabbis, one is commanded to show honor to guests by providing an escort as they depart one’s home. Commentator Micha Odenheimer writes “[e]scorting a departing guest...is an essential part of the commandment of hospitality...[and] the Torah holds [the host] responsible [for the guest’s safety] if there was no escort.”¹⁵⁹ Odenheimer notes Rabbi Yehuda Loew, a 17th century mystic often known as the Maharal of Prague, commanded escort as it is “a tangible sign of honor, and honor provides protection” wherein the “divine image as a sort of aura that surrounds each human

¹⁵⁵ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 116.

¹⁵⁶ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 117.

¹⁵⁷ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 117.

¹⁵⁸ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 118. This concept of refuge and its connection to hospitality will be explored more fully in chapter four.

¹⁵⁹ Odenheimer, “Honor or Death,” 25.

being...can be either strengthened or diminished” by acts of honor and hospitality.¹⁶⁰

d. Contemporary Judaism and Challenges to Hospitality

Related to the practice of hospitality and welcoming the other in the Jewish tradition, certain factors need to be taken into consideration. First, welcoming the other is inherently risky. Therefore, populations of Jews who were subjected to more severe anti-Semitism¹⁶¹ are more reticent to welcome the potentially threatening other. Instead, these Jewish communities tended to keep to themselves and look out for the interests of their own.¹⁶²

Second, the relationship between religious tradition, national identity, and mainstream culture is such that [a community that welcomes in many cases is the one that perceives itself as safe and perhaps holding power within a society. If a community feels under threat, it can be assumed it will

¹⁶⁰ Odenheimer, “Honor or Death,” 25. According to Odenheimer, Rabbi Loew likened the divine image in each person as a cloak given to each other through acts of honor and were compared to “the garments of the high priest [in Exodus 28:35]...[and] our protection from death.”

¹⁶¹ On the whole, it is generally accepted Ashkenazi (Central and Eastern European) Jews suffered a longer and more severe history of anti-Semitism than Sephardic (Spanish and Portugese) or Mizrahi (North African, Middle East, Central Asia region, and who are often lumped in with Sephardim) Jews who were not subjected to pogroms as frequently but did often endure forced conversion under Christian rule and second-class citizen status where they resided under Islamic rule. Similarly, Ashkenazi Jews stereotypically are culturally more reticent and wary of strangers and less assimilated with non-Jews than their counterparts. Therefore, it is understandable that history and cultures of their residing country had an impact upon how particular communities of Jews perceived and welcomed the other. See Howard Fast, *The Jews: Story of a People*, (New York: Dell Press, 1992); Zion Zohar, *Sephardic and Mizrahi Jewry: From the Golden Age of Spain to Modern Times*, (New York: NYU Press, 2005); M. Avrum Ehrlich, *Encyclopedia of the Jewish Diaspora: Origins, Experiences, and Culture*, vol. 1-3 (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008).

¹⁶² There is substantial scholarship related to Jewish assimilation that would be important to mention but goes beyond the remit of this thesis. Assimilation and hospitality toward the threatening other are very different matters and while there is substantial evidence documenting both movements toward assimilation and tendencies toward segregation, there appears to not be as much debate related to who was allowed into Jewish inner circles. See Janet Liebman Jacobs, *Hidden Heritage: The Legacy of the Crypto-Jews*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002); Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, eds. *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and Theodore Weeks, *From Assimilation to Antisemitism: The Jewish Question In Poland, 1850-1914*, (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2005).

be less likely to express itself in a hospitable manner.¹⁶³ As Jews have “lived mostly unempowered and quietist for nearly two thousand years,”¹⁶⁴ one can argue the practice of hospitality gave way to making room for survival.

These two factors can be seen at play in Gopin’s claim that “the prevailing focus of attention [in Judaism] has been increasingly on those rituals and laws¹⁶⁵ ...that would buttress cultural and physical survival, which would be specifically aimed against annihilation.”¹⁶⁶ Gopin goes on to say that this definition of focus particularly emphasizes

[the] minutiae of practice that make a clear boundary between who is in and who is out of the group, who can be trusted and who cannot be trusted, rituals that become, in their modern incarnation, markers of ethnic and national trust, markers of distinction, markers of insulation from a dangerous world.¹⁶⁷

As a result, such an emphasis strengthens and defines *who is the other*, i.e. anyone who does not participate in these activities.

Gopin proposes an intriguing idea that the key toward moving Judaism out of this more blinkered approach is in the practice of mourning, which is “a

¹⁶³ This reality is applicable to any community, not just those within the Jewish tradition, but such an argument does seem to be quite particular to the Jewish community given their history as an ethno-religious group.

¹⁶⁴ Reuven Firestone, “Judaism as a Force for Reconciliation...”, in *Beyond Violence*, 81-82. Firestone qualifies this earlier by noting the quietist character of Judaism began around the second century CE. He also asserts that “without a this-worldly protective power, the deepest piety could not protect the Jews from the will and willfulness of the powers under which they lived” and that the only “time that a community of Jews attained actual self-rule since the Roman destruction of the Jerusalem Temple is the present time in the Jewish state of Israel.” (81-82). Firestone also makes the link between violence and religious development, noting Islam and biblical Judaism “emerged out of an environment in which it was required to fight in order to survive” whereas Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity “emerged out of an environment in which they were required to *refrain* from fighting in order to survive.” (81).

¹⁶⁵ By “rituals and laws”, Gopin refers “rituals that make the Jew different” such as “obligations of protecting *Jewish* [italics mine] life, education to the uniqueness of Jewish life and practice, inculcating radical levels of defense of any Jew whose life is in danger, and ritual practices that are particularist by definition, such as dietary and purity laws.” Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 112.

¹⁶⁶ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 112. As a result, one would think adherents to Judaism should be particularly sensitive to the importance of hospitality and needs of those being threatened and in need of protection in order to ensure their safety and survival. Yet for cultures that perceive themselves as under threat of annihilation, outward-looking ethics are usually less emphasized in favor of survival.

¹⁶⁷ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 112.

close cousin to and healthy evolution out of rage over the past” and has the capacity to speak to a “group’s sense of threat to its future, its fear of annihilation” out of which eventually a relationship with the potentially threatening other can be built.¹⁶⁸ This need for mourning speaks to the disconnect between the need for security for the Jewish people and their reluctance to provide it to threatened others. The community expends valuable energy to ensure its own survival and, understandably, very little is left over to provide protected and safe spaces for others, particularly if others may have been complicit in Jewish destruction in decades or centuries past.

As a result, one interprets Gopin to assert that mourning is a metaphorical key to unlock the revival of more active other-centered actions he perceives to be essential to the Jewish tradition.¹⁶⁹ Enabling and sharing mourning of loss with the similarly mournful other, which requires acts of hospitality in the process, has the potential to illuminate the reality that what is being mourned is the failure to act out the tradition of hospitality for the other in the first place.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Gopin “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 114.

¹⁶⁹ Gopin, “Judaism and Peacebuilding,” 114-115. Gopin (115) gives practical examples of how this could be done: “to visit the dead together, to bury them together in symbolic ways, to memorialize lost lives and lost homes...to talk about the losses for as long as it is necessary, to thoroughly indulge the past rather than suppress it, for fear that it would disrupt rational dialogue and conversation.” None of those actions can take place effectively without hospitality being brought into the interaction.

¹⁷⁰ This would apply for both Arab and Jew in the context of Israel/Palestine. Inhospitality has been committed by both sides, and what is mourned could be interpreted as essentially a lack of hospitality as commanded by both Judaism and Islam.

4. Islam

Often, when hospitality is discussed within theological scholarship, there is an emphasis upon its “Judeo-Christian” nature, without seriously taking into account Islam’s contribution to hospitality as an heir of Abraham. In fact, Derrida asserts Islam is “perhaps even more than Judaism and Christianity...a religion, an ethics, and a culture of hospitality.”¹⁷¹ Moreover, Derrida reflects Abrahamic scholar Louis Massignon’s assertion that “the hospitality of the hôte Abraham that is placed at the center of Islam...makes Islam the most faithful heir, the exemplary heir of the Abrahamic tradition.”¹⁷²

In the research, however, the sources that address the issue of hospitality and welcome tend to be sources that are invested in the benefits of such practice, those considered the more progressive, marginal, or feminist voices in the Islamic tradition. This is not to say that mainstream Islam does not consider hospitality; it is to say that within the scholarship, hospitality and welcome are of particular interest to certain voices in Islam. Nevertheless, such a perspective appears to be the case in Judaism and Christianity as well considering the prior two sections, so this issue is not unique to Islam by any means.

In order to analyze the role of hospitality in Islam, this section is divided into four sub-sections. The first two sections will mirror others conducted in the Christian and Jewish section, considering the impact of the first Muslim migration (*hijra*) to Abyssinia and the experience of persecution upon the practice of hospitality in Islam, followed by consideration of Muhammad as a model of hospitality. The third sub-section will divide further, analyzing foundational values of *tawhid*, *ummah*, *adab*, and *sulh* that contribute to the practice of hospitality. Lastly, the fourth sub-section will, like those before it, address the challenges to the practice of hospitality that are present in contemporary Islam.

¹⁷¹ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 365.

¹⁷² Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 370.

a. First Muslim Migration (hijra) to Abyssinia

Texts recounting the experience of persecution in Islam are where the first instances of the term *jihād* are used in the Qur'an in order to exhort adherents to strive toward faithfulness, to resist persecution, and not to let detractors of Islam cause adherents to stumble.¹⁷³ It is in the early experiences of persecution that faith is formed and takes root, developing into something of its own and growing in maturity. In Islam, the persecution that resulted in the first migration (*hijra*) into Abyssinia in 615 CE was a formational experience.¹⁷⁴ The Qur'an does not record the event itself, but its earliest source is found in Ibn Ishaq's eighth century biographical collection of the Prophet Muhammad, *Sīrat Rasūl Allah*, or "Life of the Messenger of God."¹⁷⁵

Abuse and punishment for converting to Islam was growing in its early days. It is generally thought Muhammad started receiving his revelations in the year 610 CE and began to have a following of fellow believers soon thereafter. As this group of followers grew, to outsiders it may have seemed as if "Muhammad was forming a new kind of clan composed in the main of young dissidents who had thrown aside their old family loyalties," that had both political and economic implications within the tribal/clan system of the Arabian peninsula.¹⁷⁶ Yet, those who were opposed to these new religious developments as a result of Muhammad's revelations had to be careful. Certain converts, including Muhammad himself, were higher up in society and

¹⁷³ See Tariq Ramadan, *In the Footsteps of the Prophet: Lessons Learned from the Life of Muhammad*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 51ff where Ramadan discusses the themes of "Resistance, Humility and Exile." There is a great deal of literature that considers the meaning and limitations of *jihād*. See Gabriele Marranci, *Jihad Beyond Islam*, (Oxford: Berg, 2006) and P.L. Heck, "Jihad Revised," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 32/1 (2004), 95-128 for examples.

¹⁷⁴ In this period, there were other examples of persecution beyond the first *hijra*, but this particular event in Islamic history encapsulates the experience of persecution and exile.

¹⁷⁵ Ibn Ishaq, *Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sīrat Rasūl Allah*, A. Guillaume, trans and ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). This text is divided into *sira* (sections) that are numbered and will be referenced in addition to page numbers, as the *sira* appear to be consistent across the various editions available.

¹⁷⁶ Karen Armstrong, *Muhammad: A Biography of the Prophet*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), 121.

were part of powerful clans, which, under a vendetta cultural system, protected them. Nevertheless, the opposition “could attack slaves and the weaker Muslims with impunity” and such adherents were at significantly more risk.¹⁷⁷

Muhammad was from the clan of Hashim, whose patriarch had already developed a good economic and trading relationship with the Negus, the Christian king of Abyssinia.¹⁷⁸ When the persecution became too much to bear for his followers, Muhammad realized he could not protect them all, including some members of his own family, and sought a refuge for them by asking the Negus to provide sanctuary for them.¹⁷⁹ In total, approximately one hundred Muslims crossed the Persian Gulf into the safety of Christian Abyssinia.¹⁸⁰

Once it was discovered that a number of Muslims had fled, leaders of the ruling tribe in the area of Mecca, the Quraysh, sent two delegates to the Negus to request the emigrants be returned to Mecca. They informed the Negus the emigrants should be returned because the Muslims “had blasphemed against the faith of the people of Mecca and had disrupted society...[and] were therefore extremely dangerous and should not be trusted.”¹⁸¹ The Negus then gave the emigrants the opportunity to affirm their faith and the revelations to which they adhered, including

¹⁷⁷ Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 121.

¹⁷⁸ Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 74. Abyssinia is now known as Ethiopia. “The Negus” is a title; this king of Abyssinia is also known in other Islamic historical sources as Ashama Ibn Abjar or al-Najashi. Whether the trading relationship had been built with this particular Negus or one of his predecessors is unclear as there is no date for when the relationship began or the age of the Negus at the time of the first migration.

¹⁷⁹ Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad*, *Sira* 208, 146.

¹⁸⁰ Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad*, *Sira* 208, 146 gives a list of the men who went from which eighty-three arise. Armstrong also gives this number, saying eighty-three individuals and their families (122). Tariq Ramadan says about 100 people – 83 men and about 20 women – Ramadan, *In the Footsteps of the Prophet*, 59. Also, Armstrong notes there are some scholars (although she does not identify who they are) who question the motivation for seeking asylum, saying it may not have been to escape persecution but so that Muhammad could “establish an independent trade route to the south for...Muslims who were suffering under...trade sanctions” or that there may “have been some disagreement in the Muslim community.” (122). Nevertheless, Armstrong also asserts that while “Muhammad may have had an economic or political plan that did not work out so that, by the time historians like Ibn Isahq started to write, these plans had been forgotten.” (123).

¹⁸¹ Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 122 and Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad*, *Sira* 218-219, 150-151.

corresponding beliefs regarding Jesus and Mary to address concerns that the Negus was harboring heretics. Satisfied with their response, the Negus refused to give them over to the Quraysh delegates and affirmed the Muslim refugees would be welcome and free to worship and stated he would “protect them and see that they receive proper hospitality while under [his] protection.”¹⁸² Therein they remained for about fifteen years, by which time Islam had taken further root in the Arabian peninsula and Muhammad had gained control of Yathrib/Medina, making it safe to return.¹⁸³

The importance of this story in Islam’s history as it relates to the practice of protective hospitality should not be underestimated. In inter-religious contexts, the story is told to illustrate the actions of a Christian king who recognized the truth in the belief of a fledgling Muslim community and acted to protect them from their abusers. In hospitality contexts, the narrative illustrates the provision of sanctuary and protection to a threatened and strange other, setting a precedent for “dangerous memories” that inform action and attitude centuries later when the need arises.¹⁸⁴

b. Model: Muhammad

In Islamic texts, Muhammad’s hospitality is well-documented. As someone who was an inhabitant of the Arabian Peninsula, hospitality was a way of life. Life in the desert necessitated “the cultivation and growth of the virtues of hospitality, bravery, mutual assistance, neighbor protection, and magnanimity”¹⁸⁵ for which Muhammad was known.¹⁸⁶

Muhammad’s family was also known for its hospitality. His ancestor Hashim, who had been the leader of the clan to which Muhammad belonged,

¹⁸² Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad*, Sira 219, 151. See also Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 122-123.

¹⁸³ Ramadan, *In the Footsteps of the Prophet*, 62. Muhammad’s control of Yathrib/Medina is noted in the foundation of the Constitution of Medina in 622 CE, which will be explored in more detail in Chapter Five.

¹⁸⁴ The term “dangerous memories” was explored in Chapter One briefly and will be discussed further in Chapter Six.

¹⁸⁵ Hayka, *The Life of Muhammad*, 13.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Armstrong, *Muhammad*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), 59, 105.

was reputed to have been a prosperous and hospitable man, calling upon members of his tribe to provide food for pilgrims to Mecca¹⁸⁷ who were considered to be "God's guests, and, therefore, worthy of their hospitality."¹⁸⁸

Having been orphaned three times in his childhood, Muhammad finally came under the protection of his uncle Abu Talib, who was considered "the noblest and the most hospitable and, therefore, the most respected among the Quraysh."¹⁸⁹ Because of his orphan status, Muhammad knew all too well the necessity of hospitality and such experiences could have honed his sensitivity toward hospitality all the more.

There are numerous teachings and sayings attributed to Muhammad, particularly in the Hadith, that emphasize the need for and details the practice of hospitality. For example, Muhammad is said to have taught:

The period of the entertainment of a guest is three days, and utmost kindness and courtesy is for a day and a night." It is not permissible for a Muslim to stay with, his brother until he makes him sinful. They said: Messenger of Allah, how he would make him sinful? He (the Holy Prophet) said: He stays with him (so long) that nothing is left with him to entertain him.¹⁹⁰

Muhammad understood hospitality could become a burden and guests carried a responsibility to honor their hosts by not overstaying their welcome. Such behavior might cause resentment in the heart of the host, which Muhammad likened to sin.

Moreover, Muhammad taught the ethical responsibility of the Muslim was to do no harm to one's neighbors, to provide good meals for guests, to be charitable, and to give hospitality generously.¹⁹¹ To be prepared for

¹⁸⁷ As it was a holy shrine even before the advent of Islam.

¹⁸⁸ Hayka, *Life of Muhammad*, 2. Hashim also set up a treaty of trade with the Negus of Abyssinia, which developed the relationship that would be useful later on.

¹⁸⁹ Hayka, *Life of Muhammad*, 50. See also Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 76-79.

¹⁹⁰ *Sahih Muslim*, Bk. 18, No. 4287. However, this teaching is found in many other places in a variety of forms as the Hadith is comprised of sayings people remembered and attributed to the Prophet.

¹⁹¹ *Sahih al-Bukhari*, vol. 1, bk. 10, no. 576; vol. 3, bk. 43, no. 641; vol. 5, bk. 58, no. 142 (repeated in vol. 6, bk. 60, no. 411); vol. 8, bk. 73, no. 47-48, 155-156; *Sahih Muslim* bk. 1, no. 75.

hospitality, a bed should always be made and ready for a guest.¹⁹² And like the admonition Jesus gave in Luke 14, Muhammad also shunned “ostentatious hospitality that had become...a display of power and confidence” rather than inviting those who were in need of hospitality such as the poor, the orphan, and the powerless.¹⁹³

c. Foundational Values of Hospitality in Islam

The practice of hospitality is firmly rooted in values found and encouraged in Islamic thought. Scholars identify the virtues that contribute to the practice of hospitality in the Islamic tradition as: *sharaf* (honor), *karamah* (saving face/dignity), *murū'ah* (valor), *hikmah* (wisdom), *karim* (generosity), *ihthiram* (respect), and *'afu* (forgiveness).¹⁹⁴

In the Islamic tradition, the particular virtue of *karim* (generosity) cannot be overemphasized. As one of the ninety-nine names of God, *Al-Karim* (“The Bountiful, The Generous”) illustrates that *karim* is an important factor in how the Muslim is taught to perceive God, and, in turn, to abide by the standard of *karim* in one’s own life and interaction with others. *Karim* is considered a “quality of the spirit or soul,” and its importance in Muslim culture and tradition has remained intact throughout the centuries.¹⁹⁵

Upon consideration of the importance of *karim*, it is useful to remember survival in an inhospitable desert climate depends upon the hospitality of those who dwell in it. Survival in this sort of environment depends upon an “intricate web of relationships...and reciprocity between individuals and groups that...enable[s] desert families not only to survive but also to reproduce and flourish in their challenging environment.”¹⁹⁶ The giving of water, bread, or meat to a guest, even if it means the host family do

¹⁹² *Sahih Muslim* bk. 24, no. 5190.

¹⁹³ Armstrong, *Muhammad*, 105. See also Sira 612-613, Ibn Isahq, *Life of Muhammad*, 405.

¹⁹⁴ Mohammed Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence: Theory and Practice*, (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2001), 98; Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 2nd ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2004), 64.

¹⁹⁵ Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 62.

¹⁹⁶ Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 62.

without, is an act of solidarity and survival. Those who dwell in the desert know that to turn away guests is to consign them to their death.¹⁹⁷

Moreover, in the Islamic tradition considers it a duty to be generous and gracious to guests by providing sustenance, honor, and entertainment to them.¹⁹⁸

Nevertheless, the guest also has responsibility in this hospitable relationship. The law of hospitality, *al-diyafah*, details this relationship. The host is called upon to provide without complaint, but the guest is not to stay so long that he or she becomes a burden upon the host.¹⁹⁹ Such regulation of hospitality illustrates a principle of mutuality found in Islam; to allow both to express generosity by either providing for the guest or by limiting how much one will take from the host are both marks of one's submission to others and to Allah. Concurrently, this illustrates the principle that hospitality is not one-sided; it is not something done *to* guests without requiring the guests to do something in return.

A reputation for *karim* is a virtue in Islamic tradition as one cannot practice true hospitality if one is not willing to be generous to one's guests. Frugality has no place in Islamic hospitality. Providing generously to guests is a mark of dignity (*karamah*). This link between *karim* and *karamah* is extremely important in the relationship between a guest and a host.²⁰⁰ As both arise from the same root in Arabic, the implication is that an act of *karim* enables both the giver and the receiver to restore or maintain their *karamah*.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 62; Miriam Schulman and Amal Barkouki-Winter, "The Extra Mile: The Ancient Virtue of Hospitality Imposes Duties on Host and Guest," Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, *Issues in Ethics*, vol. 11 no. 1 Winter 2000, <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v11n1/hospitality.html>, 10 March 2007.

¹⁹⁸ Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 54; Marwan Ibrahim Al-Kaysi, *Morals and Manners in Islam: A Guide to Islamic Adab*. (Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 1986), 156; Schulman and Barkouki-Winter, "The Extra Mile."

¹⁹⁹ *Sahih al-Bukhari*, vol. 8, bk. 73, no. 156.

²⁰⁰ Fluehr-Lobban, *Islamic Societies in Practice*, 64.

²⁰¹ It is important to note here the underlying basis for *karamah* (dignity) in Islamic thought. As Islam, unlike Western Christianity, does not have a concept of original sin, the foundation for *karamah* lies in the dignity to exist and be a good steward of creation. "In contrast to the Western idea of free choice and freedom from constraint, Islam accentuates existential freedom – freedom to *be* – and locates the fulfillment of the human being in

This principle of reciprocity manifests itself in other traditions or concepts in Islamic thought and practice. Similar to the Jewish understanding, *barakah* (blessing) connotes an idea of both giving and receiving, for it carries the meaning of both “blessed” as well as “blessing.” The implication of *barakah* is this: To be blessed is to bless others; to receive blessing requires giving blessing. Found in the Abraham narrative, a blessing given by Allah requires the descendents of Abraham to be a blessing to the nations.²⁰² Likewise, reciprocity appears in the traditional greeting of the Muslim culture. “*Al-salam ‘alaikum*” (“May peace be upon you”) is said in greeting with the reply being “*‘alaykum al-salam*” returning the peace to one’s greeter. In this tradition, a host bearing peace becomes a guest of peace as well.

Additionally, Islamic theology of food informs the practice of hospitality. In Islamic thought, food is holy and deserves respect, and is therefore elevated on a table or stand and is rarely placed on the floor or other undignified surfaces. As a result, the sharing of food has a higher meaning than simple sustenance. Some Muslim cultures²⁰³ refer to *halil ibrahim sofrasi* (“the table of Abraham”), which carries connotations of a bountiful table and describes a host or home whose table is always overflowing with food and welcome.²⁰⁴

service. The dignity of the individual is underscored, in a broader context of social solidarity.” Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, “Introduction: Islamic Approaches to Peace and Conflict Resolution,” *Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam*, Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. (Lanham: University Press of America, 2001), 8.

²⁰² Qur’an 37:108

²⁰³ It appears in areas where there was a strong Turkish influence, probably spread as a result of the Ottoman Empire, and is seen in Southeast Europe and Turkey.

²⁰⁴ A popular Turkish song performed by Barış Manço (*Hal Hal*, Mu-Yap Records, 1989) titled “Halil Ibrahim Sofrasi” is translated as: “When human beings had known their limits/And hadn’t yet spoken maliciously/ Hadn’t yet looked at other’s honour venomously/What a table was set in the name of Abraham/A saucepan in the middle.../... Friends, please sit down at the table of Abraham... Blameless and perfectly happy people/Please to the seat of honour/Those who serve other humankind lavishly/... If you get your desires under control/You will sit on your throne comfortably.../Those who have strong fists and are lionhearted/Support a family and don’t know what’s earning illegitimately/You’re also welcome with us.../Join us friends.../...An empty saucepan doesn’t have its place on this table...” The video is available in Turkish at <http://youtu.be/Tvsi2ghrZz0>, accessed on 11 June 2011.

Moreover, there are several concepts in Islamic thought that can be connected to a broader understanding of the practice of hospitality, providing a theological basis beyond what has already been explored above. These concepts are namely *tawhid* (unity), the *ummah* (community), *adab* (etiquette/interpersonal ethics), and *sulh* (the process of reconciliation) and will be explored in closer detail below.

i. Tawhid

One of the most foundational and socially radical principles in Islam involves the concept of *tawhid* (unity). *Tawhid* refers not only to the unity of Allah but also to a “fundamental unity of all things,” humanity included.²⁰⁵ The unity of humanity to God’s own unity is based in the transformative focus from “self to one on the Self, the ultimate reality, the source of all other selves.”²⁰⁶ Islamic scholar Abdulaziz Sachedina recognizes this by noting the Qur’anic call to “compete with one another in good works,” which is a call, according to Sachedina, founded upon “a universally recognizable moral good,”²⁰⁷ as seen in Surah 5:48:

And We have sent down to thee the Book with the truth, confirming the Book that was before it, and assuring it. So judge between them according to what God has sent down, and do not follow their caprices, to forsake the truth that has come to thee. To every one of you We have appointed a right way and an open road. If God had willed, He would have made you one nation; but that He may try you in what has come to

²⁰⁵ Farish A. Noor, “What is the Victory of Islam: Towards a Different Understanding of the *Ummah* and Political Success in the Contemporary World?” in *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender, and Pluralism*, Omid Safi, ed. (Oxford: Oneworld, 2003), 324.

²⁰⁶ Abdulaziz Sachedina, *The Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 30.

²⁰⁷ Qur’an 5:48. However, Sachedina notes: “What is not clear, however, is whether the Koran acknowledge a variable cultural or historical understanding of what constitutes good. Since K. 5:48 is addressed to all religious communities, it is consistent to maintain that the good in the passage is applicable across religious traditions. But such an interpretation has not been universally accepted by scholars of Islamic ethics.” Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 70. In reference to the claim Sachedina makes regarding 5:48 being for “all religious communities,” he refers to Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir*, vol. 2, 589, which “mentions another opinion that regards the audience of the passage to be the Muslim community. However, the subsequent subjunctive clause beginning “Had God willed” clearly makes its audience communities under different prophets” (ftn 20, 151)..

you. So be you forward in good works; unto God shall you return, all together; and He will tell you of that whereon you were at variance.²⁰⁸

Additionally, *tawhid*'s social implications are visible in terms of unity exhibited through equality in the eyes of God and each other.²⁰⁹ Under this principle, even "mortal enemies are fellow human beings, the creation of the same God."²¹⁰ As a basis for an ethic of hospitality in Islam, *tawhid* has immense power as it implies that whatever dehumanizes one dehumanizes all.²¹¹ Feminist Islamic theologian, Amina Wadud, argues this point as follows:

If [*tawhid* is] experienced as a reality in everyday Islamic terms, humanity would be a single global community without distinction for reasons of race, class, gender, religious tradition, national origin, sexual orientation or other arbitrary, voluntary or involuntary aspects of human distinction.²¹²

Therefore, as all of humanity is one, being inhospitable and inflicting violence or perpetuating injustice is seen as anti-*tawhid*.²¹³

Likewise, seeking justice for the sake of *tawhid* is rooted in the practice of hospitality. As hospitality is based upon the value of fellow human beings and in the belief the other has something to offer in reciprocal relationship, working for justice to benefit members of the human community and to create a space for humanity to thrive is an act of

²⁰⁸ Arberry 1955 interpretation. Nevertheless, the debate Sachedina refers to is seen even in the English interpretations of the Qur'anic text, as the Hilali-Khan refers to "you" as Muhammad and the Book as the Qur'an, while the Khalifa interpretation notes the book was given to "confirm previous scriptures, and *supersede* them" (again, assuming it speaks of the Qur'an) and gives an impression of competition for who is better or more right than how Sachedina and other interpretations, such as this one, interpret the text.

²⁰⁹ Ashgar Ali Engineer, *Islam and Liberation Theology*, (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1990), 8.

²¹⁰ This understanding of *tawhid*, however, is marginal. For many in the Muslim community, *tawhid* may only refer to the unity of the Muslim community itself and not wider as Wadud or Noor interprets. Noor qualifies this interpretation of *tawhid* as to being found primarily with those in the Muslim community who seek peace and social justice. Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 324.

²¹¹ Qur'an 5:32.

²¹² Amina Wadud, *Inside the Gender Jihad: Women's Reform in Islam*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2006), 28.

²¹³ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 324-325.

hospitality. The *Sahih al-Bukhari* illustrates these values of justice and generosity by sharing this message from Muhammad given to leaders of his conquest of Yemen:

That his father said, "The Prophet sent Mu'adh and Abu Musa to Yemen telling them. 'Treat the people with ease and don't be hard on them; give them glad tidings and don't fill them with aversion; and love each other, and don't differ.'²¹⁴

In the same vein, the Mu'tazilites, whose thoughts in turn contributed to the development of Shi'ism, valued the work of justice to such an extent that "they identified themselves as the folk of 'Divine Unity and Justice' (*ahl al-tawhid wa 'l-'adl*)."²¹⁵ Furthermore, the Sunni community remembers the Prophet reminded his followers frequently that "a real believer is one whose neighbor does not go to bed hungry."²¹⁶

To provide space for rest or safety, to feed the hungry, to address the needs of one's neighbor – these are all acts of *tawhid* and of *'adl* (justice), and, in turn, also acts of honor and hospitality, in the Islamic tradition. Even the simple act of eating together carries tremendous weight, for sharing a meal together strengthens "social ties...between members of a community irrespective of social status."²¹⁷ In this way, table fellowship and acts of solidarity have capacity to strengthen *tawhid*.

Since in the tradition of *tawhid* all of humanity is the Muslim's neighbor, which is a concept similar to the understanding of neighbor in the Christian and Jewish traditions, the idea of being one another's keepers is then also an extension of *tawhid*.²¹⁸ Under this concept, the differences between people are an illusion as are the seeming dualities of Allah's nature. Instead, humanity's mutuality and the unity of the character of God, along with the virtue of reciprocity as articulated in every religions' "golden rules,"

²¹⁴ *Sahih al-Bukhari* vol. 4, bk. 52, no. 275.

²¹⁵ Safi, "Introduction," 9.

²¹⁶ Safi, "Introduction," 9.

²¹⁷ Al-Kaysi, *Morals and Manners in Islam*, 26.

²¹⁸ Safi, "Introduction," 9.

gives life meaning.²¹⁹ Moreover, the denial of *tawhid* is the greatest sin as it implies the denial of the meaning of life itself since life and its meaning “originates in the unity of existence which is essentially the manifestation of the unity of God” as spoken in the *shahadah*.²²⁰

ii. *Ummah*

Related closely to the concept of *tawhid* is the idea of the *ummah* (community). The issue of pluralism and welcoming the religious other into the community in Islam is most visible. While *tawhid* is an overarching, foundational concept related to the nature of God and God’s creation, *ummah* is the reality of that unity as exhibited and enacted in everyday life in the here and now. The *ummah* exists because of *tawhid*; it addresses issues of identity and otherness in more concrete terms, such as detailing who is in the *ummah* and who is not.

The Muslim community debates the definition of *ummah*. For Muslims who hold to an inclusive definition of *tawhid*, an inclusive *ummah* is a natural assumption; yet, the more common contemporary understanding is that *ummah* refers to the Muslim community only. The debate centers around how one interprets the inclusive example of the *ummah* provided by Muhammad in the Constitution of Medina²²¹ versus the more exclusive examples used in the post-Muhammad years of early Islam, the usage that has primarily prevailed in mainstream Islam.

Nevertheless, if one adheres to the more inclusive definition, understanding all are unified with God and to each other through *tawhid*, the worldwide community is the *ummah*, regardless of whether it professes Islam as a religious identity or not. Moreover, the plurality in the Muslim

²¹⁹ Wadud, *Gender Jihad*, 28-29.

²²⁰ Mohammed Muqtedar Khan, “Islam as an Ethical Tradition of International Relations,” in *Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam*, Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. (Lanham: University Press of America, 2001), 79-80.

²²¹ The Constitution of Medina and its impact upon the concept of the *ummah* and the legal obligations to protect the *dhimmi* will be more closely explored in Chapter Five. For now, let us note there are some scholars who argue an exclusive definition of the *ummah* is in contradiction to Muhammad’s early teaching.

community itself is proof enough that multiplicity does not threaten the *ummah* but it is instead built upon “the common threads that bind” them together as a community.²²² Through this inclusive view of the *ummah* Muslims in progressive communities “call for the rejection of a dialectical approach to the Other which can only frame the other in negative terms as the enemy (or potential enemy) that has to be greeted with suspicion and fear.”²²³ Understanding that welcome and inclusion are markers of Islam, those who hold to this interpretation of *ummah* are self-critical of the idea that it is pure or monolithic and are, therefore, committed to the ideal of plurality and hospitality since room for the guest should be made.²²⁴

Those who embrace an inclusive *ummah* take very seriously the words of the Qur’an which state that God created everyone and the differences are apparent in order that “you may know one another.”²²⁵ “All those who believe in God are members of this community too,” writes Mohammed Abu-Nimer,²²⁶ and it is here that the foundation for pluralism in Islam can be found. The inclusion of the *dhimmi*, “protected people” including other People of the Book (i.e., Jews and Christians or *ahl al-kitab*), is instrumental in this vision of the *ummah*.²²⁷ As believers who have received divine revelation, those who seek to make the *dhimmi* welcome hearken back to the words of God who said “surely this, your community (*Ummah*), is a single community.”²²⁸

The relationship between Christians and Muslims during the time of the Prophet bears witness to the practice of hospitality as the Christians gave safe harbor and protection from persecution to the Muslim Diaspora. Expelled from Mecca because of their conversions from polytheism to Islam, the Prophet encouraged his followers to seek refuge in Abyssinia under the Christian emperor as was explored in the previous section. While no formal

²²² Noor, “What is the Victory of Islam?,” 327.

²²³ Noor, “What is the Victory of Islam?,” 332.

²²⁴ Noor, “What is the Victory of Islam?,” 332.

²²⁵ Qur’an 49:13.

²²⁶ Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 74.

²²⁷ Again, these concepts will be explored more fully in Chapter Five.

²²⁸ Qur’an 23:52; Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 74. Italics added.

pacts were made regarding this relationship and its implications for the concept of *ummah*, this act represents “the first time that Muslims, as Muslims, dealt with Christians as a community.”²²⁹ No animosity was present in this relationship; instead, this episode in Islamic history “is a very early example in Islam of the importance of pluralism and interfaith dialogue” and the commonalities the People of the Book shared.²³⁰

The Prophet would continue to speak favorably of Christians because of their hospitable acts on behalf of the young Muslim community. In the words of the Prophet, one can see the further development of the concept of the *ummah* in relation to the Christian and Jewish communities. When speaking of the value of plurality in light of these historical realities, the hadith *Sahih al-Bukhari* states:

The Prophet instructed his followers on many occasions on the importance of solidarity between the believers and Muslims. He compared their relationship to the organs of the body, which communicate pain if one part is ill, or to a building, which is strengthened by the coherence of its parts. ‘The believer to another believer is like a building whose different parts enforce each other.’ The Prophet then clasped his hands with fingers interlaced (while saying that).²³¹

When considering the importance of plurality in the *ummah*, one be clear to define what pluralism is and how it contributes to this idea of hospitality. As religious scholar Diana Eck points out, pluralism and diversity are not the same. She notes one “may have people from different religious and ethnic backgrounds...in one place, but unless they are involved in active engagement with one another, there is no pluralism...pluralism is not and cannot be a non-participant sport.”²³²

²²⁹ Amir Hussain, “Muslims, Pluralism, and Interfaith Dialogue,” in *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender, and Pluralism*, Omid Safi, ed. (Oxford: Oneworld, 2003), 254.

²³⁰ Hussain, “Muslims, Pluralism, and Interfaith Dialogue,” 254.

²³¹ *Sahih al-Bukhari* 1992, vol. 3, bk. 43, no. 626 quoted in Abu-Nimer, 74. The similarities between this exposition on a community of believers and that of the image of the Body of Christ (typically interpreted as strictly Christian) by the apostle Paul in I Corinthians 12 is remarkable.

²³² Diane Eck, *A New Religious America*, (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001),

Likewise, hospitality is not and cannot be a non-participant sport. To practice genuine hospitality implies engagement, interaction, willingness to be affected by those who share one's space. To embrace pluralism and to practice hospitality is to try actively to understand – not just tolerate – the other.²³³ It is the active attempt to understand and engage those who are different that should characterize the *ummah* and it is important to remember that, as *tawhid* is sought in the reality of pluralism, unity and uniformity are not one in the same.

iii. *Adab*

Moving from the general and theoretical to the more concrete and practical in the principles that support the practice of hospitality in Islam, the concept of *adab* is important because it is the most obvious link to hospitality. Encompassing connotations of etiquette, social manners, and interpersonal ethics, *adab* is an elaborate framework for the code of Muslim behavior, which is bound up in values of honor, kindness, humaneness, civility, generosity, and courtesy. *Adab* addresses the simplest to the most complex of social situations: from sneezing or yawning, to how to conduct occasions such as weddings, or to operate within wider social relationships in a way that honors all involved.²³⁴

Sharaf (honor), *karamah* (dignity), *karim* (generosity), and *ihtiram* (respect) are the virtues of *adab*; one cannot adhere to the code of *adab* without its companion virtues, with honor playing the most important role. Simply feeding hungry people is not the fullest expression of hospitality and fulfillment of *adab*. In order to practice hospitality in its most meaningful way, it must be honorable and generous as well. How Muslims conduct themselves socially relies heavily upon honor. Proper adornment when

70-71 quoted in Hussain, "Muslims, Pluralism, and Interfaith Dialogue," 252.

²³³ Eck, *A New Religious America*, 70-71 quoted in Hussain, "Muslims, Pluralism, and Interfaith Dialogue," 252.

²³⁴ Al-Kaysi, *Morals and Manners in Islam*, 17; Safi, "Introduction," 13.

accepting or giving hospitality is important, as is providing a comfortable and clean entertaining space, an abundance of food, and an attentive attitude toward one's guests and host. Furthermore, refusal to accept invitations or to visit another's home carries significant weight in relation to one's honor and reputation as a hospitable host.²³⁵ Therefore, *adab* is, in its essence, an ethic of hospitality to be practiced in the religious tradition in order to remind the observer of one's connection to God and the divine directive to live a just, honorable, and compassionate life.²³⁶

One of the Muslim communities that seems to be growing, particularly among those who are coming to Islam from other faiths, is Sufism; and it is this same branch that takes *adab* very seriously. "All of Sufism is *adab*," writes one author detailing that Sufis have cultivated *adab* from not just an interpersonal but to a communal code of conduct and ethic.²³⁷ Believing *adab* forms and sustains the context where humaneness is developed, every relationship and situation, in fact "every level of being," in the practice of Sufism is suffused with *adab*.²³⁸ Similar to Buddhism's eightfold path, Sufism's practice of *adab* is rooted in the belief that right action leads to right speech, which in turn leads to right hearts and, finally, to right faith. Committed to fellowship and to the idea that each relationship is

²³⁵ Anne Meneley, "Living Hierarchy in Yemen," 67-68. Meneley also notes this emphasis upon honor in hospitality causes honor to be accrued "to those who are visited, who are thereby acknowledged as socially significant and morally sound, and those who are allowed to give (or give back) rather than receive." Meneley writes from the context of Yemen, but this behavior is found throughout the Near and Middle East, if not to some extent in most Islamic contexts.

²³⁶ Al-Kaysi, *Morals and Manners in Islam*, 17. It is of little wonder then that Islamic scholar Omid Safi writes of an interaction with another scholar specializing in fundamentalism, Gilles Kepel, who noted that all of the Abrahamic fundamentalists had something in common. When pressed to what that commonality might be, Kepel replied, "They all have such bad *adab*!" Believing Kepel spoke the truth, Safi goes on to note it is the loss or bad practice of *adab*, this lack of humaneness, courtesy, honor, welcome and genuine hospitality that has been so detrimental to the Muslim community, both in its relationship to outsiders as well as to those within its own ranks. Safi, "Introduction," 13. Concurrently, how Muslims perceive the other is caught up in their expectations of the other to also practice *adab*. Research done in the context of the Israel/Palestine conflict notes "Arabs...feel themselves to be distant from Jews, and they are observed to stereotype Jews as haughty, materialistic and lacking certain traditional Arab social graces such as honour, hospitality and neighborliness." In Smoocha, *Israel: pluralism and conflict*, 199-200.

²³⁷ Safi, "Introduction," 14. Italics added.

²³⁸ Helminski, Kabir. "Adab: The Courtesy of the Path." <http://www.sufism.org/books/sacred/adab.html>, accessed on 4 March 2007.

a chance to grow in self-discovery and purification, *adab* dictates the welcome and treatment of others as family.²³⁹

Included in the practice of *adab* for this community is the discipline of being “straightforward with sincerity and truthfulness.”²⁴⁰ Honesty and keeping commitments are symbols of authentic faith; lying, breaking promises, or acting insultingly in a quarrel are, concurrently, signs of hypocrisy according to the Prophet.²⁴¹ To practice *adab* is to understand “the value of one’s word.”²⁴² Similarly, the practice of hospitality is not something one can fake. For hospitality to be genuine, it welcomes and encourages truth and honesty since one cannot accommodate and welcome others if one is unwilling to be truthful “about distinct persons, the state of the world and society, and even [oneself] in new and challenging ways.”²⁴³ Furthermore, to practice hospitality – to treat others with *adab* – is to open oneself up to challenge and growth as encounter with the other inevitably brings change.

iv. *Sulh*

One of the most ritualized practices of hospitality found in Islam, called *sulh*, is particularly valuable to those who are interested in the work of peace and reconciliation. Although hospitality does not consist entirely of sharing of food or drink together, Islam, through its marriage of religion and culture, has maintained the practice of hospitality in the context of reconciliation efforts more visibly than, perhaps, more Westernized versions of Christianity and Judaism. While the actual practice may not be the same throughout the Muslim world, the function it has in Islamic tradition and culture is widespread.

²³⁹ Helminski, <http://www.sufism.org/books/sacred/adab.html>.

²⁴⁰ Helminski, <http://www.sufism.org/books/sacred/adab.html>.

²⁴¹ *Sahih al-Bukhari*, vol. 1, bk. 2, no. 33.

²⁴² Nuh Ha Mim Keller, “Adab of Islam,”

http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/nuh/adab_of_islam.htm, 4 March 2007.

²⁴³ Hütter, “Hospitality and Truth,” 216. Although this text was written for a Christian context, its application in the practice of *adab* as it relates to hospitality is congruent with Muslim understandings.

Sulh is most documented in areas around Jordan, Lebanon, and Palestine.²⁴⁴ Because it is the final step in a three-part approach toward community restorative justice, *sulh* is a process of reconciliation after a wrong has been committed and its practice could be seen as a microcosm of the role hospitality plays in Islamic life.

Two steps precede *sulh* in this movement toward reconciliation. In the first step, *atwah*, the perpetrator or his/her family provide some form of temporary economic compensation (i.e. goods, money, animals, food, etc.) to the family of the victim. If the receiving family accepts the compensation, it “indicates an agreement that revenge will not take place for the period of the dispute resolution.”²⁴⁵ Related to virtues of *karamah* (dignity) and *sharaf* (honor), this economic exchange is important as it symbolizes the honor and dignity shown to the victim’s family as well as humility and gratitude for benevolence and forbearance of revenge on behalf of the family of the perpetrator.²⁴⁶ Following *atwah*, the second step called *hudnah* refers to a period of time, similar to a truce, that begins after *atwah* is accepted. It is during this period that the two parties begin talks or, if necessary, conduct investigations.²⁴⁷

After the time of *hudnah* is complete, *sulh* begins.²⁴⁸ During *sulh* parties or families involved in the dispute are brought together again to either publicly accept or reject the results of the mediation effort and the terms offered.²⁴⁹ If the terms are accepted in a public display, then the process of reconciliation moves into the personal sphere when the family of the perpetrator visits the family of the victim’s home. During this visit, the victim’s family serves coffee, and in turn the ritual reverses when the family

²⁴⁴ George E. Irani and Nathan C. Funk, “Rituals of Reconciliation: Arab-Islamic Perspectives,” in *Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam*, Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. (Lanham: University Press of America, 2001), 180-182.

²⁴⁵ Irani and Funk, “Rituals of Reconciliation,” 184.

²⁴⁶ Irani and Funk, “Rituals of Reconciliation,” 184.

²⁴⁷ Irani and Funk, “Rituals of Reconciliation,” 184.

²⁴⁸ While some regions may use the term *sulhah* for the process of reconciliation, the term actually refers to the actual event or hospitality ritual of reconciliation rather than the process. See Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 98-99.

²⁴⁹ Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 98-99.

of the perpetrator hosts and shares a meal, called *mumalaha* (“partaking of salt and bread”).²⁵⁰

The public and private dimensions of *sulh* are equally important. The values that operate within this very real example of hospitality, and the outward expressions of the values of honor and generosity are part of *sulh*. The parties involved in the process have the right to refuse to accept terms or to refuse to drink coffee together or share a meal, indicating they may feel they have not been treated with enough honor, dignity, or generosity. This right to refusal, both in the public and private spheres, is “a form of pressure, a tactic to gain concessions, since the failure to produce an outcome may humiliate or disappoint...[and therefore] damaging the disputants and their clans’ social status.”²⁵¹

d. Contemporary Islam and Challenges to Hospitality

Without question, the practice of hospitality is well-fixed in the Islamic religious and cultural traditions. There are questions, however, whether hospitality as it is practiced by Muslims makes a real difference to the non-Muslim other, particularly in cases where that other is threatened or threatening.²⁵²

²⁵⁰ Irani and Funk, “Rituals of Reconciliation,” 185.

²⁵¹ Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 95. Once again, one can see the economic power of hospitality - practice of hospitality as currency – and the use of reciprocity to indicate honor and respect, as previous chapters have explored.

²⁵² This question takes particular shape in the recent news related to Muammar Qaddafi’s family finding refuge in neighboring Algeria after he had been overthrown by the National Transitional Council (NTC) of Libya. While the NTC condemned Algeria for offering shelter, referring to it as “an act of aggression,” the Algerian ambassador to the United Nations, Mourad Benmehidi, declared that “in desert regions there was a ‘holy rule of hospitality’ and his country had accepted the family on humanitarian grounds.” BBC News, “Libya interim leaders give ultimatum to Gaddafi forces, 30 August 2011, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14715518>, accessed on 30 August 2011. Such a situation highlights several factors worth noting. First, Algeria does not have a reputation for taking in non-Muslims on humanitarian grounds, so it is appropriate to question the full extent of this declared “holy rule of hospitality” as it is applied to Muslims and non-Muslims alike. Second, if the practice of hospitality in Islam were monolithic, the Muslims of Libya would recognize the protective hospitality the Muslims of Algeria have given and would respect it since it is a “holy rule” after all. Third, and related to this, if ever an example were needed that illustrated how a religious imperative gets subverted by political interest or gain, this would be it. While sometimes subversion is a positive development, in certain cases it

There are obvious impediments to the arguments presented thus far regarding the practice of hospitality in Islam. First and foremost, much of the argument stated here is based upon a very inclusive interpretation of the Qur'an and the Hadith as well as theological concepts foundational to Islam. Undoubtedly, some Muslims would disagree with the discussion of *tawhid* (unity) and the *ummah* (community) as some traditional understandings limit them to including only to those who profess Islam. Nevertheless, the reality that these inclusive interpretations have originated from Muslim scholars and theologians bears witness to the fact that there is great plurality in the Muslim community as well. The fear among those who do not hold such a view is that, if the *ummah* is opened up to everyone, it will dissolve into something without meaning. Nevertheless, this "presupposes the unity and fixity of the *umma[h]* in the first place."²⁵³

Furthermore, for those who might interpret *tawhid* and *ummah* as specific to the Muslim community, there is an even greater temptation to restrict them to only Muslims in one's specific community to the exclusion of other Muslims with whom one may not agree. Primarily these are issues related to how Muslim communities view plurality and diversity, and how these same communities embrace the other. Some argue "Western values and cultures underlie pluralism," and are therefore resistant to it.²⁵⁴ Yet, there is sufficient evidence that the Prophet embraced plurality (as opposed to relativism). For those who are willing and open to embrace and engage the other, there is more flexibility in considering who is part of the *ummah* and to whom one should show solidarity through the concept of *tawhid*.

There is substantial evidence in the Qur'an, the Hadith, and other writings to support this flexibility. In those same texts, however, there is room for legitimate interpretation to go against this flexibility. Therefore, as

can be negative and one can see how a "holy rule of hospitality" can be adopted or neglected depending upon the situation at hand. Finally, this scenario and this research as a whole highlights that "holy rules" are rarely, if ever, interpreted purely or in the same manner in the current context as they had been in the past, and imperatives understood by one generation are often further complicated or forgotten altogether in future generations.

²⁵³ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 328.

²⁵⁴ Abu-Nimer, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence*, 82.

with any other religious tradition, interpretation becomes the pivot point whereby one can justify actions on either end of the spectrum.

5. Observations for Christianity's Practice of Hospitality in the Abrahamic Context

*...she listened for the holes – the things [they] did not say;
the questions they did not ask...*

- from Toni Morrison's *Beloved*²⁵⁵

As this research is an exercise in liberation and feminist theology, re-assessing the Christian tradition's theology and ethic of hospitality in light of other authoritative sources that speak to gaps in belief and practice, is appropriate. Black liberation theologian James Cone argues for utilizing this method when he notes the black Christian community "listened to the white theological rhetoric about justice of God and the unity of the church and then related it to white passivity regarding the transformation of ecclesiastical and social structures of oppression."²⁵⁶ From that listening exercise, he notes the black community concluded "white church people talk about love and reconciliation," and one could add hospitality in the case of this research, "but seldom with the practical intention of translating theological doctrines into political realities."²⁵⁷ Therefore, inconsistencies and gaps that may affect practice need to be addressed in order to have an effectual theology.

Moreover, being in dialogue – and practicing hospitality - allows for observation of other traditions that enhance and highlight what is missing in one's own, where the blind spots and holes are, what one could not see without the other's presence and witness. Cone does this in a different context by noting Christianity "does not possess in its nature the means for analyzing the structure of capitalism" and therefore, the adoption of Marxism

²⁵⁵ Toni Morrison, *Beloved*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), 108.

²⁵⁶ James Cone, *Speaking the Truth: Ecumenism, Liberation and Black Theology*, 2nd ed., (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999), 147.

²⁵⁷ Cone, *Speaking the Truth*, 147.

"as a tool of social analysis can disclose the gap between appearance and reality, and thereby help Christians to see how things really are."²⁵⁸

Therefore, the utilization of a dialogical inter-religious hermeneutic as part of the methodology used here lends further expectations that the other Abrahamic traditions of Judaism and Islam have something to contribute to Christianity in this context. It is understandable the theology and ethic of hospitality in each of the Abrahamic traditions should have elements that are particular to one tradition in contrast to another. Yet, the absence of certain aspects in one tradition should give reason for pause, as it may point to something that has been lost, forgotten, ignored, or overwritten through the course of the tradition's development.

As such, the crucial observation to be made is there is practically no discussion in contemporary Western Christian theological and ethical scholarship related to honor outside of antiquated contexts.²⁵⁹ Furthermore, there are no discussions related to the role of honor in the life of the faithful today. It seems as if the concept of honor disappeared into the realm of chivalry in Western culture, and therefore, the concept of honor is perceived as pre-modern and irrelevant to the current context. Yet, honor is not a monolithic concept, and perversions of honor, as a means to abusively sustain power over an other or commit violence and violation, may have also contributed to its decline. Nevertheless, the absence of discussion related to honor in Western Christian scholarship and faithful life may illuminate the disconnect one often senses in inter-religious dialogue, particularly with Jewish and Muslim counterparts.

Nevertheless, honor does exist and plays a role in Christian thought, albeit honor is primarily explored in historical contexts rather than present day. Throughout the New Testament, one notices the existence and sensitivity to an honor/shame code, and yet its impact upon current thought

²⁵⁸ James Cone, *For My People: Black Theology and the Black Church*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984), 187.

²⁵⁹ There are some explorations regarding dignity, integrity and keeping promises that could be interpreted as honor, but the use of the word "honor" to describe them is practically non-existent in Western Christian scholarship, as is the connection between honor and current Christian theological and ethical scholarship in the area of hospitality.

has lessened extensively.

Unsurprisingly, the expression of honor in the New Testament is primarily linked with issues of social justice and hospitality. Jesus' Sermon on the Mount found in Matthew 5-7 carries in it understandings of honor and shame, particularly in 5:38-42 where Jesus exhorts followers to maintain honor, and also dignity, when others seek to shame. Similarly, the hospitality narratives of Jesus found in the Gospel of Luke illustrate the importance of honor. In Luke 14:8-13, Jesus shares a parable that emphasizes the role of honor in the invitation of guests as well as where those guests are placed at the table in relation to the host. As a result, as Hershberger notes, "honor was at the heart of...hospitality" in these texts.²⁶⁰

Similarly, Jesus' teachings contradicted the cultural convention of advantageous reciprocity as it applies to hospitality, which, in turn, carries with it acts and attitudes of honor and shame according to Hershberger. In the later part of the Lukan passage above, Jesus calls upon his listeners to invite those who are in need of hospitality – the poor, crippled, lame, and blind, among others – rather than simply inviting one's friends, family and wealthy colleagues. [Instead, Jesus calls for the attendance of those in need who have nothing to give in return other than themselves. In this way, hospitality according to Jesus is about honoring the individual, not accruing honor by way of reciprocity for oneself.²⁶¹ Hershberger notes Jesus' teaching here refers to a "downward mobility" that is antithetical to how hospitality was practiced at this time. She notes his admonition for "bringing unclean people into your house, people who would defile you...[was about] seeing everyone as your equal and demonstrating that with your hospitality," which contributes to the political implications of hospitality as such acts would be considered quite subversive.²⁶² In the end, Jesus appears to imply God grants honor through acts of hospitality and that this relationship between the two is not a mechanism in a reciprocity system given by one's peers, guests, or

²⁶⁰ Hershberger, *A Christian View of Hospitality*, 125.

²⁶¹ Hershberger, *A Christian View of Hospitality*, 126.

²⁶² Hershberger, *A Christian View of Hospitality*, 126.

hosts.

The link between hospitality and social justice is also apparent in these texts and in the later epistles that outlined hospitable practices of the early church. As early Christians saw themselves as strangers and aliens who inhabited “marginal situations of shame, unrest, and even persecution,” it was expected for them “to conduct themselves in an honorable and blameless manner midst their hosts.”²⁶³ Concurrently, the apostle Paul admonishes adherents to strive to out-do each other with regards to honor while practicing hospitality, effectively linking honor and hospitality in a more direct way.²⁶⁴

On the whole, hospitality in Christianity as it is practiced today does not emphasize honor as such.²⁶⁵ Yet, if one considers the practice of hospitality in the Christian tradition, it is not difficult to imply honor as part of the equation. The concept of honor carries with it a certain aspect of moral authority and practice, which is certainly present in the Christian practice of hospitality in the current context. Christian ethicist Christine Pohl describes hospitality as a “way of life [that is] fundamental to Christian identity”²⁶⁶ and that “[w]elcoming strangers into a home and offering them food, shelter, and protection” are its “key components.”²⁶⁷ Regarded as a “highly valued moral practice,” Pohl asserts hospitality is “an important expression of kindness, mutual aid, neighborliness, and response to the life of faith”²⁶⁸ and it stands as “one of the pillars of morality on which society [is] built.”²⁶⁹ In Judaism and Islam, those values and actions are inextricably linked to concepts and etiquettes of honor.

Furthermore, the absence of understanding and discussion in scholarship related to honor in Western Christianity illuminates a gap that

²⁶³ Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 115 with reference to I Peter 2:12.

²⁶⁴ Rom 12:9-13

²⁶⁵ Yet, one could also argue that there is a similar decline in honor in Judaism and Islam as well. The problem is not necessarily limited to Christianity, but its absence in Christianity is more marked.

²⁶⁶ Pohl, *Making Room*, x.

²⁶⁷ Pohl, *Making Room*, 4.

²⁶⁸ Pohl, *Making Room*, 4.

²⁶⁹ Pohl, “Building a Place for Hospitality,” 27.

undoubtedly contributes to the decline in the practice of hospitality. As has been explored in the above section related to Islam, one can ascertain that there appears to be a correlative relationship between honor and hospitality in that when honor is strongly emphasized in a tradition, the practice of hospitality is taken more seriously as well. As a result, there are two possible ways this can be interpreted: either hospitality is best understood and practiced when honor is taken seriously, or traditions and individuals who practice hospitality best are those who understand honor.²⁷⁰

The inability to understand the importance of honor and the ritual of hospitality illuminates a possible reason why inter-religious dialogue, cooperation, and collaboration are often ineffectual or superficial. Cooperative theology and practice on behalf of the marginalized and threatened other is also a hospitable, and honorable, theology and practice. A cooperative theology characterized by honor and hospitality that is shared between the cooperating traditions is the ideal. Thus, a recovery of a vocabulary and understanding of honor in the Christian tradition is needed if hospitable theological and ethical relationships between the Abrahamic traditions are to be propagated further.

²⁷⁰ This could be seen as a bit of a chicken/egg scenario. Is honor an internal attitude of hospitality? Or is hospitality an outward expression of honor? Or could it, perhaps, be both?

Conclusion

This chapter has focused upon hospitality specifically in the theology and practices of the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. It began with an analysis of the shared origins of the three traditions, namely in the common Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultural heritages which are, in turn, influenced by geography and climate, and in the foundational patriarch and model of hospitable behavior common to all three, the person of Abraham.

Each tradition's theology of hospitality has been briefly considered on its own terms, analyzing resources that undergird its practice as well as factors that hamper its practice in the current context. More specifically, the experience of exile and persecution, foundational values, and models of behavior toward the other has been explored and interpreted through the lens of hospitality toward the other. Yet, throughout the process, each section has reflected the particular aspects of hospitality in each tradition that makes their practice unique.

The final section of this chapter has illuminated an element currently missing in the debates and discussions of Western Christian scholarship related to hospitality: the role of honor. Engaging with the traditions of Judaism and Islam in order to find this gap in Western Christian thinking has affirmed the inter-religious methodology of this research, enabling one to see what is missing only through exposure to other traditions that have something to contribute to the theology and practice of hospitality.

PART TWO:

PROTECTIVE HOSPITALITY

CHAPTER FOUR: HOSPITALITY AND PROTECTION

It is in the shelter of each other that the people live.

- an Irish *seanfhocail*¹

To leave one's country in search of refuge, to save one's family, one's community, meant facing the unknown, and not knowing what would happen tomorrow or whether the place one had chosen as temporary refuge would open its doors and warmly welcome those fleeing terror and death.

- Rigoberta Menchú Tum²

Introduction

Heretofore, this research has explored the complexity of hospitality as ethical practice (Chapter Two) and the religious dimension that the Abrahamic traditions offer towards this (Chapter Three). Throughout there has been a movement toward considering a particular aspect of hospitality: the provision of protection. Chapter Two highlighted three main strands of hospitality – table fellowship, intellectual welcome, and protection. In Chapters Four - Six, protective hospitality for the threatened other will be given specific focus, analyzing theory and contributing factors that both encourage and hamper the practice of providing sanctuary for the endangered other, particularly in contexts of conflict or serious threat.

As this chapter is first time hospitality will have been considered through the particular lens of protection, the sources considered in this chapter are from a variety of disciplines. When considering the practice of

¹ Or "old saying." Such *seanfhocail*, or sayings, are impossible to locate in time or place. Thanks to Pádraig O'Tuama for alerting my attention to it.

² Rigoberta Menchú Tum, foreword, *Presencia de los refugiados guatemaltecos en México* (Mexico City: COMAR and UNHCR, 1999), 17 in María Cristina García, *Seeking Refuge: Central American Migration to Mexico, the United States and Canada*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006), 1.

protective hospitality during the course of this research, it became quite clear early on that contextual orientation was necessary. If formulations were going to be presented that were realistic and reflective of belief and practice within the Abrahamic communities, representatives of the faiths needed to be consulted on what they understood hospitality, and more specifically protective hospitality, to be. Therefore, I conducted informal group and individual conversations with a number of religious leadership and laity from Jewish, Christian, and Muslim traditions in both Northern Ireland and Bosnia between 2007 and 2011.

As a result of those conversations, it became clear early on that the religious leadership, laity, and their communities were fairly limited in their capacity to identify or “do theology” related to protective hospitality. For example, in 2009-2010 I conducted focus group conversations in Northern Ireland, situated around a table including a meal that was accompanied by tea and coffee, to discuss the role of hospitality within their respective religious traditions. Over the course of four weeks, the group discussed hospitality centered around four different emphases: welcoming the other, the role of food & drink, risk and refuge, and hospitality as peacemaking.

These conversations were enlightening in that they indicated the level of engagement present within the communities related to hospitality. By the end, it was obvious that on the whole, those who participated tended to think of hospitality in very conventional ways. Discourse in and about the theology of hospitality heretofore has been primarily restricted, in their experience, to conversations about tea and coffee, table fellowship or possibly as far as immigration or inter-religious dialogue, but it rarely goes wider. However, in the focus group conversations, when faced with questions of “Who do you welcome?,” “For whom do you put yourself at risk?,” and “What does your faith say about providing safe space?,” the participants – religious leadership and lay persons alike - were often hard pressed to come up with well-articulated, confident, and authoritative answers. Instead, there was speculation, exploration, and furrowed brows. Despite hopes for theology to be a “practical discipline, emerging from concrete human situations,

informing patterns of faithful living,”³ these conversations illuminated a disconnect between religious thought and religious practice around the topic of hospitality. Furthermore, when protective hospitality was discussed, the conversation automatically turned to risk, violence, and, somewhat surprisingly, concerns related to the purity of communal identity.⁴

This disconnect between religious thought and religious practice is perhaps understandable. My own background illuminates the contextual nature of theological construction and the disconnect between stated religious belief and practiced religious ethics. I am a product of the “Christ-haunted”⁵ and racially-divided American South. Religion and its influences upon culture and ethical practice contribute to who I am. I grew up in a white, lower middle class culture that prided itself on its Southern hospitality and yet was often antagonistic, fearful, hateful, or simply dismissive toward black community members who lived on the other side of town, went to different schools, and cleaned white people’s houses.

Moreover, in a specifically religious context, I grew up immersed in the Protestant culture of Southern Baptists⁶ that taught its followers to seek and follow God’s will in one’s life and reach one’s highest potential, but as a woman I was unwelcome to study theology, teach men, or be a pastor. These embedded ironies were unresolved. As such, places such as Bosnia, Croatia and Northern Ireland where I have lived and worked over the last thirteen years have felt familiar in their the mixture of religion and social constructs

³ Graham, *Theological Reflection: Methods*, 9.

⁴ Both on social and religious communal levels.

⁵ A term used to describe the South by southern writer Flannery O’Connor, where she says, “While the South is hardly Christ-centered, it is most certainly Christ-haunted,” referring to the religion ever-present in American Southern culture. From a paper read by O’Connor at Wesleyan College for Women, Autumn 1960 in Macon, Georgia and is reprinted in *Mystery and Manners: Occasional Prose*, eds. Sally and Robert Fitzgerald (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969), 44.

⁶ By Southern Baptists, I mean churches and religious structures who are officially connected with the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), over the last three decades has taken a decisive turn toward theological, political, and social conservatism and fundamentalism both in the U.S. and in their missionary efforts, through the International Mission Board (IMB), abroad. See Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention*, (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990) and Walter Shurden, *Not a Silent People: Controversies that Have Shaped Southern Baptists*, (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys Publishing, 2000) for more detailed analysis of this shift.

which serve to undergird both the imperatives for hospitality and protection and acts of inhospitality found in these post-conflict contexts.

While theology can open the door to new perspectives and horizons, oftentimes the process of theological reflection evokes bemusement in some while taking root and providing illumination in others.⁷ There are some communities who are exceptions, but “few congregations [are] given the resources to think intelligently about their faith...[d]espite references to theology as ‘the work of the people of God.’”⁸

This disconnect between thought and practice and the limitations present in religious communities and mainstream culture to conceive of and clearly articulate their understandings of hospitality and protection, therefore, affects how this research is presented. This chapter will be more exploratory than empirical, more a prescription of issues and possibility than a description of a current state of affairs. What will be presented in this chapter seeks to examine protective hospitality in such a way as to encourage dialogue and cooperative responsible action for the other.

To address what is present in the literature and the issues that were highlighted by the conversations mentioned above, this chapter is comprised of two parts. The first part will begin with three sections that lay the groundwork for the rest of the chapter, articulating the mechanics and conceptions of protective hospitality. The first section will detail the stages of protective hospitality based on the work of scholar Amy Oden. This will set the stage for an understanding that protective hospitality is not a singular, static event but is a nuanced and multi-staged movement. Furthermore, Oden helpfully illuminates the reality that protective hospitality, in and of itself, provides no guarantees for a positive outcome. The second section will consider the meaning and limitations of protection, with its particular emphasis upon preserving dignity and supporting human rights as an explicit act of social justice. The third section will identify several motivations in

⁷ Graham, *Theological Reflection: Methods*, 6.

⁸ Graham, *Theological Reflection: Methods*, 6 referring to Lewis Mudge and James Poling, ‘Editors’ Introduction’, in Mudge and Poling, eds., *Formation and Reflection: The Promise of Practical Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987), xiv.

literature that arose out of Holocaust research as to why people practice protective hospitality by giving sanctuary to the threatened other. Such an understanding of motivation is important as it enables Abrahamic communities to emphasize and further develop the values and skills identified in order to inform the future practice of protective hospitality.

The second part of the chapter seeks to address the obstacles that hamper the practice of hospitality which were identified in the conversations held. This second part is divided into three sections. The first section will address the issue of risk. It will begin with an analysis related to the formation and enforcement of boundaries as elements of protection as well as control and isolation, marking where boundaries are healthy and where they are a hindrance to the practice of protective hospitality. This examination of risk will continue by considering the elements of protective hospitality that require one to be open to encounters with the uninvited where there are no guarantees for a particular outcome. It will conclude with an assessment of an “ethic of risk” that informs responsible action, enabling one to enter into the practice of protective hospitality with awareness and a sense of empowerment. The second section will address the issue of purity and argues that concerns for individual, communal or moral purity are most often concerns about unity and control, whereas protective hospitality requires one to be open to outside “contaminants” in order to preserve life. The third and final section of this chapter will consider the intersection between protective hospitality and violence, emphasizing hospitality’s concern for life, freedom from cruel relationship, openness to the influence of others, and affinity to the principles of nonviolence over the destructive elements of violence.

1. The Mechanics of Protective Hospitality

There are three sections in the first half of this chapter that examine the mechanics of protective hospitality. The first analyzes Oden's definition of the stages of hospitality, considering specifically the provision of protection. The second examines the meaning and limitations of protection. Finally, the third section identifies motivations present within literature that explain why practitioners of protective hospitality acted as they did. As a result, this section seeks to provide a foundation for the construction of the remainder of the chapter as it considers the mechanics and conceptions of protective hospitality.

a. Stages of Protective Hospitality

Hospitality is often depicted as a singular, static, and often one-dimensional act, but as argued in Chapter Two it is much more nuanced and complex. Protective hospitality, like general hospitality, is practiced in stages. Christian historian and specialist in hospitality scholarship Amy Oden argues there are four stages in the practice of hospitality that help shape the process by which hospitality is extended, and these stages are particularly helpful in formulating the specific process of providing protective hospitality.⁹

Oden suggests the first stage is one that "encompasses a set of practices that welcome the guest," seen in the simple acts of "a warm greeting, words of welcome or an embrace, [or] even going out to greet the guest."¹⁰ In light of the need for protective hospitality, Oden includes the "offer of sanctuary to an exile or fugitive" in this first stage of hospitality.¹¹

⁹ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146-147. Oden references the *Didache* and early Christian writers such as Tertullian, Dionysius, Eusebius, Ambrose, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom and Bede as examples of how the various stages of hospitality take shape and are practiced.

¹⁰ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146.

¹¹ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146. Oden qualifies the first stage, however, by stating "the first movement of hospitality that initiates contact is not always an act of receiving. It may be expressed in the practice of visiting another, such as the sick or the hungry. In this case, hospitality is initiated by going to the other and, in a sense, receiving them, though it may be in their own homes or place of refuge, even the street..."

The second stage of hospitality, according to Oden, involves acts of restoration whereby the host seeks to “restore the guest, usually by addressing the most immediate needs whether physical or spiritual or both” which may include “foot washing, bathing, feeding, clothing, and prayer.”¹² Acts of restoration primarily concern the health and well-being of the guest.¹³ In the practice of protective hospitality, the bringing or taking in of the threatened other to establish safety would be part of the second stage.

Oden identifies the third stage as the act of “dwelling together.” This stage is a step further than the previous in that it is no longer the establishment of protection, but a sustained effort over the course of an amount of time. Oden emphasizes that in this stage there should be a “willingness to share one’s life with the other” and acts in this stage may include “sharing lodging or shelter of some kind, providing protection or sanctuary, and sharing resources such as food, clothing, medical care, and alms.”¹⁴ Oden notes this stage may also include “practices that reframe social relations away from exploitation and toward dwelling together” in a different way than before.¹⁵ As such, Oden calls this third stage “a hospitality of presence.”¹⁶

¹² Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146.

¹³ Italics added. It is here where the resonance between the practice of genuine hospitality and the practicality of life as seen in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is the most visible. Being hospitable requires sensitivity to the most pressing and basic, yet unfulfilled, needs of the stranger. However, in the context of threat, Maslow’s physiological and safety needs may be interchangeable. In some cases, the need for safety will be paramount and will override even the basic need for food and drink. For more information on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, see Abraham Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1954). For critiques of Maslow’s theories, see Manfred A Max-Neef, *Human Scale Development: Conception, Application and Further Reflections*, (New York: The Apex Press, 1991); R. Cianci and P.A. Gambrel, “Maslow’s hierarchy of needs: Does it apply in a collectivist culture,” *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 8:2, 2003, 143-161. Another approach could be found in Judith Lewis Herman’s *Trauma and Recovery* (London: Pandora, 1997), chapter 8 (155-174) where she details the necessity for safety to be ensured before recovery from trauma can be considered: “Recovery unfolds in three stages...[and] the central task of the first stage is the establishment of safety.” (155).

¹⁴ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146-147.

¹⁵ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147. Oden explains this by giving the following example: “the relationship of master to slave may be reoriented toward living in the awareness of a shared *imago dei*, or a wealthy person may divest themselves, reframing their social location so that they no longer help the poor but are the poor, dwelling together.”

¹⁶ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147.

The fourth and final stage is letting go or “sending forth” the guest,¹⁷ when the need for protection is recognized by the host and guest as coming to an end. Oden describes this stage as entailing “release, letting go of the stranger or guest with whom one has dwelt” and includes the act of “burying the dead as an hospitable practice that can be categorized...as sending forth.”¹⁸ From a justice perspective, this stage implies the practice of hospitality “does not create systems of dependence, but empowers the other to move on” as hospitality is to be “offered with open hands, so one does not hang on to the other in order to justify one’s continued hospitality.”¹⁹ In this final stage, Oden notes “blessing, giving food or other supplies for the journey, or giving companions for escort” would be offered.²⁰

However, Oden identifies further significance to this final stage of hospitality by stating:

The act of release includes letting go of the outcome of the practices of hospitality...[as] the practices of hospitality are independent of their outcomes. One lives hospitably without any guarantee of a payoff. The sick person may die, the stranger may misuse the resources shared, the hospitality offered may not be honored. Desire for a particular consequence of hospitality must be released.²¹

In light of Oden’s assertion that the means of hospitality should be differentiated from its end, a positive outcome from hospitality cannot be guaranteed. It is this lack of guarantee, this possibility for risk, failure, or endangerment that dissuades many from extending protective hospitality to the threatened other in favor of one’s own safety, control and, ultimately, isolation in what may be particularly hostile times. Nevertheless, in the

¹⁷ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147.

¹⁸ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147.

¹⁹ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147.

²⁰ Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 147. In the provision of escort, the continued provision of protection or assurance of safety is still being given. Ancient expressions of hospitality took this stage seriously, as guests would be escorted to the city gate to ensure that they were safe as possible within the realm of the host’s domain. See Gen 18:16 as an example where Abraham escorted the divine messengers from his home and to the boundaries of his domain.

²¹ Amy Oden, *And You Welcomed Me*, 146-147.

ensuing discussion related to protective hospitality, a realistic awareness of this absence of guarantee for a positive outcome is necessary.

b. Protection: Meaning and Limitations

While chapter two focused on the various meanings and limitations of hospitality, attention should also be paid as well to the meaning and limitations of protection as the focus shifts toward protective hospitality. The origin of the word is Latin, *protegere*, which means “to cover in front” or “to cover over.”²² As a transitive verb, it is defined as “to shield from injury or harm,” or “to secure or preserve against encroachment, infringement, restriction, or violation; maintain the status or integrity of” and carries with it heavy usage within legal vocabularies.²³

“To shield” or “to secure or preserve” from violation and to “maintain... integrity” all point to protection as being an inherently exclusive action in that something (a person, place, species, etc.) is set aside, blocked off, guarded, or placed somewhere where it cannot be corrupted, injured, or harmed. Meanwhile, hospitality has been popularly portrayed, as examined in previous chapters, as an action that is inherently inclusive. Therefore, would not these seemingly opposed ideas make the term “protective hospitality” an oxymoron?

On the surface level, perhaps, it is. But as has also been discussed in previous chapters and will be explored here more fully, the meaning and practice of hospitality is full of tensions. One of those tensions is the idea that hospitality is only hospitality within a particular set of defining

²² *pro* – “front”; *tegere* – “to cover.” “Protect,” Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law. Merriam-Webster, Inc. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/protect> Accessed 3 June, 2010.

²³ “Protect,” Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law. Merriam-Webster, Inc. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/protect> Accessed 3 June, 2010. Merriam-Webster's also notes its usage in other contexts: “In a gangster sense, ‘freedom from molestation in exchange for money’...is attested from 1860. Ecological sense of “attempted preservation by laws” is from 1880 (originally of wild birds in Britain). Protectionist in the economics sense is first recorded 1844, from Fr. *protectionniste* (in political economy sense, protection is attested from 1789).

boundaries, such as via place given, actions taken, manners shown, people present, or a myriad of other factors. The same is true for protective hospitality, with simply more overt emphasis placed upon those boundaries and, as being put forward here, the ethical obligations that those within the Abrahamic traditions have to shield and secure the threatened other.

Christian ethicist Christine Pohl's inclusion of the provision of protection and shelter in the discussion of hospitality is useful to this discussion. The inclusion of protection is automatic for her, in that her definition of hospitality "involves sharing food, shelter, protection, recognition, and conversation."²⁴ She mentions the Israelite laws regarding providing protection for strangers and resident aliens,²⁵ but also brings attention to the practices in the early church protecting the community's hospitality from abuse, detailing parameters set into place in order to make its long-term practice sustainable.²⁶ Additionally, Pohl later connects the practice of hospitality with the changes in language from the Reformation era, noting "concerns about respecting and protecting strangers that had originally been articulated in the language of hospitality were recast as concerns about human rights."²⁷

It is this evolution toward human rights language that, perhaps, makes those who are more unfamiliar with theological language see the practical aspects of hospitality, particularly when one considers its role in contexts of conflict. The implications of hospitality for protecting the threatened other are seen in a statement by Darrell Guder, a Christian theologian who focuses on the role of the church in contemporary society. He asserts the practice of hospitality by the faithful is a participation in the peaceable kingdom of God and such a practice "indicates the crossing of boundaries (ethnic origin, economic condition, political orientation, gender status, social experience,

²⁴ Pohl, "Building a Place for Hospitality," 27.

²⁵ Pohl, "Building a Place for Hospitality," 28. The laws that deal with the cities of refuge will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

²⁶ Pohl, "Building a Place for Hospitality," 29.

²⁷ Pohl, "Building a Place for Hospitality," 32. Perhaps the shift in language of hospitality which precipitated the movement away from honor as noted in the chapter previous is in some way connected to this shift toward human rights language. In human rights discourse, it is much more common to hear the word "dignity" rather than honor.

educational background) by being open and welcoming of the other.”²⁸

Without this example of crossing boundaries through the practice of hospitality, Guder continues, “the world will have no way of knowing that all God’s creation is meant to live in peace.”²⁹ Such an assertion is particularly true in the provision of protective hospitality.

Similarly, Leonardo Boff claims those who are concerned about and work for justice for the poor and excluded are practicing a modernization of the Abrahamic “legacy of covenant and hospitality” which is not meant to be a “paternalistic attitude of being there *for* the other; it rather...[is] being *with* the other, and whenever possible...living *as* the other.”³⁰ Moreover, in focusing upon the needs of others, the practice of hospitality will inevitably bring one into contact with social injustices and challenge the practitioner to look for ways to work towards the good of all creation, including the good of one’s guest.³¹ It is in this aspect of placing oneself in another’s shoes, living in solidarity with the other, and committing oneself to the practice of crossing boundaries and welcoming the threatened other that protective hospitality resides.

Christian theologian Henri Nouwen highlights the connection between hospitality and sanctuary by emphasizing the Latin roots depicting a movement from “*hostis* to *hospes*,” noting there is desperate need for safe, nurturing spaces where people can live lives free from fear and hostility, and where transformation from enemy to guest can take place.³² While he does limit the discussion of hospitality and creating space around more spiritual, mental, and emotional realms and does not include the physical dimension as well, he does make important links between the need of space for cultural

²⁸ Darrell J. Guder, et al., *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 177.

²⁹ Guder, *Missional Church*, 177.

³⁰ Boff, *Virtues*, 83. Boff specifies Judeo-Christian rather than Abrahamic in his assertion, yet there is no reason why Islam cannot be included in his idea.

³¹ Dorothy Bass, “A Guide to Exploring Christian Practices,” *Practicing Our Faith* Online Library, <http://www.practicingourfaith.org/exploring-christian-practices-guide>, accessed on 11 June 2011.

³² Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 46. The discussion of *hostis* vs. *hospes* is dealt with more thoroughly in chapter two.

and language recognition, where freedom is given to strangers to “sing their own songs, speak their own languages, [and] dance their own dances.”³³

Furthermore, in the practice of protective hospitality, particularly among Abrahamic traditions, the one who is welcomed “is consistently defined as someone who lacks any resources to support themselves...who lacks a ‘place’ in society because they are detached or excluded from the basic means of supporting and sustaining life – family, work, polity, land and so on – and are thus vulnerable.”³⁴ Similar to Nouwen’s emphasis upon recognition, this emphasis upon supporting the place of the vulnerable and excluded in a society carries significant political weight and, therefore, highlights the political potential of protective hospitality.

Yet, ethicist Alasdair MacIntyre adds another dimension to protective hospitality that combines both its political nature and its capacity to contribute to communal health. While MacIntyre sees hospitality “as a universal practice...central to the proper functioning of any society,”³⁵ he argues it is grounded in the “virtue of *misericordia*,” defined as “the capacity for grief or sorrow over someone else’s distress just insofar as one understands the other’s distress as one’s own...[or] an aspect of charity whereby we supply what is needed by our neighbour.”³⁶ Luke Bretherton takes this further and considers the implications of *misericordia*, acknowledging its practice in conjunction with hospitality “directs one to include the stranger within one’s communal relationships” which extends

³³ Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, 51. It is unclear by this text if Nouwen is aware of Paul Ricoeur’s work on the politics of recognition, yet this statement would resonate with Ricoeur’s assertions that recognition is a moral exercise. Cf. Paul Ricoeur, *Course of Recognition*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005). Ricoeur’s work is explored more closely in Chapter Two.

³⁴ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 139. Bretherton uses this definition of stranger to explain who is a stranger in the Christian tradition because he has limited his research to this particular community. Nevertheless, his concept of a stranger would not be foreign to the Jewish and Islamic understandings either and, therefore, I have taken the liberty to broaden it. Cf. Marc Gopin, “The Heart of the Stranger,” in *Explorations in Reconciliation*, David Tombs and Joseph Liechty, eds. (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006), 3-21.

³⁵ Alasdair MacIntyre, *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*, (London: Duckworth, 1999), 123. Also referred to in Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 127.

³⁶ MacIntyre, *Dependent Rational Animals*, 125. Also referred to in Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 127.

“the bounds of one’s communal obligations, and thereby including the other in one’s relations of giving and receiving characterized by just generosity.”³⁷ Such understandings provide the foundations for the practice and provision of protective hospitality.

In all of these ways in which hospitality is discussed, it is clear that provision of safety, refuge or space in which the threatened other can live, and hopefully thrive, is an act of justice but also an act of hospitality. As a result, one can argue that protective hospitality is uniquely placed, with this particular emphasis upon dignity and human rights, as an act of social justice.

c. Motivations for Protective Hospitality

Chapter Three considered the variety of motivations for providing hospitality based upon the work of Andrew Arterbury and Ladislaus Bolchazy. Similarly, this chapter considers the variety of motivations that lead people to put themselves at risk and provide protective hospitality for the threatened other.

Are some more prone to provide protective hospitality than others? Although this research emphasizes the theological and ethical resources in the Abrahamic traditions that can inform the practice of protective hospitality, wider inclusion of research in the area of altruism and the typology of rescuers is useful. Understanding what motivates people to act in solidarity with the threatened other can help Abrahamic communities emphasize and further develop the values and skills to inform the practice of protective hospitality.

David Gushee, a Christian ethicist, considered the motivations of rescuers during the Holocaust, surveying the work of altruism researchers, sociologists, and others who were interested in the actions of those who risked their lives to give safe harbor to Jews during World War II.³⁸

³⁷ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 127.

³⁸ See especially David P. Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles of the Holocaust: Genocide and Moral Obligation*, 2nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: Paragon, 2003). Gushee’s findings are relevant here because they are also applicable in the more contemporary setting of protective hospitality

In his research, Gushee collated the various motivations found in the sociological studies done upon rescuers, and identified seven main motivations as to why some people decided to risk themselves for the other. He lists them as follows: moral obligation, inclination toward inclusivity, religious affiliation, social responsibility and empathy, resistance and solidarity, special kinship with other Abrahamic peoples, and remembered experiences of persecution.

1) *Moral Obligation*: This motivation for protection and rescue assumes that those threatened are “within the boundaries of moral obligation” wherein the host acts on “the conviction that it [is] morally obligatory to invite the stranger within the reach of human care, even though doing so might cost... everything.”³⁹ Furthermore, those who act with this motivation refuse to allow government bodies or abusive systems to define the threatened other “as outside the boundaries of moral obligation.”⁴⁰

2) *Inclined toward Inclusivity*: For those who are willing to put themselves in harm’s way to protect the other, “tolerance appears steadily, though not universally...[as] values learned in childhood” by those who provide protective hospitality.⁴¹ They may have been taught altruism and inclusion, assessing people “as individuals rather than as group members” and having “a predisposition to regard all people as equals and to apply similar standards of right and wrong to them without regard to their social status or ethnicity.”⁴²

among the Abrahamic traditions, despite his own research parameters.

³⁹ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 113.

⁴⁰ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 134.

⁴¹ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 120.

⁴² Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 120, quoting and referring to the work of Samuel P. Oliner and Pearl M. Oliner, *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*, (New York: Free Press, 1988), 149-151. He also references Eva Fogelman’s *Conscience and Courage*, 259-260 noting her statement that tolerance was “taught to 88 percent of her sample of rescuers,” and cites Fleischner, who noted “some rescuers ‘reacted against their [intolerant] family background,’ drawing upon other resources.” See Eva Fleischner, “Can Few Become the Many? Some Catholics in France Who Saved Jews during the Holocaust.” In *Remembering for the Future*, edited by A. Roy Eckardt and Alice Eckardt, vol. 1, 233-47, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989), 242.

3) *Religious Affiliation*: In the research on those who were rescuers, there does not appear to be any differentiation between those who were religious and those who were not.⁴³ Additionally, religious commitment in those who provided hospitality as opposed to those who did not were similar, as approximately “70% of both groups described themselves as ‘very’ or ‘somewhat’ religious.”⁴⁴ Gushee notes, however, that the majority of those who professed to be religious were rescuers, while a majority of those who professed to be “not at all religious” were also found to be rescuers, indicating “rescuers may have had stronger convictions about religion, positive or negative, than nonrescuers did.”⁴⁵

4) *Social Responsibility and Empathy*: Gushee refers to tests conducted by Oliner and Oliner that “offered stronger and more systematic evidence concerning rescuer personality traits,” and found rescuers “scored higher than nonrescuers on the Social Responsibility Scale, a measure assessing the individual’s sense of responsibility toward other people and sense of duty to contribute to the well-being of others and the community.”⁴⁶ The individuals also scored higher “on the Empathy Scale...[which measures one’s] responsiveness to other’s *pain*.”⁴⁷

5) *Resistance and Solidarity*: Similar to concepts of moral obligation, those who were motivated toward protective hospitality in the studies refused to

⁴³ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 126.

⁴⁴ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 126-127.

⁴⁵ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 126-127. This point is extremely important.

Detractors of religion and religiously motivated ethics would point to the lack of differentiation between rescuers and nonrescuers by religious factor as evidence that religion plays no role in the decision to provide protective hospitality. As protective hospitality is not the domain of only religious individuals or communities, such a statement might be true in some cases. However, the findings Gushee notes imply the strength of conviction for or against religion still plays a role in a majority of the findings’ samples, and, therefore, should not be dismissed.

⁴⁶ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 132, referencing Oliner and Oliner, *The Altruistic Personality*, 173-174.

⁴⁷ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 132, referencing Oliner and Oliner, *The Altruistic Personality*, 173-174.

allow others to define for them who was in and who was out.⁴⁸ Instead they were more practiced in the “habits of political resistance and solidarity” wherein those “with relatively more power and freedom stand with those who are most threatened, working in partnership...for survival and ultimately in liberation.”⁴⁹

6) *Special kinship with other Abrahamic peoples*: The research to which Gushee refers found the motivation for protective hospitality among many Christians was their “strong sense of religious kinship with Jews as a people.”⁵⁰ Nevertheless, such kinship should not be restricted to the Judeo-Christian relationship, but broadened to the Abrahamic family as a whole. While the research on Muslim rescuers may not be present in Gushee’s work, such a restriction is short-sighted as it does not take into account the Muslims who protected Jews during that period as well.⁵¹ Furthermore, to date there has not been any significant research conducted in contexts such as Israel/Palestine where the situation is somewhat reversed and Jewish individuals are now working to protect Palestinian Muslims, and often refer to this idea of kinship.⁵²

7) *Remembered Experience of Persecution*: Lastly, the experience of minority communities who remembered their own experiences of discrimination historically was also a motivator for protective hospitality. The French Huguenot community of Le Chambon relied heavily on its past experiences of

⁴⁸ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 134.

⁴⁹ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 141-142.

⁵⁰ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 152.

⁵¹ The emergence of the activities of Muslims during the Holocaust seems to have only really become present in mainstream Holocaust scholarship in the last decade. For more information on these stories and motivations, see Peter Hellman, *When Courage was Stronger Than Fear: Remarkable Stories of Christians and Muslims who Saved Jews from the Holocaust*, (New York: Marlowe and Company, 2004) and Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories From the Holocaust’s Long Reach into Arab Lands*, (New York: PublicAffairs, 2006).

⁵² However, various organizations operating in Israel/Palestine began on the Israeli side and find their work based in ideas of kinship and shared humanity. See Women in Black (<http://www.womeninblack.org/en/history>), Rabbis for Human Rights (<http://rhr.org.il/eng/>), and Israeli Committee Against Housing Demolition (<http://icahd.org/>) among others. All accessed on 19 September 2011.

persecution. Similarly, the small Baptist community in Lithuania and Western Ukraine likewise utilized their history of persecution to identify with and provide protection for the threatened other in the context of the Holocaust.⁵³

From Gushee's research, one can see that religious belief is not the sole determiner of decisions to provide protective hospitality for the threatened other. A variety of factors inform the practice, and Gushee's research related to religion shows there were a significant number of religious individuals who *did not* protect. Rather than interpret this negatively toward religion, however, it presents adherents of the Abrahamic traditions with an opportunity. This dissertation highlights each of these motivations - moral obligation, inclusive values, religious affiliation, social responsibility and empathy, resistance and solidarity, special kinship, and remembered experiences of persecution – as part and parcel of the Abrahamic theology and practice of protective hospitality. Some motivations have been already mentioned and others will be considered in more detail in the following chapters. Each of these motivations are present in the Abrahamic traditions and might be able to contribute to a cooperative theology which supports the practice of protective hospitality among the Abrahamic communities in response to situations where the threatened other is in need of refuge.

⁵³ Gushee, *Righteous Gentiles*, 159-160.

2. Embracing Risk: Boundaries, Purity, and Violence in the Practice of Protective Hospitality

In the following sections, an analysis of risk as it pertains to the provision of protective hospitality will be considered. Within the area of risk, more focused analyses on the issues of place and boundaries and the tension between the invited and uninvited aspects of hospitality will be considered. Building upon those considerations, an examination of purity and its role in serving to discourage encounter with the other will be conducted, followed by an assessment of the relationship between protective hospitality and violence. This final section on violence will specifically consider the contribution of Christian theologian Hans Boersma and the arguments related to nonviolence in the provision of protective hospitality.

a. Risk

The fact that risk is involved in the provision of protective hospitality is undisputed. When protective hospitality is discussed, risks including harm to oneself, family, home or community and/or a perceived or real negative impact upon one's reputation, social or political standing, or economic well-being are usually also considered. Understandably, the fear of these risks, along with the risks to purity to be discussed in more detail later, is the primary impediment to the practice of protective hospitality. Therefore, if the practice is to be examined in detail, an analysis of the risk involved and how it can be dealt with is necessary.

When faced with any decision, most individuals or communities analyze the risk of acting upon that decision.⁵⁴ Risk is defined as “the

⁵⁴ See Mary Douglas, *Risk Acceptability According to the Social Sciences*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985). Primarily comprised of literature review, Douglas analyzes the relationship between risk perception, risk analysis, risk acceptability, social justice, and morality, looking at a variety of risks found in life including gambling, insurance, building property within the reach of natural disaster potential, health decisions, and so on. It becomes obvious that every aspect of life carries with it some sort of risk, and therefore, life itself is risk management. Furthermore, even Jesus talked about counting the cost, particularly in relation to becoming his follower. See Matt 8:18-22; Luke 9:57-62; 14:25-34.

possibility of incurring misfortune or loss,⁵⁵ and when faced with the decision to provide protective hospitality for a threatened – or “at risk” – other, there is an understanding that the threats which endanger the other may also threaten the one who gives her/him safe harbor. Ethicist Christine Pohl notes an awareness of such risks:

Hospitable households, cities of refuge, the underground railroad, and the sanctuary tradition have sometimes made the difference between life and death for those fleeing danger. In its resistance to the dominant powers, this kind of hospitality has cost some hosts their lives.⁵⁶

As mentioned previously, it is impossible to practice genuine hospitality and avoid all risk, or as one author puts it, when it comes to hospitality, “[t]here are no guarantees.”⁵⁷ Nevertheless, it is natural to avert risk whenever possible. It is natural to want to reduce or eliminate risk altogether, often with the understanding that “the loss of anything of value is loss that [one] cannot accept.”⁵⁸ Theologian Miroslav Volf argues “security is important...because of our vulnerability.”⁵⁹ As hospitality is practiced, boundaries become more transparent and “the host is made vulnerable and dependent”⁶⁰ upon the goodwill of the stranger he/she protects and, in many ways, the systems or actors under whose threat the guest flees.

Nevertheless, life consists of a series of risks, and according to Volf, “[t]o be human is to be vulnerable” and “[v]ulnerability is the essential condition of human life.”⁶¹ Life with others – in effect, a society – is equally full of risks. To avoid risk and vulnerability is to avoid life, and one could argue that to vigilantly assess risk and vulnerability at the cost of the

⁵⁵ “Risk,” Dictionary.com. *Collins English Dictionary - Complete and Unabridged 10th Edition*. (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009) available at <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/risk> (accessed: July 07, 2011).

⁵⁶ Pohl, *Making Room*, 64.

⁵⁷ Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 59.

⁵⁸ Miroslav Volf, “How safe can we be?,” *Christian Century*, 19 October 2010, 66.

⁵⁹ Volf, “How safe can we be?,” 66.

⁶⁰ Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 59.

⁶¹ Volf, “How safe can we be?,” 66.

threatened other is to create an idol of one's own false sense of security. In light of the risks involved in the provision of protective hospitality and its various implications with regards to politics and solidarity, scholar Charles Fried declares that rather than "asking how much risk is acceptable...the general question would be what kind of society do you want?"⁶²

i. Place and Boundaries

As hospitality is always given in a specific context – in a home, a community, a city, a nation – the issue of place and its role in the provision of hospitality, particularly protective hospitality, should be analyzed. Since place is defined by boundaries, as in what is *here* and what is *there*, the concepts of place and boundaries are inextricably linked.

Philosopher Claire Elise Katz notes "it is the home that makes the ethical possible."⁶³ With such a provocative statement, defining what home means and how it determines ethical behavior and morality is necessary. "House" implies a physical structure, a tactile arrangement of materials that provides at least a modicum of shelter from the natural elements. Comparatively, "home" can refer to that same physical structure, or a particular community, a nation, but the defining factor is its impact on the emotions and self-identification of the one who calls the particular place "home. Additionally, Derrida argues that to welcome "is perhaps to insinuate that one is at home here, that one knows what it means to be at home, and that at home one receives, invites, or offers hospitality."⁶⁴ Obviously, Derrida argues, one welcomes others into a place where one feels at home, a place that affirms one's identity.

⁶² Douglas, *Risk Acceptability*, 14-15 quoting the Kantian "moral theory based on risk" work of Charles Fried, *Anatomy of Values* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970).

⁶³ Katz, *Levinas, Judaism and the Feminine*, 59. Her statement is given in the context of thoughts from the Talmud and interpretations by Emmanuel Levinas, who asserts that the final chapter of Proverbs, wherein the ideal woman and her home is described, is "a moral paradigm."

⁶⁴ Derrida, *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, 15.

Therefore, since home plays a defining role in the development and definition of one's self-identification, a return to the concept of the practice of hospitality as "an act that constitutes identity"⁶⁵ is necessary in order to help address issues that arise in the consideration of home. While it has been noted previously, this particular emphasis upon home is enhanced by McNulty's discussion of home as it relates to identity and place:

[Hospitality] is the act through which the home – and the homeland – constitutes itself in the gesture of turning to address its outside. But as an accidental encounter with what can be neither foreseen nor named, hospitality also insists on the primacy of immanent relations over identity. Hence, it both allows for the constitution of identity and challenges it, by suggesting that the home can also become unhomey, *unheimlich*, estranged by the introduction of something foreign that threatens to contaminate or dissolve its identity.⁶⁶

McNulty's assertion that the home is the place where hospitality is given and identity is constructed, and, as a result, where hospitality carries with it risks to the home's purity, is revealing.⁶⁷ However, the issue of place and home as the hub of hospitality first requires expansion. Pohl defines hospitable places as "comfortable and lived in...settings in which people are flourishing...[where] the people that inhabit them [are given] shelter and sanctuary in the deepest sense of these words," and, therefore, she notes shelter and protective hospitality are not limited to physical place but also present in people and "the shelter of relationships."⁶⁸

⁶⁵ McNulty, *The Hostess*, viii.

⁶⁶ McNulty, *The Hostess*, viii.

⁶⁷ The issue of purity will be discussed in a following section.

⁶⁸ Pohl, *Making Room*, 152. Elie Wiesel makes a similar statement, related to refuge being found in persons, saying each person is a sanctuary that no one has the right to invade. Elie Wiesel, "The Refugee," *Cross Currents*, 34:4 (Winter 1984-85), 387. This sentiment of protective hospitality based in persons and relationships rather than in specific locales can be seen in the work of Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT), the Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and Israel (EAPPI), and others who do not work out of physical locations, but who work to be centers of hospitality in inhospitable contexts (border crossings, checkpoints, and other locations where the threatened other is at risk), bearing witness to injustice and attempting to provide safety through the use of their own bodies and physical presence. For more information on the work of these groups, see Elizabeth F. Boardman, *Taking a Stand: A Guide to Peace Teams and Accompaniment Projects*, (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 2005); Tricia Gates Brown, ed. *Getting in the Way: Stories from Christian Peacemaker Teams*, (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2005); Barbara Müller, *The*

Yet, since a physical home, in the sense of a house, community, or nation is defined by what is within its boundaries, it stands to reason that boundaries are, therefore, important.⁶⁹ Boundaries provide the criteria by which identity is formed, belonging is established, and health and safety are maintained. They are the realm in which normative aspects of life are conducted. Boundaries are also necessary if one seeks to provide protective hospitality to the threatened other, as those under threat often “come from living in chronic states of fear” and are in need of a safe place “to relax, heal, and reconstruct their lives.”⁷⁰

Furthermore, if hospitality is to be considered “an utter openness,” then the concept of home becomes empty, lacking commitment and without identity.⁷¹ When practiced unreservedly by “allowing itself to be ‘swept by the coming of the wholly other, the absolutely unforeseeable stranger’”⁷² and without boundaries, it allows the other the potential to become “so radically overpowering and incommensurate that it ruptures all ... mediation, receding into an indiscernible and anonymous horizon, making [one] in principle responsible for all, even for the one who would destroy.”⁷³ In such a context, there is no common space for reciprocity, and “the result is an evaporation of...vitality.”⁷⁴ In turn, this form of hospitality lacks protection for those who are under threat. Likewise, without boundaries, there is simply “nothing to which we can invite or welcome anyone else.”⁷⁵

Balkan Peace Team: 1994-2001, Paul Foster, trans. (Stuttgart: Ibidem, 2007); Howard Clark, ed. *People Power: Unarmed Resistance and Global Solidarity*, (New York: Pluto Press, 2009); and Kathleen Kern's *In Harm's Way: A History of Christian Peacemaker Teams*, (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2009) and *As Resident Aliens: Christian Peacemaker Teams in the West Bank 1995-2005*, (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2010).

⁶⁹ For a more focused but less academic discussion of boundaries and hospitality, see Caroline Westerhoff, *Good Fences: The Boundaries of Hospitality*, (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 2004) which addresses the issue for Christian churches as they negotiate issues of inclusivity, identity and hospitality.

⁷⁰ Pohl, *Making Room*, 140.

⁷¹ Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 63.

⁷² Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 362-363. Also referred to in Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 63.

⁷³ Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 63.

⁷⁴ Reynolds, “Improvising Together...,” 63.

⁷⁵ Caroline Westerhoff, *Good Fences*, 7.

On a theological level, rabbi and conflict transformation scholar Marc Gopin argues Abraham's model in monotheistic religion illustrates that the love of God, who is "the quintessential stranger to this world," requires adherents to understand boundaries that perpetuate the Otherness of God.⁷⁶ Gopin argues if the boundary to God's otherness is transgressed, and God is invited "too far inside," one ends up "worshipping something else – not God, but ourselves quite often, or a piece of land"; however, if one does not "open the door to this extraordinary Stranger then we risk an existence bereft of meaning, [and] of spiritual and emotional depth."⁷⁷

Yet, boundaries that establish "too much rigidity in communal formation can suffocate grace and undermine protective hospitality, negating difference by creating constrictive mechanisms of exclusion and violence."⁷⁸ The issue of communal identity formation and preservation through the enforcement of strict boundaries has, at times, caused the respective Abrahamic communities to choose "self-protective and inwardly turned solidarity over care and concern for others not shaped in its own image."⁷⁹ Such actions to preserve identity, particularly when motivated by fear of the unknown,⁸⁰ "tempts a community to feign security by claiming certainty over and against others who are seen as threats" and if these temptations are succumbed to, hospitality is traded "for an alleged possession of 'the' truth" which, in turn, "obstructs the cultivation of moral characteristics, such as humility, justice, courage, and, ironically, truthfulness."⁸¹

Richard Beck, writing from a Christian perspective and as a professor of psychology, argues the psychotherapeutic community has "fetishized" the concept of interpersonal boundaries, which has exhibited itself in unhealthy ways in relation to hospitality.⁸² More specifically, Beck asserts the concept

⁷⁶ Marc Gopin, "The Heart of the Stranger," 8.

⁷⁷ Gopin, "The Heart of the Stranger," 8.

⁷⁸ Reynolds, "Improvising Together...", 63.

⁷⁹ Reynolds, "Improvising Together...", 63.

⁸⁰ One could say that fear of the known may also be a motivation, considering how Abrahamic communities remember what has been done to each other over the centuries.

⁸¹ Reynolds, "Improvising Together...", 63.

⁸² Beck, *Unclean*, 126-128. Beck notes: "...the psychotherapeutic community has tended to fetishize the notion of boundaries. And in this fetishization of boundaries, the

of boundaries arise in a psychotherapeutic sense from “concerns about unhealthy boundaries, enmeshment, victimhood, and dependency” which are rooted in “a morbid situation” where “relationships are often found to be diseased, dysfunctional, or maladaptive.”⁸³ Boundaries, for Beck, are indications that the “mutuality of love has been lost” and are necessary for those with a “morbid self-concept [wherein] the individual allows the other to ‘use and abuse’ them.”⁸⁴ Beck goes further by noting when boundaries are necessary, love has failed in some way as one is “actively hurting” another.⁸⁵ As a result, when boundaries are used, they are used “as a form of *protection*” from further harm.⁸⁶

In Beck’s opinion, the issue with boundaries as it relates to the general practice of hospitality is that boundaries are being discussed and applied when there is no real reason for them to be put in place.⁸⁷ Beck understands that in cases of abuse or danger, boundaries that ensure safety are essential. Yet, within the realm of hospitable life, which Beck asserts should be characterized by love, boundaries often keep one disengaged from others and can be poisonous and antithetical to the practice of hospitality. Interestingly, Beck compares acts of what could be considered “protective hospitality”⁸⁸ to the love in healthy family relationships, by detailing how “love [of] the self and the other become so identified, emotionally and

psychotherapeutic community has, perhaps unwittingly...incorporated some of the most toxic aspects of modernity into their views of mental and spiritual health...The modern view of the self...is characterized by what Charles Taylor has called the ‘buffered self.’ [referencing Taylor’s book *A Secular Age*]...the modern notion of selfhood became introverted and individualistic, the self as isolated and distinct (‘buffered’) from the world. The notion of a self-determined, isolated, autonomous ego is a ubiquitous feature in modernity. The buffered self is a critical feature in how we moderns view our social contract, politically and economically.”

⁸³ Beck, *Unclean*, 127.

⁸⁴ Beck, *Unclean*, 127.

⁸⁵ Beck, *Unclean*, 127.

⁸⁶ Beck, *Unclean*, 127. Italics are in the original text.

⁸⁷ In a situation where protective hospitality is being given, boundaries to protect the threatened other from the abuser, however, would be an exception to Beck’s assertion. Beck is challenging the status quo of those communities who find themselves safe and comfortable, unchallenged by the other or the need to act on behalf of justice for the other because of self-protective boundaries.

⁸⁸ Beck never names it as such.

symbolically, that the two form a union, an identification, a fusion.”⁸⁹ While such a relationship “might seem like the very definition of enmeshment,” in actuality, he asserts, “this description of love describes how most of us...experience love.”⁹⁰ He goes on to state:

What parent, if faced with the choice, wouldn't sacrifice the use of his or her right arm to save their child? Or even give their very life? The point is that the safety and well-being of the child is more important than the parent's own physical body. This, after all, is what we mean by sacrificial love: the loss of the self (e.g., one's own life or situation in the world) for the sake of the other.... In all of this we see how our notions of selfhood become intertwined and fused with the other to the point where *the well-being of the other is how I define my selfhood!*⁹¹

Archbishop Desmond Tutu's ubuntu theology of South concurs with the idea that one's identity is defined by the well-being of others:

A person is a person through other persons...A person with *ubuntu* is open and available to others, affirming of others, does not feel threatened that others are able and good, for he or she has a proper self-assurance that comes from knowing that he or she belongs in a greater whole and is diminished when others are humiliated or diminished, when others are tortured or oppressed, or treated as if they were less than who they are.⁹²

In this way, we, as members of the human race, have the “responsibility to welcome endangered persons into [our] lives...and communities” when their “basic well-being is under attack by the larger society.”⁹³ Those attacks, related to the definition and violation of boundaries, are borne out of “dynamics of disgust and dehumanization

⁸⁹ Beck, *Unclean*, 126.

⁹⁰ Beck, *Unclean*, 126.

⁹¹ Beck, *Unclean*, 126.

⁹² Desmond Tutu, *No Future without Forgiveness*, (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 31.

Cf. See also Michael Battle, *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*, (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2009); Samuel A. Paul, *The Ubuntu God: Deconstructing a South African Narrative of Oppression*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton, University Press, 2009).

⁹³ Pohl, *Making Room*, 82-83.

[which] foster exclusion and expulsion.”⁹⁴ Conversely, the practice of protective hospitality welcomes into safety “the outcast and stranger as a full member of the human community...expand[ing] the moral circle, to push back against the innate impulse” in human communities that assumes “humanity ends at the border of the tribe.”⁹⁵

While self-identification is a natural part of human existence, ethicist Christine Pohl asserts “when, by acknowledging difference, we only endanger,” we are obligated to forgo boundaries and “only acknowledge our common human identity.”⁹⁶ To address this, Pohl calls for “a constant, complex interaction between identity-defining, bounded communities and a larger community with minimal boundaries that offers basic protection for individuals.”⁹⁷

ii. *Invited and Uninvited*

In popular terms, hospitality is often spoken of as always being ready for a guest. Yet philosopher Jacques Derrida questions this assumption. He asserts that while hospitality is certainly about catering to the needs of the invited guest, it conversely requires an aspect of the unexpected or uninvited as well. In fact, Derrida argues hospitality “consists in welcoming the other that does not warn me of his coming.”⁹⁸ John Caputo adds to Derrida’s argument by declaring that if an invitation “is a selection process whereby one puts in place in advance a set of prior conditions under which the

⁹⁴ Beck, *Unclean*, 124.

⁹⁵ Beck, *Unclean*, 124. André Trocmé of Le Chambon was asked by the police to turn over the Jews they were hiding, and he was noted to have said: “‘We do not know what a Jew is. We only know men.’” Pohl, *Making Room*, 82-83. Additionally Gopin notes the portrayal of God’s “singling out” Abraham as well as Abraham’s petition on behalf of Sodom in Genesis 18, noting the “act of singling out and making promises to a particular clan are clear evidence of the valuation of boundaries” as it details that “out of a place of *particularity*, of being a sojourner who nevertheless crosses boundaries with a universal concern...Abraham presents an ideal model of engagement with the world, without consuming that world or allowing it to consume him.” Gopin argues further that relation “becomes possible without violence, while the spiritual mission of interrelationship is not only maintained but is realised on a far deeper level than would be thought possible.” In “The Heart of the Stranger,” 13.

⁹⁶ Pohl, *Making Room*, 82-83.

⁹⁷ Pohl, *Making Room*, 82-83.

⁹⁸ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 381.

hospitality will be exercised,” then “the most radical or unconditional hospitality [would] be a hospitality without invitation” of the other.⁹⁹ Such a discussion of the invited guest as opposed to the uninvited guest is appropriate since the experience of protective hospitality is very often accompanied by this reality of surprise and a call for immediate action.

Caputo relies upon the work of Derrida and states Derrida draws distinctions “between invitation and visitation” of the other in that “hospitality by invitation is always conditional, a compromised and programmed operation, as opposed to hospitality to the uninvited other – who pays us an unexpected visit – which is unconditional and unprogrammed.”¹⁰⁰ For Derrida, hospitality “presupposes waiting, the horizon of awaiting and the preparation of welcoming.”¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, hospitality’s relationship with risk comes with Derrida’s assertion that it also presupposes letting “oneself to be overtaken, *to be ready to not be ready*, if such is possible, to let oneself be overtaken, to not even *let oneself be overtaken*, to be surprised, in a fashion almost violent, violated and raped [*violée*], stolen [*volée*]...precisely where one is not ready to receive.”¹⁰² Particularly in the context of protective hospitality, this tension between being prepared to act on behalf of the threatened other and never truly being prepared for whatever situations may arise that require the provision of sanctuary exists. Derrida illuminates the potential for danger in the practice of protective hospitality, and he explains it by noting that “[i]f I welcome only what I welcome, what I am ready to welcome, and that I recognize in advance because I expect the coming of the *hôte* as invited, there is no hospitality.”¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, 76.

¹⁰⁰ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*, 76. Yet, one must ask, without invitation or some other general public declaration that hospitality is available, how will the “uninvited” know to come, that such a place to come is even available? Does there need to be a culture of invitation rather than an explicit “please come to my house” invitation? Furthermore, such a discussion begs the questions: Does the practice of hospitality assume a total eradication of social convention? Are there not still some behaviors common to all that express both need for hospitality and an invitation to hospitality?

¹⁰¹ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 361

¹⁰² Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 361. Derrida goes further by saying it is “not only *not yet ready* but *not ready, unprepared* in a mode that is not even that of the ‘not yet’.”

¹⁰³ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 362. The assessment of risk in relation to the threats

While this potential for danger exists in the general practice of hospitality, its potential is all the greater in the provision of protective hospitality, especially in contexts of conflict.

Nevertheless, Derrida differentiates between “absolute hospitality” and “conditional hospitality.”¹⁰⁴ Absolute hospitality “cannot depend on the ‘invitation,’ over which ‘we’ regain control...but must be beholden to the ‘visitation’” of the unexpected guest, where the host must be “prepared to be unprepared, for the unexpected arrival of *any* other.”¹⁰⁵ In comparison, conditional hospitality is “structured by the economy of exchange,” of reciprocity and “the logic of gratitude,” depending in many ways on the conventions of place and time.¹⁰⁶

Given the risk involved, Derrida’s dichotomy between absolute hospitality and conditional hospitality has implications for the Abrahamic traditions. Derrida argues absolute hospitality is veritably “impracticable” as it would require the host to “submit to...dispossession, [and] to realize [one’s] identity as a host at the cost of risking everything that defines one as master” of one’s own self.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, this willingness to submit to dispossession is often considered a marker of devout religious life and experience as one is continually called upon in the Abrahamic texts to submit to God. Therefore, “the privileged representative of...absolute hospitality – the patriarch Abraham,”¹⁰⁸ after whom the Abrahamic tradition follows, lends authority to and provides a model for protective hospitality.¹⁰⁹

Derrida mentions will be dealt with in the following section.

¹⁰⁴ Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley, eds., *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1999), ch. 6, “Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida,” 70 in Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 120-121.

¹⁰⁵ Kearney and Dooley, *Questioning Ethics*, 70 in Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 120-121. Italics in original.

¹⁰⁶ Kearney and Dooley, eds. *Questioning Ethics*, 70 in Yong, *Hospitality and the Other*, 120-121.

¹⁰⁷ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xx.

¹⁰⁸ McNulty, *The Hostess*, xx-xxi.

¹⁰⁹ Abraham’s own dispossession of homeland and life as he knew it as claimed in Genesis 12 is referenced in the Abrahamic traditions that dispossession and submission in service or obedience to God is part and parcel of the faithful life. However, as with anything, the nature of the dispossession and to whom it is credited, as opposed to who actually does the dispossessing, requires identification. I would assert a relationship characterized by

Caputo also asks a few important questions, in the spirit of Derrida and his definition of absolute hospitality, particularly in relation to this issue of danger and tension between hospitality for the invited versus the uninvited:

But what is to say that I will not be murdered in my bed by all this hospitality? How am I to distinguish between the guest and the outright enemy, who will do me and mine the worst violence? Am I not duty bound to protect myself and my family from such violence?¹¹⁰

Caputo notes his answer to these questions is found by Derrida who validates the questions and argues “there would never be any way in principle to eliminate all the risk and still preserve the ideal of hospitality.”¹¹¹

The practice of protective hospitality is situated not in the avoidance of risk, but instead in considering how risks should be encountered and managed with and on behalf of the threatened other. In the context of protective hospitality, avoidance of risk is rooted in an “ethic of control” wherein “agency, responsibility and goodness...[are] a particular construction of *responsibility*” on the assumption that “it is possible to guarantee the efficacy of one’s actions.”¹¹² An “ethic of risk,” on the other hand, is “an alternative construction of *responsible action*”¹¹³ wherein risk is understood as a matter of course. The ethic of risk is rooted in the belief and practice

religious and emotional abuse that dispossesses the abused in the name of God is not of God. Therefore, wisdom and discernment must be utilized.

¹¹⁰ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct*, 76. Such a question about duty to protect family elucidates a follow-up question: what constitutes family?

¹¹¹ Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct*, 76. Caputo refers to a conversation had with Richard Kearney, Jacques Derrida and himself in *God, the Gift, and Postmodernism*, 130-136 which informed this statement. Elsewhere, Derrida asserts: “Hospitality, therefore – if there is any – , would have to, open itself to an other that is not mine, my hôte, my other, not even my neighbor or my brother, perhaps an ‘animal’ – I do say animal, for we would have to return to what one calls the animal, first of all with regards to Noah who, on God’s order and until the day of peace’s return, extended hospitality to animals sheltered and saved on the ark, and also with regards to Jonah’s whale, and to *Julien l’hospitalier* in Gustave Flaubert’s narrative....” Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 363. Derrida’s play on words in reference to the invitation of animals obviously also alludes to the dehumanization often applied toward enemies, threatening others, the most-often uninvited.

¹¹² Italics added. Sharon Welch, *The Feminist Ethic of Risk*, revised edition, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 14.

¹¹³ Italics added. Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 14.

that, in essence, protective hospitality should be provided in solidarity with those who are the “most vulnerable and least able to help themselves.”¹¹⁴

Ethicist Sharon Welch identifies the ethic of risk with a corresponding factor - maturity. She describes maturity in this context as a “recognition that the language of ‘causes’ and ‘issues’ is profoundly misleading,” that “evil is deep-seated,...barriers to fairness will not be removed easily by a single group or by a single generation” and that “the creation of fairness is the task of generations,...[since] work for justice is not incidental to one’s life but is an essential aspect of affirming the delight and wonder of being alive.”¹¹⁵

Conversely, without maturity in an ethic of risk and its correlated responsible action, the idea prevails “that work for justice is somehow optional, something of a hobby or a short-term project, a mere tying up of loose ends in an otherwise satisfactory social system.”¹¹⁶ For Welch, responsible action comes as a result of an ethic of risk and

does not mean one individual resolving the problem of others. It is, rather, participation in a communal work, laying the groundwork for the creative response of people in the present and in the future. Responsible action means changing what can be altered in the present even though a problem is not completely resolved. Responsible action provides partial resolutions and the inspiration and conditions for further partial solutions by others. It is sustained and enabled by participation in a community of resistance.¹¹⁷

The resistance to which Welch refers, borne out of an ethic of risk, is “far from naïve,” but is characterized by a “full awareness” of the risks one must take as well as “the different costs faced by others.”¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Maryann Cusimano Love, “The Ethics of Risk,” *America: The National Catholic Weekly*, 11 September 2006, available at http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=4943, accessed on 7 July 2011.

¹¹⁵ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 70.

¹¹⁶ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 70.

¹¹⁷ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 74-75.

¹¹⁸ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 78. In this section, Welch is analyzing the risks taken by the Logon family in Mildred Taylor’s *Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry* (New York: Bantam Press, 1984) as a case study in how an ethic of risk is practiced.

According to Welch, the ethic of risk and the real risk of losing everything including oneself, as is possible in the provision of protective hospitality, hinges upon love.¹¹⁹ Because of love for and from others, and not simply because of self-sacrifice, people “are empowered to work for justice...[which] often entails grave risks and dangerous consequences.”¹²⁰ She continues:

The concept of self-sacrifice is faulty in two fundamental ways...To those resisting, the primary feelings are those of integrity and community, not sacrifice....[and] what is lost in resistance is precisely *not* the self. One may be deprived of the accoutrements of a successful self - wealth, prestige, and job security [or even life, maybe] – but another self, one constituted by relationships with others [or with God], is found and maintained in acts of resistance. When we begin from a self created by love for nature and for other people, choosing *not* to resist injustice would be the ultimate loss of self.¹²¹

As such, the failure to practice protective hospitality and act with an ethic of risk endangers the self to a greater extent than whatever risks one might face otherwise.

To place these realities within a narrative, post-modern philosopher Peter Rollins tells a modern parable entitled “Salvation for a Demon” where this issue of invitation and potentiality for risk, through extending hospitality to “monsters,”¹²² takes on challenging form.¹²³ The parable introduces the reader to a “kindly old priest” who was famous for his hospitality as he

¹¹⁹ Welch’s ideas regarding love echo Beck’s argument about love in the context of boundaries in the previous section.

¹²⁰ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 165.

¹²¹ Welch, *Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 165. There would be critiques to Welch’s dependence upon love as a defining factor of an ethic of risk. Marxism, in particular, would take issue with this reliance upon love, seeing it as sentimentality and “brotherly sympathy” upon which people become “intoxicated.” See M. M. Bober, *Karl Marx’s Interpretation of History*, 2nd ed., rev. (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1965), 146. Welch responds to the Marxist critique by agreeing that “love for individuals is not enough...Yet, if the motive of love for all people is lost, programs for social change become idealized as ends in themselves, and groups of people are oppressed in the name of the greater good” (166).

¹²² “Monsters” in the sense of “the nadir of sociomoral disgust, the final outworking of its logic in which people are dehumanized to the point of being ontologically Other...subhuman *and* malevolent, a source of social threat and danger.” See Beck, *Unclean*, 91-106.

¹²³ Peter Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic: And Other Impossible Tales*, (Brewster, MA: Paraclete, 2009), 24-29. This parable is also referred to in Beck, *Unclean*, 132-133

“welcomed all who came to his door and gave completely without prejudice or restraint...[as e]ach stranger was, to the priest, a neighbor in need and thus an incoming of Christ.”¹²⁴ The reader’s concept of hospitality and risk, however, is challenged when a demon, “with large dead eyes and rotting flesh,”¹²⁵ “knocks on the church door in the middle of the night on a cold winter evening”¹²⁶ and asks the priest, “I have traveled many miles to seek your shelter. Will you welcome me in?”¹²⁷ The priest welcomes the demon in “without hesitation,” and once inside, the demon proceeds to spit venom, curses, and blasphemy while destroying icons and other holy decoration in the sanctuary.¹²⁸ The priest does nothing in response, but continues his devotions “until it was time for him to retire for the night.”¹²⁹ Upon his leaving, the demon asks the priest where he is going and asks if he can come since he is tired and needs a place to sleep. Again, the priest welcomes the demon to stay in his home, saying he will prepare the demon a meal. Once inside the home, the demon mocks the priest and destroys the religious artifacts decorating his simple home. The priest does nothing in retaliation or to protect what is his own. Then the demon makes one final request:

“Old man, you welcomed me first into your church and then into your house. I have one more request for you: will you now welcome me into your heart?”

“Why, of course,” said the priest, “what I have is yours and what I am is yours.”

This heartfelt response brought the demon to a standstill, for by giving everything the priest had retained the very thing the demon sought to take. For the demon was unable to rob him of his kindness and his hospitality, his love and his compassion. And so the great demon left in defeat, never to return.

¹²⁴ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 24.

¹²⁵ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 25.

¹²⁶ Beck, *Unclean*, 132 referring to Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 25.

¹²⁷ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 25.

¹²⁸ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 25.

¹²⁹ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 25.

...And the priest? He simply ascended the stairs, got into bed and drifted off to sleep, all the time wondering what guise his Christ would take next.¹³⁰

Fantastical as it seems, Rollins' parable challenges his reader to consider for whom one would open the doors to one's home and sacred places, and to whom will one provide sanctuary and protection. How would the parable seem to the reader if the demon had killed the priest's family or burned his house down, or was the other upon whom all blame of suffering and injustice in one's own community was laid? Such an outcome is not outside of the realm of possibility, and makes real the risk that is placed upon the safety and purity of one's home, life, and self-identification as a result of providing protective hospitality. Yet, Rollins' reflects on his own parable by noting:

To welcome the demon, in whatever form the demon takes, is all but impossible. But through our trying to show hospitality to the demon at our door, the demon may well be transformed by the grace that is shown. Or, we may come to realize that it was not really a demon at all, but just a broken, damaged person like ourselves.¹³¹

By inviting in the demon, or the stranger, and providing shelter, one is given the opportunity to determine his or her true nature, and as Beck notes, realize the possibility "the monster might not really be a monster at all."¹³²

¹³⁰ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 26-27.

¹³¹ Rollins, *The Orthodox Heretic*, 29

¹³² Beck, *Unclean*, 133.

b. Purity

The fear of the loss of self in Welch's above argument is often constructed in terms related to loss of purity. Contamination, tainting, dilution, ruination or stain either in the areas of morality and ethics, belief and orthodoxy, or self-identification either on an individual or communal level are risks taken when one practices protective hospitality.¹³³

According to Mary Douglas, an anthropologist specializing in issues of purity and defilement, risks to purity emerge when something is out of its normal place.¹³⁴ In this way, Douglas asserts, "where there is no differentiation there is no defilement,"¹³⁵ and, as a result, "ideas about separating, purifying, demarcating and punishing transgressions have as their main function to impose system on an inherently untidy experience."¹³⁶

If purity is of concern, then the "messiness" or untidiness of life experiences, particularly where others are concerned, is a constant struggle. Douglas' identified system of differentiation, according to Beck, "creates the attribution of *dirt*" whereby life becomes "'messy' and disordered, where aspects of life – physical or, more often, moral – have come into illicit *contact*, been *blended* or dissolved into an undifferentiated *mixture*."¹³⁷ Furthermore, "[d]irt...defines (negatively so) the normative core of the community, the shared assumptions about what is licit and illicit, about what is proper versus

¹³³ Such risks to purity are greater if the one being given refuge is from a different ethnic, religious, ethical or moral background or as a result of perceived or real crime or sin was committed which necessitated the need for protection. Furthermore, while it will not be explored here, the role of fear as it relates to purity is worth noting. In relation to cultic practice and identity formation – both now and in biblical era – threats to purity are usually responded to with fear – fear of being cut off, rejected, stained or tainted as noted above. As will be explored, there appears to be an oppositional relationship between purity and mercy. Is there a similar oppositional relationship between purity and love, related to the admonition in the New Testament epistle of I John "Perfect love casts out fear"? (4:18).

¹³⁴ Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, Vol. II, Mary Douglas Collected Works (London: Routledge, 1996). According to this reasoning, Douglas would argue dirt (as in soil), in and of itself, is not *dirty*, per se, but is only dirty when it is somewhere it should not be in accordance with boundaries that have been set up in relation to it. Similarly, Martha Nussbaum states "one's own bodily products are not viewed as disgusting so long as they are inside one's own body, although they become disgusting after they leave it." Martha Nussbaum, *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 88 in Beck, *Unclean*, 84-85

¹³⁵ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 161.

¹³⁶ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 4.

¹³⁷ Beck, *Unclean*, 130-131.

transgressive” and “signals a normative failure” through transgression over boundaries designed to keep it contained.¹³⁸ In the end, these normative failures signaled by the presence of “dirt, pollution, and contagion” create a “powerful psychological system” where the “norms of the community” are then imposed upon those who have disregarded the boundaries of purity.¹³⁹

In religious life, a concern for purity is interrelated with concerns about holiness. Douglas notes “[t]o be holy is to be whole, to be one; holiness is unity, integrity, perfection of the individual and of the kind.”¹⁴⁰ This integrity, as a result of holiness, is “intimately associated” with purity, particularly in relation to “normative integrity” where the individual or community eventually has to “make distinctions, to draw lines in the sand to define its normative existence.”¹⁴¹

In the Jewish tradition, concepts of purity and impurity are primarily rooted in the priestly, levitical sources of the *Tanakh*, and the socio-moral classifications of purity developed later in rabbinic Judaism.¹⁴² Jewish scholar Jacob Neusner notes in the “early days of Biblical Judaism the terms ‘pure’ and ‘impure’ originally had no ethical value.”¹⁴³ Nevertheless, as time went on and socio-cultural development evolved, “the employment of purity and impurity as value-judgments” began to distinguish the pure as “the equivalent of the good or morally right” while the impure became equated with “evil or...immorality.”¹⁴⁴ When the Second Temple was destroyed in 70 CE, the emphasis upon *ritual* purity waned, the influence of morality in purity grew, and the issue of purity, in general, became more conceptual than concrete as evidenced in the Talmud, whose “purity laws comprise and create a wholly abstract set of relationships”¹⁴⁵ in comparison to the earlier priestly

¹³⁸ Beck, *Unclean*, 130-131.

¹³⁹ Beck, *Unclean*, 130-131.

¹⁴⁰ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 55.

¹⁴¹ Beck, *Unclean*, 131.

¹⁴² Jacob Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972-1973*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1973), 26-27.

¹⁴³ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 11. Neusner also notes that, as a result, the earlier texts reflect this as well.

¹⁴⁴ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 11-12.

¹⁴⁵ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 16.

literature.¹⁴⁶ Similar to a familiar example of impurity seen in the condition of leprosy, it is understandable the concept of impurity arose from objects of “loathing – reptiles, dead bodies, menses and other excretions, birds of prey that eat dead bodies, eels, octopus, insects and the like.”¹⁴⁷ As these objects were the “primary sources of impurity,” the ideas of impurity associated with them were later “extended to other objects by analogy and pseudosystematic reasoning.”¹⁴⁸

On the other hand, cleanliness and purity became associated with “doing good, without explicit reference to the cultic terms” from which it originally arose.¹⁴⁹ Later texts such as Trito-Isaiah (64:5), Neusner argues, allude “to the incongruity of one who, while ritually pure, does impure deeds.”¹⁵⁰ The connection is then made between moral or ethical impurity as uncleanness, which, in turn, leads to rejection by God into whose holy and pure presence one cannot enter.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁶ It bears noting, however, that Neusner claims “Christians (to the end of New Testament times) reverted to the prophetic and sapiential contrast between ethical and cultic purity, but developed nothing in the already-available interpretative legacy. Only with rabbinic Judaism do we see a sustained and original effort to renew the inquiry into the meaning and potentialities of the details of purity both as law and as metaphor.” (31). David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*, (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000) would argue Neusner’s claim, articulating the ways in which Gentile influence shaped and re-formed the concepts of purity and impurity in the new Christian tradition during the time which Neusner mentions. Neusner also claims “Christians, who did not care to see the Temple rebuilt, ultimately gave up on the purity-laws.” (129). While Christians did give up on the dietary laws, the issue of rebuilding the Temple and its impact on the abandonment of the purity laws is up for debate. I would argue it was not abandonment, per se, but a shift to an understanding of moral purity – not ritual/cultic purity (“be holy for I am holy” (Lev 19:2) / “be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect” (Matt 5:48). For the inclusion of Islam in the discussion of purity and impurity, particularly in the case of dietary laws, see Gregory W. Dawes, “The Sense of the Past in the New Testament and the Qur’an,” 9-31 (see specifically 20-23) in *Islamic and Christian Cultures: Conflict or Dialogue*, Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, III, Plamen Makariev, ed., (Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2001).

¹⁴⁷ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 11-12. The evolution of purity as a sociomoral indicator is seen in the example of “leprosy of a person or of a house” which, according to Neusner was traced in later rabbinic Judaism “to a wide variety of sinful acts” including “murder, selfishness, idolatry, pride, false swearing, incest, arrogance, robbery, envy, and, especially, slander.” (115). See also Beck, *Unclean*, 13-32; 143-164 for a particularly helpful description of the role of disgust and aversion as determiners of purity boundaries.

¹⁴⁸ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 11-12.

¹⁴⁹ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 13. Ps 18:21, 25; 24:3-5; Isa 1:16.

¹⁵⁰ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 13. Neusner also gives the example of Ecc 9:2, which “equates the righteous and wicked with the clean and unclean.”

¹⁵¹ Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 13. Neusner describes Isaiah 35:8 as outlining “a

To draw boundaries in order to define purity from impurity is part of human nature as “all communities...establish notions of dirt and pollution.”¹⁵² Like the issue of boundaries explored previously, purity serves a positive function by defining identity, belonging, safety, health, and normative behavior. Humanity is programmed with a “psychology of disgust and contamination,” which, in turn, “regulates social boundaries.”¹⁵³ Helpfully, Martha Nussbaum notes that as the psychology of disgust “concerns the borders of the body,” it assists in health by focusing “on the prospect that a problematic substance may be incorporated into the self” and, therefore, the “disgusting has to be seen as alien.”¹⁵⁴

Nevertheless, in the context of hospitality, concern about purity appears to be primarily a concern for unity and control. To sustain that unity and control, formulations regarding purity enable the development of classifications and “[c]ommunal integrity is maintained by monitoring and preserving...[these] classifications, keeping aspects of life distinct and separate.”¹⁵⁵ Yet, this idea of a “pure” religion or community is a fallacy. Religious violence is often justified as a response to a threat to purity, often hinging upon the idea that a particular set of believers are the sole proprietors of truth and are, therefore, responsible for the purity of those around them, and have been appointed by God to rid the area of “contaminants.”¹⁵⁶ A refusal to risk purity is a refusal to allow the contamination of the other or commit any perceived or real transgression

holy highway, over which God will not permit the unclean or the fool to pass.” Cf. Jer 33:8; Lam 4:15; Ezek 14:11, 20:26; Hag 2:11-14; Zech 3:5. Neusner also asserts “uncleanness also serves as an allegory for exile.” (115).

¹⁵² Beck, *Unclean*, 131.

¹⁵³ Beck, *Unclean*, 4.

¹⁵⁴ Nussbaum, *Hiding from Humanity*, 88 in Beck, *Unclean*, 84-85. The same could be said for the communal body and that which is outside it.

¹⁵⁵ Beck, *Unclean*, 130-131.

¹⁵⁶ See Gabriel A. Almond, R. Scott Appleby, and Emmanuel Sivan, *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms Around the World*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Charles Kimball, *When Religion Becomes Lethal: The Explosive Mix of Politics and Religion in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011). While she does not use the term “purity,” this issue is considered in Ellen Ott Marshall’s book *Christians in the Public Square: Faith that Transforms Politics* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008), particularly in her chapter on “theological humility,” 73-106.

that may, rationally or irrationally, be equated with the actions of those seen as impure or immoral.

Magda Trocmé, a woman renowned for her own efforts alongside those of her husband and fellow villagers in providing protective hospitality to Jews during World War II, noted that “the righteous often pay a price for their righteousness; their own ethical purity.”¹⁵⁷ This becomes a real possibility when one blurs boundaries and endangers the purity of one’s community, home, or life by allowing someone or something different to enter into one’s space. Lies, subversion, and concealment are all possible realities to ensure the safety of the threatened other in the provision of protective hospitality and, yet they are, in equal measure, also possible threats to communal, ethical, and theological or spiritual purity.

In classic literature from my native American South, this issue is played out successfully in Mark Twain’s *Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn*, where Huckleberry Finn contemplates his friend and traveling companion, Jim, who is a runaway slave. Finn has been told in Sunday School that those who allow slaves to go free will go to hell and decides to notify Jim’s “owner,” Miss Watson, of Jim’s whereabouts in order to redeem himself. Then Finn remembers Jim, the times they have had, and the friendship they have shared, imagining Jim not as a slave but as a fellow human being. At that point, Finn says to himself, “Alright, then, I’ll go to hell,” deciding he would risk whatever moral and spiritual purity he thought he had in order to ensure Jim’s freedom.¹⁵⁸

Yet, in the context of Christian theology, the model of Jesus of Nazareth provides an obvious resource in addressing the purity question. In Matt 9:10-13, Jesus defends his practice of hospitality in the company of “tax

¹⁵⁷ Attributed to Magda Trocmé, wife of Protestant pastor, André Trocmé, who led the effort in Le Chambon. Russell, “Hot-House Ecclesiology,” 50. Dietrich Bonhoeffer also argued something similar in his books *Ethics*, (New York: Touchstone, 1995) and *Letters and Papers from Prison*, updated and expanded edition, (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 212.

¹⁵⁸ Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn*, Penguin Classics, 1884 original publish date (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 281-283. An interesting discussion in Newlands, *Hospitable God*, 139-168 considers hospitality as salvation. According to Newlands premise, Finn’s action to provide hospitality to and protect Jim was potentially a salvific act, despite Finn’s concerns about “going to hell” for not turning Jim in.

collectors and sinners” to the established religious leadership by highlighting the tension between “mercy” and “sacrifice.”¹⁵⁹ Beck notes the paradigm of sacrifice, “the purity impulse,” sets up boundaries of holiness, differentiating between what is clean and unclean. “Mercy, by contrast, crosses those purity boundaries,” he argues, by blurring “the distinction, bringing clean and unclean into contact.”¹⁶⁰ Beck applies this further, noting “holiness and purity” are concerned with building walls and erecting division, whereas “mercy and hospitality” transgress and disregard those same boundaries.¹⁶¹ In turn, this reaction against purity highlights the “politically subversive” potential of protective hospitality as it is “an attack upon the status quo” and “the antithesis of sociomoral disgust,”¹⁶² through the provision of sanctuary to an other who has been labeled undesirable.

Similarly, Jesus’ discussion with the religious leadership regarding his healing miracles and meeting desperate need on the Sabbath in Matt 12:9-11 and Luke 14:4-6 illustrates that for a greater, higher good, one must be willing to risk one’s moral purity and transgress even those boundaries that may have been put into place for a good reason. As Jesus notes later in Matt 22:38-40 the all of religious law is encompassed in the dual-obligation of loving God and loving one’s neighbor. To follow the letter of the law and not abide by these greater boundaries of responsible action is to make an idol of the law or one’s own purity.

In an ethical framework of risk as noted previously, the reliance upon mercy and hospitality as a counterbalance to the pursuit of holiness and purity is valuable. Yet, one must be careful as holiness is still an important aspect of Abrahamic religious life. Luke Bretherton is helpful here in his research, aptly titled *Hospitality as Holiness*, wherein he notes that in the Christian tradition, “Jesus does not resolve the tension between hospitality

¹⁵⁹ Beck, *Unclean*, 1.

¹⁶⁰ Beck, *Unclean*, 2-3.

¹⁶¹ Beck, *Unclean*, 2-3.

¹⁶² Beck, *Unclean*, 123-124. Beck references, as an example, the Eucharist and “the hospitality associated with it...[as] a deeply countercultural act in the life of the early church,” wherein “[s]ociomoral borders, often associated with socioeconomic disparities, were challenged and dismantled” (123).

and holiness.”¹⁶³ Instead, Bretherton argues Jesus inverts the relationship between hospitality and holiness, as “hospitality becomes the means of holiness.”¹⁶⁴ He continues:

Instead of having to be set apart from or exclude pagans in order to maintain holiness, it is in Jesus’ hospitality to pagans, the unclean, and sinners that his own holiness is shown forth. Instead of sin and impurity infecting him, it seems Jesus’ purity and righteousness somehow ‘infects’ the impure, sinners, and the Gentiles....Instead of Jesus having to undergo purity rituals because of contact, it is the [impure] who [are] ‘cleansed’ by contact with him.¹⁶⁵

Bretherton argues that in the context of Jesus’ life and ministry, his “speech and action announces a form of hospitality that, to some of his contemporaries, is shocking in relation to certain Old Testament precedents,” and as a result, “his hospitality brings him into contact with the custodians of Israel’s purity.”¹⁶⁶ Yet, Jesus preserved holiness in that he rejected “co-option by, and assimilation to, the pagan hegemony, and capitulation to sin.”¹⁶⁷ Instead, Bretherton concludes, the balance between hospitality and holiness through the witness of Jesus is seen in his “participation in the kingdom of God as enacted in his table-fellowship.”¹⁶⁸

Ethicist Philip Hallie’s work on what he calls the “yeasaying” and “naysaying” ethics are applicable here. Hallie notes “yeasaying,” or positive, ethics are well documented, such as the biblical imperative to be one another’s keeper, and are named as such because they “say yes to the protection and spreading of life” and urge their adherents “to help those whose lives are diminished or threatened.”¹⁶⁹ Hallie asserts, however, that to abide by a positive ethic is “less hygienic” as one gets dirty hands in the

¹⁶³ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 130.

¹⁶⁴ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 130.

¹⁶⁵ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 130.

¹⁶⁶ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 130.

¹⁶⁷ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 130-131.

¹⁶⁸ Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 131.

¹⁶⁹ Philip Hallie, *In the Eye of the Hurricane: Tales of Good and Evil, Help and Harm*, (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), 26-27.

process as it requires one to act, to get involved, to take risks.¹⁷⁰ Conversely, to follow the “naysaying,” or negative, ethic requires one to have “clean hands” and is an “ethic of decency, of restraint,”¹⁷¹ or as perhaps Welch might have described it, an ethic of responsibility where one is responsible to one’s purity and the powers that be.¹⁷² Hallie argues one can obey the negative ethic by remaining silent, and still do evil by allowing injustice and threat to life to prevail. Alternatively, Hallie’s formulation of the positive ethic “demands action,”¹⁷³ or again in Welch’s terms, responsible action or an ethic of risk, as one “be alive...[to] meet its demands,” being prepared to perhaps go far out of one’s way, and even be willing to risk one’s own life.¹⁷⁴

Beck addresses the tension between purity and hospitality in religious terms by noting the ethical call to provide hospitality is “a call to remake the heart” since the faithful life does not hinge upon “moral and spiritual ‘purity,’” but upon one’s “fundamental stance toward the other.”¹⁷⁵ That fundamental stance toward the other is found in what Miroslav Volf calls “the will to embrace,” which is described as a “default stance...prior to any judgment of the other” and the position from which any judgments arise in the future.¹⁷⁶ Volf further articulates the will to embrace by describing it as

the will to give ourselves to others and ‘welcome’ them, to readjust our identities to make space for them, is prior to any judgment about others, except that of identifying them in their humanity. The will to embrace precedes any ‘truth’ about others and any construction of their ‘justice’. This will is

¹⁷⁰ Hallie, *Eye of the Hurricane*, 26-27.

¹⁷¹ Hallie, *Eye of the Hurricane*, 26-27.

¹⁷² One could interpret this in the Abrahamic traditions as idolatry, as it prizes purity above the moral and ethical obligations God places upon followers.

¹⁷³ Hallie, *Eye of the Hurricane*, 26-27.

¹⁷⁴ Hallie, *Eye of the Hurricane*, 26-27.

¹⁷⁵ Beck, *Unclean*, 136-137. Beck couches his argument in a discussion about Paul’s regulations regarding church discipline set out in I Corinthians 5:1-11, where followers were enjoined to “not associate with sexually immoral people.” Beck argues, and I think he is right, that I Corinthians 5 “cannot be understood without understanding I Corinthians 13” where Paul declares the greatest of all things is love. Beck applies the requirement for love by noting that without it, “acts of charity can be dehumanizing,” “church discipline can be dehumanizing,” and “calls for holiness can be dehumanizing.”

¹⁷⁶ Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 29. Also referred to in Beck, *Unclean*, 138.

absolutely indiscriminate and strictly immutable; it transcends the moral mapping of the social world into 'good' and 'evil.'¹⁷⁷

In light of Volf's assertion, Beck declares "no conversation about sin, purity, or holiness can begin until human dignity has been secured beyond all question of doubt."¹⁷⁸ He adds:

Discussions of purity and sin cannot be *primary* discussions. For when the "will to purity" trump the "will to embrace" (when sacrifice precedes mercy), the gears of sociomoral disgust begin to turn, poisoning the well of hospitality by activating the emotions of otherness. In the desire to secure purity the faith community will begin to turn *inward*. The moral circle *shrinks*...Walls – ritual, physical, and psychological – are erected to protect and quarantine the faith community.¹⁷⁹

Therefore, while purity and boundaries are a necessary and natural part of human existence and behavior, the implication in relation to protective hospitality is that purity should rarely, if ever, be used as a reason for inaction or exclusion of the threatened other.

c. *Violence*

The relationship between hospitality and violence is a complex one. Generally, the literature depicts hospitality as nonviolent and non-coercive. Yet, protective hospitality's proximity to violence, as well as its response to the reality or potential of violence cannot be ignored, especially as both hospitality and hostility arise from the same root as was explored in the second chapter of this dissertation. Furthermore, the place of violence in the provision of protection is potentially problematic and should be explored.

In an attempt to contain this argument and respond to certain definitions and categories of violence that arise within the context of conversations related to protective hospitality, I want first want to focus upon

¹⁷⁷ Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 29. Also referred to in Beck, *Unclean*, 139.

¹⁷⁸ Beck, *Unclean*, 139.

¹⁷⁹ Beck, *Unclean*, 139.

the work of Christian theologian Hans Boersma.¹⁸⁰ Boersma's theological constructions provide an interesting case study in opposing views related to the relationship between hospitality and violence, primarily because, thus far, his work is the only theological source that addresses this particular intersection.¹⁸¹ After addressing Boersma, this section will then explore the issues that arise from his argument, other concepts of violence, the disparity between cruelty and hospitality, and finally widen the lens briefly to consider questions raised by broader ideas related to peacekeeping and intervention on national and international levels based on Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace*.

Boersma's argument arises from a Dutch Reformed tradition,¹⁸² centered upon a very broad definition of violence and a corresponding vision of God's election¹⁸³ and limited hospitality. Each of these aspects play an important role in his formulation of the relationship between hospitality and violence.

First, in order to understand Boersma's argument related to the relationship between hospitality and violence, an exploration of how Boersma defines violence is necessary. Emanating from his interpretations of an Augustinian understanding of violence, Boersma defines violence broadly as "any use of coercion that causes injury, whether that coercion is positive or negative."¹⁸⁴ Boersma expounds on this by noting "the Christian Church has

¹⁸⁰ Hans Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross: Reappropriating the Atonement Tradition*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic Press, 2004).

¹⁸¹ Derrida has briefly addressed the issue of hospitality and violence but not in a systematic way and from a philosophical rather than theological point of view. Cf. "Violence and Metaphysics," in *Writing and Difference*, Alan Bass, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 79-153. However, despite the isolation of Boersma's work, the potential scope for the research into the relationship between violence and hospitality is enough for a research dissertation on its own. Therefore, what will be covered here is simply a selection and critique of Boersma's work as it applies to the broader topic of protective hospitality rather than an exhaustive analysis.

¹⁸² While Boersma would most likely debate with this assessment, one cannot help but note some of the more problematic theological foundations of the Dutch Reformed church and its corresponding views of violence presented here provided the ideological and spiritual underpinnings for South Africa's apartheid system.

¹⁸³ Referring to the idea that only a chosen few – as opposed to everyone – will be able to enter into God's presence/paradise/heaven upon death or in an eschatological sense.

¹⁸⁴ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 17, 43-51. For example, Boersma refers to monotheistic religions as violent in that they exclude other concepts of God, beliefs

hardly shown a consensus on the inherent negativity of violence,” and, as a result, uses the term on a much broader and neutral way than many would assume is possible.¹⁸⁵ For Boersma, violence can include “properly administered punishment,”¹⁸⁶ physically restraining someone in danger (from an outside force or themselves), economic boycotts or strikes which intentionally cause harm to the one(s) against whom they are directed,¹⁸⁷ or any other force, coercion or act “of damage or injury (including morally acceptable ones)”, whether they be “physical or nonphysical.”¹⁸⁸ Such acts or forces would also include boundaries and limitations, mechanisms by which exclusion are applied. He then argues that, as a result, “the practice of hospitality does not exclude all violence” and, therefore, it is “impossible to extend hospitality without at the same time also engaging in some violence” as all acts of hospitality are limited in some way.¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, in the vein of Augustine, Boersma refers to “morally acceptable” actions as acts of “ordered love,”¹⁹⁰ and, accordingly, he argues “justified violence...can be an act of love.”¹⁹¹

outside of their own faith constructions, etc. He also refers to conditional hospitality as violent in that it has conditions (i.e. limits which make it exclusive). Boersma bases his understandings of violence on Augustine’s *Confessions*, Henry Chadwick, trans. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), l.ix.14 and *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeon*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Richard Stothert, trans.; Philip Schaff, ed. (1887; repr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 4:301 (XXII.74).

¹⁸⁵ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 43. He backs up his argument by asserting this claim is evident by the fact that “none of the traditional atonement models have felt the need to absolve God from all violence” and that “by far the majority of theologians have argued that human violence also can, under certain circumstances, be justified and even regarded as an act of love” (43), referring to the theologies of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and John Calvin as supporting this stance. Boersma refers to Darrell Cole, “Good Wars,” in *First Things*, 116 (October 2001), 27-31 for a discussion of these.

¹⁸⁶ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 45.

¹⁸⁷ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 46-47.

¹⁸⁸ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 47.

¹⁸⁹ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 48. He parallels this with God and God’s hospitality by saying “God’s hospitality requires violence, just as [God’s] love necessitates wrath” although he clarifies by noting “God is love, not wrath; [God] is a God of hospitality, not a God of violence” noting an “absolute primacy of hospitality over violence.” (49).

¹⁹⁰ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 47, referring to Augustine’s *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeon*, 4:301 (XXII.74) and also to Donald X. Burt, *Friendship and Society: An Introduction to Augustine’s Practical Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). Boersma clarifies Augustine’s stance by noting “[e]ven if the use of violence is necessary, it is, of course, still possible that people use with the wrong motivation or in the wrong fashion”

For Boersma, hospitality requires coercion and is, therefore, violent as seen through some of the Christian theological traditions of the atonement.¹⁹² According to his argument, God's hospitality is conditional upon two kinds of violence. First, it depends upon a redemptive violence found in the torture and crucifixion of Jesus and, second, God's hospitality is violent in that it is exclusive to those who accept it.¹⁹³ Yet, Boersma argues, this violence makes possible God's "vision of eschatological unconditional hospitality."¹⁹⁴

Curiously, Boersma seeks to answer postmodern philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas who, according to Boersma's interpretation, assert humanity is "always engaged in an inescapable web of violence, which makes hospitality...impossible."¹⁹⁵ Boersma interprets

and, therefore, "the *love* of violence – not every act of violence as such – [is]...something that must be opposed."

¹⁹¹ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 48.

¹⁹² Boersma follows the traditional Reformed perspective on the death of Jesus Christ, seen through the lens of substitutionary atonement, necessitating his torture and death for the salvation of mankind as a perfect sacrifice was required in order for the elect (or, perhaps one should say, God's chosen people) to be covered by Christ's sacrificial blood and enter into God's presence unblemished by sin. Therefore, because there are those who are elected to enter into God's presence and will encounter the "divine face of hospitality in [God's] electing love," Boersma sees this going "hand in hand with the violent exclusion of others." Moreover, Boersma sees the act of Jesus being crucified as an act of hospitality in that it enables us to be invited into God's presence, leading to his assertion that "[v]iolence does not destroy hospitality." Since such a sacrifice was required according to Boersma's theological interpretation, violence was necessary in order for hospitality to be practiced by God for the benefit of those who accept it, yet hospitality maintains its integrity despite this. Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 16-17. There is substantial disagreement over this particular facet of Christian theology, however, primarily based in feminist theology. For discussions on alternative atonement theories and arguments related to redemptive suffering, see Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering, and the Search for What Saves Us*, (Boston: Beacon, 2002); S. Mark Heim, *Saved from Sacrifice: A Theology of the Cross*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); and J. Denny Weaver, *The Nonviolent Atonement*, 2nd ed., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).

¹⁹³ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 17.

¹⁹⁴ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 17.

¹⁹⁵ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 16. However, Boersma designs what he calls "limited hospitality" in opposition to Derrida and Levinas, which is ironically in many ways similar (in relation to the conditionality of hospitality) to ideas presented by Derrida in his book *Acts of Religion* or in *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, trans. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), which Boersma never mentions or acknowledges exists, and therefore negating much of his argument. Boersma only interacts with Derrida's discussion of unconditional/impossible, or eschatological, hospitality, which Derrida admits is impossible on human terms in *Acts of Religion*, 363-367. See also Derrida, "Violence and Metaphysics," in *Writing and Difference*, Alan Bass, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 79-153; Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley, eds.

Derrida especially as being negative toward hospitality, which is an unfair interpretation and lacking in a complete understanding of Derrida's full arguments regarding hospitality. Naturally, Boersma broadens the concept of where and by what means hospitality can be practiced and asks: "[i]s hospitality without violence even possible?"¹⁹⁶ For Boersma, when one decides whom one lets into one's home and whom one chooses to keep on the other side of one's doors, one has chosen to exclude and therefore act with violence, making the "violence of exclusion a necessary counterpart to the practice of hospitality."¹⁹⁷ Boersma argues further, noting one should "practice hospitality with an eye to the future of God's pure hospitality in which violence will no longer have a place" but for now, "[s]uch a practice necessarily involves violence."¹⁹⁸ Additionally, Boersma asks the question: "do we as human beings have the right, and perhaps even the duty, to protect ourselves and others against strangers who might want to abuse our hospitality?"¹⁹⁹ Such a question, again, invites an exploration of boundaries

"Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida," chapter 6 in *Questioning Ethics*; and Derrida, "Hospitality," in *Deconstruction in a Nutshell*, 110-112. However, unlike Boersma, my interpretation of Derrida is that he never seems content to consign unconditional hospitality as impossible, but encourages the reader to wrestle with the tension inherent in the practice of hospitality, all the while pushing to welcome as much as possible.

¹⁹⁶ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 27.

¹⁹⁷ Boersma includes these concepts related to the above with the following footnotes on 27-28: "Caroline Westerhoff emphasizes the need for boundaries to counter possible abuse of hospitality (*Good Fences: The Boundaries of Hospitality* [Cambridge: Cowley, 1999]) See also Thomas C. Oden's comment in his discussion on the need for boundaries: A center without a circumference is just a dot, nothing more. It is the circumference that marks the boundary of the circle. To eliminate the boundary is to eliminate the circle itself. The circle of faith cannot identify its center without recognizing its perimeter" (*The Rebirth of Orthodoxy: Signs of New Life in Christianity* [New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002], 131) Cf. Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 63-64."

¹⁹⁸ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 50. Later Boersma responds to Rene Girard in chapter six (133-151) of his book, arguing Girard's depiction of violence and his corresponding politics of hospitality are flawed by his assertion that violence is pervasive in human culture and that the work of Christ on the cross was a scapegoat mechanism in order to release and detract itself from the grasp of violence through a new model of nonviolence provided by Jesus. Boersma, on the other hand, is informed by his conviction that violence "can be a positive expression of love" (144-145) and, therefore, rescuing culture from violence is unnecessary. For Boersma, the end of violence will only be an eschatological reality (257-261).

¹⁹⁹ Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 27-28. Derrida would call this type of hospitality "hostipitality." See *Acts of Religion*, 356-420.

and protection of both host and guest in the practice of protective hospitality that has been explored previously.

Boersma's argument differs from other accounts on some fundamental issues: the broad definition of violence, the meaning of hospitality, God's limited versus universal embrace, and the necessity of violence as a means of redemption or love. Boersma is correct in his understanding of hospitality as practiced in this world as being a limited and imperfect practice. As has been noted elsewhere, Derrida differentiates between conditional and unconditional hospitality. Such realities are a matter of course in the context of an imperfect, free-willed humanity. Leonardo Boff reflects Derrida's ideas on the relationship between conditional and unconditional hospitality much more succinctly, and in the vein of liberation theology, when he states:

There ought always to be a dynamic articulation between conditional and unconditional hospitality so that one is not sacrificed in the name of the other. The ideal of hospitality must help with the formulation of good laws and to inspire generous public policies that welcome foreigners, immigrants, refugees, and those who are different...[U]nconditional hospitality needs conditional hospitality so that it becomes effective. And conditional hospitality needs unconditional hospitality so that it does not become bureaucratic, and does not lose its openness, which is something essential when welcoming someone.²⁰⁰

For Boff, the tension between conditional and unconditional hospitality is both natural and necessary. Furthermore, Boff argues "the ideal of hospitality becomes a utopia without concrete content," requiring both the unconditional and conditional aspects of hospitality to temper one another in the confines of present reality.²⁰¹ Again, Boff declares

²⁰⁰ Boff, *Virtues*, 57.

²⁰¹ Boff, *Virtues*, 57. Boff's usage of the term *utopia* in relation to the idea of unconditional hospitality reminds me of a quote from Oscar Wilde, who quipped that "a map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth glancing at." Oscar Wilde, "The Soul of Man Under Socialism," Section 24, 1891. Found at the Molinari Institute's online library, <http://praxeology.net/OW-SMS.htm>, 7 July 2010.

Hospitality is simultaneously a utopia and a practice. As utopia it stands for one of the greatest yearnings in the history of humanity, the yearning to always be welcome, independent of social and moral conditions; and to be treated humanely. As practice it creates policies that make it possible for and provide guidance for welcoming. But because it is concrete, it suffers from the hindrances and the limitations of given situations.²⁰²

However, Boersma's definition of violence and its role in hospitality has a weakness. Whilst there is a need for boundaries between that which is considered safe and that which is deemed unsafe, what constitutes identity and what defines otherness, Boersma's definition of violence, which includes any type of exclusion or coercion, has the potential to relegate violence into the realm of the absurd. This lessens the impact of "real," traumatic violence from which the threatened other seeks protective hospitality in order to escape, live, and thrive.²⁰³ Therefore, one particular critique is that Boersma does not take violence and the trauma it causes seriously.

Additionally where is human agency and personal judgment in Boersma's construction of violence in relation to protective hospitality? If violence is defined so broadly that it can be labeled as an "act of ordered love," then so must love be defined as broadly. At what point does one decide that one act of violence is justified and another is not if both arise from a place of "love"? If love is defined as broadly as violence, one can imagine the abuses, intentional or unintentional, that could be committed under the umbrella of misguided love.²⁰⁴ Boersma's formulations leave no

²⁰² Boff, *Virtues*, 108-109.

²⁰³ Is the fact that I am not encouraged to receive gifts in honor of Father's Day celebrations because I am neither male nor a father an inherently violent act? I do not believe it is. If I were to undergo gender reassignment and become a man and was still excluded, then I could concede an injustice may exist that would need to be addressed, but much of it would depend upon how I perceived the exclusion, my feelings about being a father, and the motives and actions of those who sought to exclude me. But that is precisely where Boersma's argument fails: the role of human agency and personal judgment in the use of violence. Yet, I can also see Boersma's point, particularly in relation to the protection question. Can one provide hospitality in the form of protection in a nonviolent manner, without coercion or exclusion in their more aggressive forms toward either the host, guest or those still on the outside who seek to do the guest harm?

²⁰⁴ It is already common to hear of violence being committed against individuals (such as children and women in contexts of domestic abuse or clerical abuse) in the name of

room for the fallibility of personal judgment in his description of the use of this broad description of violence inherent in his perception of the practice of protective hospitality, which is problematic.

Moreover, since Boersma asserts hospitality is defined ultimately as God's actions through Jesus' torture, murder and resurrection, it leaves little, if any, room for others (non-Christians, for example) who are not a part of that particular paradigm.²⁰⁵ One can anticipate that Boersma would most likely assert that their exclusion is part of the violent aspect of God's hospitality. Yet, such a stance toward the issue of election and limited hospitality on a soteriological level is problematic, particularly in the context of the Abrahamic traditions being explored here. What is the point of hospitality in Judaism and Islam if the ultimate, eschatological purpose of hospitality is in God's hospitality through Jesus?

Lastly, inherent in Boersma's argument is a concept of God common in the reformed traditions who is omniscient and, more importantly, omnipotent, who has an overarching plan to which everyone abides. This perception sees God as "the all-powerful determiner of every event in life, and every event is part of a bigger picture – a plan that will end in triumph,"²⁰⁶ a plan that will inevitably end in the culmination of extension of God's hospitality to the chosen few. Yet, when such an idea is taken seriously, it implies God "has a purpose in the death of...six million Jews"²⁰⁷ and another six million others during the Holocaust, or in the rape and mutilation of a woman held in a Serbian rape camp in Bosnia.²⁰⁸ According to feminist theologians Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole Bohn, these types of

love and protection. But in the Augustinian tradition, such acts of "ordered love" as seen in cases of "just war," which was used by the Bush and Blair administrations in the U.S. and UK respectively to justify the Iraq war as an exercise in protecting powerless people from an evil regime, are equally problematic.

²⁰⁵ To be fair, Boersma's work is an exercise in Christian theology. He never implies an inter-faith or ecumenical understanding in his argument. He may very well hold one outside the confines of this particular piece of published research, but there is no evidence suggesting he presents a different understanding elsewhere.

²⁰⁶ Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse*, 7. There are, however, elements of this deterministic thought in Islam as well.

²⁰⁷ Brown and Bohn, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, 7.

²⁰⁸ Angela Robeson, "Weapons of War," *New Internationalist*, 244, (June 1993), Available at <http://www.newint.org/features/1993/06/05/rape/>. Accessed on 21 July 2011.

scenarios illustrate the “travesty of this theology” which relies upon a deterministic universe under the capricious control of an omnipotent God.²⁰⁹ In light of what has been presented in this dissertation, such a position appears arrogant and short-sighted, particularly in light of protective hospitality and the realities faced by others who are often traumatized by violence and are seeking meaning for their experiences.

In opposition to Boersma’s definition of violence, consideration of Rabbi Irving Greenberg’s concept of violence in the context of protective hospitality is valuable. Greenberg asserts there is a “crucial distinction” between “exercising power and force” and violence.²¹⁰ According to Greenberg, violence is defined “as an unjustified use of power and force,” and as such, “not all use of force is violent or wrong.”²¹¹ He goes on to note “[m]easured force...is legitimate” as evil with “access to unlimited aggressive force and power would triumph unopposed...[and d]eath [would win] out if good people are unable or unwilling to take up arms in defense of life.”²¹²

Such a stance is not comfortable for those who adhere to the principle of nonviolence, but it is less problematic than Boersma’s definition. However, the key terms here in Greenberg’s definition are *unjustified*, *measured*, *legitimate* and, most importantly, *defense of life*. As has been examined previously, the necessity for boundaries exists, as hospitality without boundaries “offers no protective mechanisms to counter violence, in effect surrendering all categorical leverage to name and resist evil.”²¹³ Yet, the use of violence (as Greenberg sees it) still negates the life of those who do evil, willingly or unwillingly.

An alternative may be developed that combine the practice of protective hospitality with the principles of nonviolence that would, in effect, offer “protective mechanisms to counter violence” without resorting to

²⁰⁹ It could also be argued such theological claims serve to hamper the practice of protective hospitality in that, at its worst, it would claim those who are suffering are getting what God wants them to receive or what they deserve, which serves a higher purpose negating any obligation to intervene.

²¹⁰ Greenberg, “Religion as a Force for Reconciliation...”, 104.

²¹¹ Greenberg, “Religion as a Force for Reconciliation...”, 104.

²¹² Greenberg, “Religion as a Force for Reconciliation...”, 104.

²¹³ Reynolds, “Improvising together...”, 63.

violence itself. The case of rescuers of Jews in Le Chambon, France during the Holocaust highlights the practicality of nonviolence in a context that is often used to negate the effectiveness of nonviolence.²¹⁴ The rescue efforts led by André Trocmé and Edouard Theis in Le Chambon were adhered to the practice of nonviolence and still succeeded in saving the lives of thousands of Jews who sought refuge there. Philip Hallie notes a discussion he had with Edouard Theis years later about the events in Le Chambon. Theis declared he had never hated or advocated violence against the Germans and other authorities who sought to destroy the Jewish population. Instead, he stated: "You see, we weren't only trying to save the children; we were trying to keep the Germans from staining their lives with more evil."²¹⁵

Classic concepts of nonviolence are much more conducive to the practice of protective hospitality than Boersma's argument. While Boersma allows that the *love* of violence is not condoned, the lack of discussion related to human agency and personal judgment highlights the fact that enforcing a "pure" use of violence is impossible.

Related to this, Boersma neglects to explain the absence of love and the presence of cruelty in his exploration of the relationship between protective hospitality and violence. Can protective hospitality be given without love or with cruelty? Some say no. Beck argues the provision of hospitality is not simply charity but something much more inward, an act of love:

There is a vast difference in receiving welcome, refuge, or table fellowship from chilly, hostile, and begrudging hosts versus the embrace of warm, affectionate, and big-hearted hosts... The call to hospitality is not simply a call to charity but is, rather, a call to remake the heart... The critical issue concerns the fundamental stance toward the other... Acts of charity can be dehumanizing... Calls for holiness can be

²¹⁴ See Robert W. Brimlow, *What About Hitler?: Wrestling with Jesus' Call to Nonviolence in an Evil World*, (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2006) for a helpful discussion of the common use of the context of World War II, Hitler and the Holocaust when the topic of violence and nonviolence arise. See also Glen Stassen, ed. *Just Peacemaking: The New Paradigm for the Ethics of Peace and War*, (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2008).

²¹⁵ Hallie, *In the Eye of the Hurricane*, 34.

dehumanizing. The outcome of these actions pivot off the status of the heart.²¹⁶

Similarly, according to ethicist Philip Hallie,²¹⁷ the link between cruelty and hospitality is oppositional. He asserts “the opposite of cruelty is not simply freedom from the cruel relationship; it is *hospitality*.”²¹⁸ To explain his point, Hallie contrasts the difference between liberation from cruelty and protective hospitality by focusing upon a testimony from a Jewish woman who received protective hospitality from the people of Le Chambon during the Holocaust:

It was indeed a very different attitude from the one in Switzerland, which while saving us also resented us so much. If today we are not bitter people like most survivors it can only be due to the fact that we met people like the people of Le Chambon, who showed to us simply that life can be different, that there are people who care, that people can live together and even risk their own lives for their fellow man.²¹⁹

Hallie explains this testimony by noting “the Swiss liberated refugees and removed [those who were threatened] from the cruel relationship” through charity, whereas the people who provided protective hospitality to the threatened other went further by teaching those they provided refuge to “that goodness could conquer cruelty, that loving hospitality could remove them from the cruel relationship.”²²⁰ Hallie argues:

The opposite of the cruelties of the camps was not the liberation of the camps, the cleaning out of the barracks and the cessation of the horrors. All of this was the *end* of the cruelty relationship, not the opposite of that relationship....No, the opposite of cruelty was not the liberation of the camps, not freedom; it was the hospitality of the people of Chambon,

²¹⁶ Beck, *Unclean*, 136-137.

²¹⁷ Hallie specialized in research on cruelty, particularly in relation to research that was conducted on Jewish and Roma children by the Nazis, and then was compelled to do research on goodness as evidenced by the community of Le Chambon, which was discussed in Chapter One. The intersection between the two strands of research is found in his various works: *Cruelty*, (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983); *Lest Innocent Blood be Shed* (1994); and *In the Eye of the Hurricane* (2001).

²¹⁸ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” 26.

²¹⁹ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” 26-27.

²²⁰ Philip Hallie, “From Cruelty to Goodness,” 26-27.

and of very few others during the Holocaust. The opposite of cruelty was the kind of goodness that happened in Chambon.²²¹

As a result, one may argue that hospitality without love is not real hospitality but, is instead, merely charity; and protective hospitality without love is not protective hospitality but, instead, merely rescue or liberation in the most basic sense. The key component is hospitality's power to provide space for transformation.

According to Boersma, "violence does not destroy hospitality,"²²² but, is instead, a part of hospitality. Yet, if hospitality's emphasis is upon life, freedom from cruel relationship, and openness to the other's influence, then the relationship between hospitality and violence becomes extremely tenuous. Feminist theologians Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker noted, in their exploration of violence and redemption, that violence "denies presence and suffocates spirit," robs its victims and perpetrators of "knowledge of life and its intrinsic value," stealing one's "awareness of beauty, of complexity," and "ignores vulnerability, dependence and interdependence."²²³ In light of this, violence could be seen as the antithesis of hospitality and the particular provision of protective hospitality.

On another level, when the relationship between protective hospitality and violence is discussed, it is appropriate to take into account the actions of nation-states and the use of hospitality as an antidote to violence and as preventative protection from aggression. While it may surprise some, in the context of the nation-state, the contribution of protective hospitality as a means of prevention is not new, but was advocated by Immanuel Kant in his 1795 essay "Perpetual Peace."²²⁴ Leonardo Boff goes as far as to say that for Kant: "hospitality is the central virtue of globalization."²²⁵

²²¹ Philip Hallie, "From Cruelty to Goodness," 26.

²²² Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross*, 16.

²²³ Brock and Parker, *Proverbs of Ashes*, 9-10

²²⁴ Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*, Ted Humphrey, trans., (Indianapolis: Hackett and Company, 2003), article 3, 15-18.

²²⁵ Boff, *Virtues*, 58. Boff does not identify the source and Kant did not use the term "globalization," but Kant's assertion is found in *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*, Ted

Kant approached the use of protective hospitality as a means for preventing violence and establishing peace between states. Hospitality on a national scale, according to Kant, meant "the right of an alien not to be treated as an enemy upon his arrival in another's country...as long as he behaves peaceably."²²⁶ Kant argued the stranger "may request the *right* to be a *permanent visitor* (which would require a special, charitable agreement to make [the stranger] a fellow inhabitant for a certain period),"²²⁷ therefore underscoring the necessity and role of diplomacy. Moreover, "the *right to visit, to associate,*" according to Kant, "belongs to all [people] by virtue of their common ownership of the earth's surface; for since the earth is a globe, they cannot scatter themselves infinitely, but, finally, tolerate living in close proximity."²²⁸ Kant also likened the conquests of poorer nations by more developed ones as "inhospitable" and unjust,²²⁹ and long before the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., Kant proclaimed "a transgression of rights in *one* place in the world is felt *everywhere*" as inhabitants of the Earth are part of one community.²³⁰

Yet, centuries later, King would differentiate between just and unjust laws, remarking, "...it was 'illegal' to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. But I am sure that if I had lived in Germany during that time I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal."²³¹ Such a statement is useful in viewing the paradigm of protective hospitality toward the threatened other in a hostile context in light of Kant's

Humphrey, trans., (Indianapolis: Hackett and Company, 2003), article 3, 15-18.

²²⁶ Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, (2003), 15.

²²⁷ Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, (2003), 15-16.

²²⁸ Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, (2003), 15-16. The connection Kant makes between hospitality and human rights makes the establishment of protective hospitality a natural and understandable development in thought and action. Kant's ideas are, most obviously, applicable to issues related to immigration, but taken further and in the spirit of Kant's ideas, would apply in the same way to issues related to asylum and refugee contexts as well.

²²⁹ Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, (2003), 16.

²³⁰ Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, (2003), 18. King echoed a similar statement in his "Letter from Birmingham City Jail, April 16, 1963" published in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, James Melvin Washington, ed. (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1986), 290.

²³¹ King, "Letter from Birmingham City Jail," 295.

observations. However, Kant's essay is less clear on his views related to what would now be called "humanitarian intervention."²³²

In short, protective hospitality should be an affirmation of life in all of its fullness, and while violence may be an inevitable part of the greater picture of human life, I argue that in the practice of hospitality, violence is not inevitable. Instead, the power of protective hospitality resides in its capacity to resist and counteract violence and injustice, tell the truth to power by considering the interests of and giving sanctuary to a threatened other, and provide a healing balm for that which violence has sought to destroy.²³³

²³² Within the last decade or two, there has begun a movement toward implementation of an international policy, called "The Responsibility to Protect" (shortened to R2P), in response to oppression and violence endured by a threatened population, particularly in contradiction to the long-standing precedent of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia which guaranteed national sovereignty and discouraged intervention. The policy of R2P has been debated on numerous levels over the years, by groups as diverse as the United Nations, religious bodies, national governments, and policy institutes. On an idealistic level, it seeks to respond to critiques which arose from contexts in genocide that decried the callousness of the international community for not intervening on behalf of those being killed. On a cynical level, it has been relegated as another excuse used by wealthier nations to meddle in the affairs of less fortunate areas to their own advantage (US President Bush used R2P rhetoric to justify the wars in both Afghanistan and Iraq). Pacifist groups are wary toward the policy's implementation, recognizing these two sides and speculating whether or not it is simply a military rather than preventative solution as it appears to be a revision of just war theories. For more information on R2P, see Doug Hostetter, Rachel Davis, Benjamin Majekodunmi, and Judy Smith Höhn "Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities and the Responsibility to Protect: Challenges for the UN and the International Community in the 21st Century," *The Responsibility to Protect Occasional Paper Series*, International Peace Institute, (June 2008); "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide," United Nations High Commission for Human Rights, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_genoci.htm, accessed July 10, 2008, article 2; and *Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty* (ICIS), Gareth Evans, Mohamed Sahnoun et al., International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, 2001. See also the website for International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (ICRtoP) at <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org> for more information.

²³³ These aspects of protective hospitality stem from the characteristics of life-affirming theology found in Brock and Parker's *Proverbs of Ashes*, 8-9. Similarly, Newlands refers to Elie Wiesel's Nobel Prize acceptance speech where Wiesel argues one is required to take sides to protect human life, and that "[n]eutrality helps the oppressor, not the victim." *Hospitable God*, 56. Often, "taking sides" in response to evil is equated to the use of violence, but it does not always have to be so.

Conclusion

The Babylonian Talmud notes that when one “saves one life, it is equivalent to saving an entire world,”²³⁴ highlighting that “all people bear an obligation to save the lives of others.”²³⁵ Rabbi Irving Greenberg interprets this text by arguing that since each person is created in the image of an infinite God, each person has infinite value; and since “one individual life has infinite value, then one has saved infinity...[and] saving infinity is the equivalent of saving six billion times infinity as well.”²³⁶ He continues his argument by stating “if one truly, emotionally encounters the infinite value of the other, this stimulates a powerful inner urge to save that life, for that life is infinitely precious” and, in turn, the uniqueness and equality of the other “elicits the desire to protect them.”²³⁷

The choice of sections in this chapter has been shaped by conversations on hospitality with religious leadership and laity. In light of what was discovered, this chapter has addressed the issues that arose when specific practice of protective hospitality was discussed. Despite the exploratory rather than empirical approach, the overall emphasis of each section has been that allowing oneself to be exposed to the other and, ultimately, being willing to put oneself at risk for the safety of the other is an effective means whereby dignity can be affirmed, transformation can take place, and relationships of solidarity may be formed.

This chapter has addressed the mechanics of protective hospitality, considering the stages involved in its provision, the meanings and limitations inherent in protection, and the motivations that spur individuals and communities to act on behalf of a threatened other. It has also analyzed particular aspects of protective hospitality that impede its practice, namely the areas of risk, the formation and enforcement of healthy boundaries, and

²³⁴ Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:5; *Babylonian Talmud*, Tractate Sanhedrin 37a.

²³⁵ James L. Heft, “Introduction” in *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, James L. Heft, ed. (New York: Fordham, 2004), 7.

²³⁶ Irving Greenberg, “Religion as a Force for Reconciliation and Peace...,” 95.

²³⁷ Irving Greenberg, “Religion as a Force for Reconciliation and Peace...,” 96.

concerns related to spiritual, communal or moral purity. Furthermore, this chapter has also examined the relationship between protective hospitality and violence, noting an emphasis upon concern for life, freedom from cruel relationship, openness to the influence of others, and affinity to the principles of nonviolence in its provision.

The outcomes of the practice of protective hospitality are not guaranteed. There is tremendous potential to explore and determine within the theology and ethics of the Abrahamic traditions value of addressing the faith-based aspects of these challenges more systematically. These include the issues of risk, violence, and threats to religious, ethical and communal purity that accompany thought and action related to the provision of protective hospitality. While some have been noted here, particular resources in the textual traditions of the Abrahamic traditions related to these issues will be the focus in the next chapter.

**CHAPTER FIVE:
PROTECTIVE HOSPITALITY AS A RELIGIOUS PRACTICE**

Any human being is a sanctuary. Every human being is a dwelling of God – man or woman or child.... Any person, by virtue of being a son or daughter of humanity, is a living sanctuary whom nobody has the right to invade.

- Elie Wiesel¹

Introduction

The sacred texts of the Abrahamic traditions offer valuable insight into protective hospitality and its ethical complexity. This Chapter draws on material from the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible and from the Qur'an and Islamic traditions to consider what Christian theology might learn about protective hospitality through a more systematic engagement with the other Abrahamic traditions. It takes up the earlier argument from Chapter Three that the clearer obligations and stronger expectations around hospitality in Jewish and Islamic traditions influence practical behavior, and that these are linked to distinctive notions of social justice and to a more explicit honour code than is found in expressions of contemporary Western Christianity.

As a result, this chapter will explore in greater detail the Abrahamic examples of protective hospitality as found in the sacred texts, looking specifically at the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, the Qur'an and extra-textual sources in Islam. The purpose of limiting to the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible and not focusing upon the New Testament examples is for two reasons. First, this limitation is invoked in order to highlight the shared textual tradition between Judaism and Christianity that shapes the practice of protective hospitality. Second, the limitation is a practical one related to the need for brevity. While there are significant passages in the New Testament that could be included, this work is not an exhaustive analysis of all texts but an analysis

¹ Elie Wiesel, "The Refugee," *Cross Currents*, 34:4 (Winter 1984-85), 387.

of sample texts that problematize, shape, and speak specifically to the provision of protection.²

To do this it, the first section looks at four texts from the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible: Joshua 2:1-22; Genesis 19:1-14; Judges 19:14-27; and the deuteronomic witness related to the Cities of Refuge. Through these texts, it will be argued that hosts can be required to go to extraordinary lengths to protect those who are guests, that one needs to be willing to give oneself over for the value of the life of another, and that the cities of refuge texts, despite the textual issues present in their witness, still capture the imagination for a better, more just world.

The second section examines material in the Qur'an and extra-textual sources in Islam, which highlight the importance of a vision of a just society and the mandate to protect others. More specifically, the issue of protection as given by or mandated by God will be identified as well as a thematic analysis of the Lot/Lut narrative as it is presented in the Qur'an and extra-textual sources. Lastly, there will be a focused consideration of the Constitution of Medina and its impact upon concepts of the *ummah* ("community") and the *dhimmi* ("protected people") in the Islamic tradition, which provides a valuable contribution to the Abrahamic practice of protective hospitality.

² Protective hospitality in both the Jewish and Christian traditions can be encompassed in the identified texts found in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, understanding, however, these texts do not exhaust the topic but are merely selections.

1. Protective Hospitality in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible³

Throughout the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, there are texts where the practice of protective hospitality is observed. The primary texts that apply to the paradigm of protective hospitality in both Judaism and Christianity for the purposes of this research are found in the narratives of Rahab and the spies in Jericho (Joshua 2 & 6), Lot's visitor's in Sodom (Genesis 19), and the Levite and the concubine in Gibeah (Judges 19), and in the provisions concerning the cities of refuge found in various places in the deuteronomic literature.⁴

a. Joshua 2:1-22

Chapter Three already mentioned the story of Rahab and the spies in Jericho in reference to the role of women as rewards of reciprocity in hospitality. Rahab's actions in the Joshua text also highlighted the particular delight found in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible for the subversive. Nevertheless, attention should be paid to the general narrative of Rahab as an example of protective hospitality as well.

Rahab is designated as a prostitute in most versions of the narrative; and while it may seem a minor detail, this is a significant aspect of the story.⁵ As referenced previously, the example of Rahab illustrates perfectly the realities involved with risks to one's moral and ethical purity in providing protective hospitality to the threatened other. Purity was risked on the part of Israel in that the spies were in danger and were given refuge by someone who was not only a woman, but a prostitute. Furthermore, Rahab risked her

³ Both terms are used as this is an exercise in both the Jewish and Christian scriptures, and the usage of both terms is an intentional reminder of this.

⁴ The paradigm of protective hospitality can be seen in other narratives as well Moses' rescue as an infant in Egypt (Exodus 7:21-22), Judith's actions and role as a guest in Holofernes' tent in order to save her community (Judith 2).

⁵ While there are arguments against Rahab being a prostitute, on the whole, for me, the subversive nature and character of the narrative makes much more sense if Rahab was, indeed, a prostitute. However, Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 5.1.2, labels Rahab as an innkeeper and other translations also use this similar translation. The word *zanah* used to designate Rahab, can be used for both prostitute or innkeeper/hostess. A possible solution may be that she was a madam, running a brothel rather than subsisting as a singular, solitary prostitute, or that in at least some cases the role of innkeeper and prostitute overlapped to some extent.

life and standing in the community, albeit the standing of someone who lived on the walls of the city and not in its center, by lying to the king of Jericho, telling his messengers she did not know where the men had gone when he commands her to give them up into his custody (2:2-4). She also took further risk by placing her trust in the spies' ability to uphold their part of the agreement – to provide protection for herself and her family in return should they return and attack the city (2:12-14).⁶

Rahab is the hero in this narrative, not the spies. The principle of reciprocity is present in this text, but what is unique about this text is that whereas women are often mentioned in hospitality narratives as chattel to be traded, Rahab negotiates the provision of refuge, accommodation and protection to Joshua's spies in Jericho in return for her own and her family's protection when the city of Jericho will be overtaken.⁷

Furthermore, this text highlights the complexity of identifying the other. Rahab is an insider; she lives within the walls of Jericho, and the king and his messengers are aware of who she is. Yet, she is also the other, an outsider, as she is a sex worker and lives on the outer limits of the city walls, marginalized by not only her fellow city-dwellers but also by the many generations who have read this text over the centuries. Likewise, the spies are also the other, in forbidden territory and at risk of being killed, and yet, they are insiders in their own community who are able to repay Rahab's protection with protection of their own when it becomes necessary.

In the context of ancient Israel, it was customary that if one is providing hospitality, one is also required to ensure safety and protection to

⁶ Narratively, there is a great deal going on in this story beyond the scope of this research. However, when considering this text, one should note there are questions about the spies and whether or not they're to be taken seriously or laughed at in this story. There are also questions about why the Israelites were interested in battling Jericho to begin with and the ethics of how the siege will be carried out, namely in the instructions given to destroy everyone except Rahab and her family. Furthermore, there are questions about when and for what purpose this story was written, particularly given archaeological research conducted by Kathleen Kenyon in 1952-1958 that argues Jericho was never destroyed in the manner depicted in the Book of Joshua. See Kathleen Kenyon, *Digging Up Jericho*, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957), 51-102.

⁷ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 77.

one's guests, at all costs.⁸ Rahab had made the decision her home would be a safe place. While her motive for protecting these strangers may have been to find their favor and save herself and her family from imminent danger,⁹ the text does not suggest this. In fact, the text notes Rahab had already made the decision to protect the strangers before she knew their identity (2:1, 4). Therefore, it would be appropriate to interpret this text as a story of a woman who sells her body for a night of pleasure to two strange men, who are revealed the following day as enemies of the state and threats to the security of the homeland. Yet, Rahab knew to turn them over would be to most likely consign them to death. She risked herself further by hiding them in her own home, and later enabling them to escape from of the city and into safety (2:15-16). As a result, the narrative of Rahab is celebrated elsewhere in later texts¹⁰ as providing exemplary hospitality.¹¹

⁸ We see how this plays out (or does not play out, as the case may be) in Genesis 19 and Judges 19 as well. Cf. Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (2 vols; ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906 [repr. 1976]), I, 210; Julian Pitt-Rivers, *The Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977) 110; and Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 79-80.

⁹ Andrew Arterbury writes that not only was the provision of protection as an act of hospitality for the benefit of the stranger and his/her own safety, but also the townspeople into whose community strangers arrived had to assume, for their own protection, that these strangers had "either military resources or 'magical' powers" and that the "custom of hospitality in antiquity grew out of a desire to neutralize [these] potential threats" by either protecting one's "household or community from the wrath of the stranger" or to curry the stranger's favor. See Arterbury, "Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...", 21. Arterbury refers the reader to the story of Rahab as an example. A more substantial work on Arterbury's research on hospitality can be found in his book *Entertaining Angels* (2005). Alternatively, the townspeople can choose to attack strangers, as seen in the following cases of Gen 19 and Judg 19.

¹⁰ Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25; *I Clement* 12:1-3. See also Andrew Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 77.

¹¹ The genocide and violence committed by the Israelites in Joshua 6 cannot be ignored in this story. There are some serious issues related to the use of the *herem* (ban) which, in the eyes of the Israelites, required complete annihilation of peoples in areas they conquered. Nevertheless, the later actions of the Israelites are not similarly lauded as Rahab's actions are. In this story, hospitality trumps conquest. John Docker's work *The Origins of Violence: Religion, History and Genocide* (New York: Pluto Press, 2008) is extremely critical of the book of Joshua and the genocide depicted in the Hebrew Bible, noting such a narrative has given inspiration to many other acts of genocide, particularly in the name of God, throughout history. Douglas S. Earl, *The Joshua Delusion: Rethinking Genocide in the Bible*, (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2011) approaches Joshua much more sympathetically as deliberate myth to affirm theological belief, preserving (or rescuing?) God from accusations of genocide, cruelty and immorality. A more objectively critical analysis can be found in Michael Bergmann, Michael J. Murray, and Michael C. Rea, eds., *Divine Evil?: The Moral*

b. Genesis 19:1-14

For many readers, the following two texts to be explored – Genesis 19 and Judges 19 – are very problematic as they give horrifying, violent, and blatantly sexist examples of protective hospitality wherein the host provides protection for his guests at the expense of women in his household.¹² Moreover, the sexual aspects of these narratives as they have been interpreted traditionally, namely in the homosexual aspect of the men of the town wanting to have sex with, and/or rape, the host's male guests, further complicates the reading and interpretation of these texts for many.¹³ Scholar Jon Berquist notes, "the fear of homosexual rape in the midst of concerns with proper hospitality" defines these passages.¹⁴ However, biblical scholar Scott Morschauser takes a unique legal approach to the text, seeing the narrative as a detailing of procedures related to hostage-exchange in the context of threatening strangers (i.e. potentially spies or saboteurs) in the midst of a city-state.¹⁵ These two approaches to the text - the classically held

Character of the God of Abraham, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), which hosts conversations from critics and defenders of the problematic texts (including Joshua), and in Walter Brueggemann's *Divine Presence Amid Violence: Contextualizing the Book of Joshua*, (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), which takes a more literary and sociological approach.

¹² As a feminist reader and interpreter, these stories disturb me greatly. In no way do I want to condone the "blatant acceptance of male-female gang rape as a responsible social act" as seen in the following texts. Jon L. Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality: The Body and the Household in Ancient Israel*, (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 90. However, as is necessary in the practice of biblical hermeneutics, one must be aware of the inference present in one's own cultural and ethical understandings of a text, being careful to not let it affect the text's original intent. To condemn Lot's actions is natural and appropriate – to a point. But the reality of the status of women at this time as property of one's father or husband, with little if any sexual independence or say in who she is married off to and into whose household she is absorbed, indicates we are working with an entirely different ethical paradigm as it relates to women's roles in this text. What I seek to illuminate here are the parameters and practice of protective hospitality, even if those parameters are enforced through what are interpreted as negative, and even abhorrent, choices in our current context.

¹³ Over the centuries, these texts have been used in anti-homosexual rhetoric, equating homosexuality with crime and depravity. Only recently has the interpretation of these texts, especially Gen. 19 in reference to the destruction of Sodom, been used to highlight the real issue here is the use of force and lack of protective hospitality practiced by the people of Sodom and not their sexual preferences. See Harry A Woggon, "A Biblical and Historical Study of Homosexuality," *Journal of Religious Health* 20 (Summer 1981), 158-159 and John J McNeill, *The Church and the Homosexual*, Boston: Beacon, 1993, 42ff for examples.

¹⁴ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 90.

¹⁵ Scott Morschauser, "'Hospitality', Hostiles and Hostages: On the Legal Background

sexual subjugation argument and Morschauser's legal, hostage-exchange argument - will be analyzed side by side.

Regardless of these two arguments, however, these narratives apply to protective hospitality and are invaluable for the light they are able to shed on the practice, realities, risks, underlying values, and moral obligation for the host to protect one's guest. Additionally, according to biblical scholar Morschauser, the Genesis 19 text has "a clear relationship" with the deuteronomistic history corpus, sharing "a common vocabulary" with the deuteronomistic material of the Rahab narrative in Joshua 2 and 6 as explored previously, as well as Judges 19 which will be analyzed later, an indication that each of these texts is linked in a common deuteronomic witness and should be considered as a unit.¹⁶

The moral obligation to protect one's guests is a "core feature of ancient hospitality" according to Arterbury. Within the practice of hospitality, the host makes an "implicit vow to provide the stranger with protection" once the guest comes under the host's realm of influence.¹⁷ Yet, in the context of a shared space such as a town or village, taking in guests is a public act¹⁸ as well as a private one, as seen in these two passages. These two texts give the impression the entire town is aware of the strangers' presence, and with the strangers' presence comes threat – either political or magical – as well as an opportunity to exploit or gain power over that threat.¹⁹

As, according to the more traditional interpretation, protection of one's guest is paramount,²⁰ the lengths to which one goes to ensure protection appears extreme in the following texts, particularly to the

to Genesis 19.1-9," *Journal of the Society of the Old Testament*, 21A (2003): 461-485.

¹⁶ Morschauser, "'Hospitality', Hostiles and Hostages," 485, fn 78.

¹⁷ Arterbury, "Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...", 20-21. "Under the host's realm of influence" implies either under the host's roof, property boundaries, or even in the town where the host lives as evidenced by the obligation for the host to escort the guest to the town gate upon his/her departure. See Genesis 18:16 for an example.

¹⁸ And, therefore, also political.

¹⁹ Arterbury, "Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke...", 20-21

²⁰ Arterbury cites Ps 23:5-6 as an example of the imperative that "the endangered foreigner can rest assured because 'the host is obliged to protect his guest from all enemies, at all costs.'" Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I, 210 in Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 86.

contemporary reader. The Genesis 19 text details the visit of the divine messengers to Lot's home and his family in the city of Sodom. This visit comes after the messengers have visited Abraham, announcing the imminent arrival of a son and heir (Gen. 18:1-15). As they proceed to Sodom to assess its righteousness,²¹ Abraham's nephew Lot is sitting at the gate of the city (v.1), and reaches out to the visitors insisting they stay with him in his home, even after they say they wish to "spend the night in the square" (v. 2).

Morschauser notes Lot's presence at the city's gate "is not gratuitous or incidental" to this text. Instead, this description of Lot situated at the gate would indicate to an Israelite audience that Lot "was an individual of influence and standing within the social order of Sodom...empowered to adjudicate for the populace" and to guard the city walls from hostile entry.²² As a result, Morschauser interprets this piece of the narrative as the reason why the townsmen later threatened Lot and the guests, since Lot granting the strangers entry while essentially on "guard duty" would have aroused "suspicions and roused widespread attention" as the townspeople would have feared "potential enemies [had] gained access to the site."²³ Concurrently, since Lot might have been seen as the "last line of defense

²¹ See Gen 18:16-33 (the pericope situated between the messengers' visit to Abraham and this text) wherein Abraham argues and bargains with God to save Sodom from destruction according to the number of righteous people who inhabit the city. See Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis*, Interpretation Biblical Commentary Series, (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1982) and Terence E. Fretheim, *Abraham: trials of family and faith*, (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2007). For a more systemic analysis of the Sodom narrative in early Jewish, Christian and Islamic writings, see Edward Noort, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18-19 and its interpretation*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004).

²² Morschauser, "'Hospitality', Hostiles and Hostages," 464-466. Morschauser continues by noting that "[t]ypically, a Syro-Palestinian city-state of the Bronze and Iron Ages would have been surrounded by walls marking boundaries. These structures would have been constructed primarily for defensive purposes—walls being the major fortifications against invading armies. In circumstances of attack, the citizenry and denizens of the nearby countryside would retire behind such strongholds for protection" (465). As a result, Morschauser claims those who would be responsible for "guarding 'city-gates' would have been most attentive to such problems. The responsibility for keeping vigilant at one's post for potential hostiles must have been a keen one. Undoubtedly, in times of actual warfare, there would have been heightened awareness about who, and what, was allowed behind fortifications" (466). Whether there was, however, a state of attention in Sodom reflecting this was a time of "actual warfare" is not clear, which may negate a certain amount of urgency in Morschauser's particular interpretation.

²³ Morschauser, "'Hospitality', Hostiles and Hostages," 467.

against spies and saboteurs,”²⁴ his offer of hospitality to these strangers might have bordered on treason in the eyes of some.

Nevertheless, Lot insisted very strongly that they spend the night in his home,²⁵ and the messengers conceded. However, Lot’s invitation appears to be conditional: they are to spend the night in his home and then “go on their way” early in the morning the following day (v. 2). Again, Morschauser argues that a “less-idealistic understanding of [Lot’s] offer [of hospitality] leads one to conclude that the visitors are to be under the supervision of their erstwhile patron – under surveillance – until they are escorted out of the gates first thing in the morning.”²⁶ This order of events could be paralleled, according to Morschauser, with the Rahab narrative, where there is an imperative placed upon the citizens of the city to turn over their guests for the safety of the city or under threat of them being spies.²⁷

However, as the messengers are entertained in Lot’s home, the city’s men arrive at Lot’s door, demanding his guests be handed over to them (v. 4-5) so that the guests can be “known.”²⁸ The most common and traditional interpretation of this text, however, is that the townsmen’s intentions were to have non-consensual sex with the guests since the text appears to be

²⁴ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 467.

²⁵ Parallel with Judg 19:20.

²⁶ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 469-470. Morschauser continues: “While Lot’s entreaty that they not spend the night in the street is sometimes taken as an expression of ‘lavish’ kindness, a more realistic view is that the individuals are being prevented free access to the town....By granting them sanctuary, Lot, in his official capacity as a ‘gate-keeper’, has assumed responsibility for his charges’ welfare, and for their activities within Sodom itself. Their movements and actions are to be monitored - they are placed under a kind of temporary ‘house-arrest’: an implication being, lest they pose a danger to the community.”

²⁷ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 470. He refers to Joshua 2:2-3 and Genesis 42:5-14 as examples of this imperative that will play out in the Lot narrative, and notes “these examples demonstrate that the realities surrounding the extension of ‘hospitality’ are far more complex than is sometimes assumed. Strikingly enough, a common denominator in all these cases is that the privilege is withdrawn or curtailed because of fears of enemy infiltration—a telling similarity to Genesis 19.”

²⁸ Morschauser argues the Hebrew verb, *yada*, translated as “to know” is “a crux within Genesis 19” having “a number of meanings, ranging from simple ‘comprehension’ to the ‘gaining of experience’, with its employment as a euphemism for ‘intimate physical relations’ often cited in this connection.” In a footnote, Morschauser further explains “the meaning of [the verb *yada* ‘to know’ in Biblical Hebrew] as denoting homosexual intercourse/rape widely accepted for this verse is derived from its usage in Judg 19.22—the latter supposedly being based on Gen 19.5! The circularity of the argument is evident.” (471).

loaded with overtones of rape and subjugation. Yet, Morschauser argues with this assertion, noting the townsmen insistence to “know” Lot’s guests has a “judicial implication” as it potentially connotes a legal process of discovery and inquiry or interrogation.²⁹

In light of the threat of the mob of men at his door, Lot offers his two virgin daughters instead as a means of protecting his guests (v. 6-8).³⁰ Such an offer highlights two interpretative possibilities. If the interpretation is taken as a sexual threat, it would imply that in this social context, the dishonor of having one’s virgin daughters molested is more favorable than the dishonor of having one’s guests molested.³¹ It would also appear that only one’s daughters or unmarried women in the household have the status that makes them suitable candidates for surrender.³² While certainly not a model for ethical behavior in our current context, this narrative never implies that Lot’s willingness to offer his daughters to the mob for gang rape in order

²⁹ Morschauser asserts this text “is not a cry that the parties be turned over for ‘rape’—homosexual or otherwise. The implication is that the men be produced for *interrogation*: to discover (legally), and to ascertain their true identity—whether they are friends or foes; whether they truly deserve hospitality, or are to face hostility...Accordingly, individuals are to be held—in safekeeping— until a condition or promise is satisfactorily carried out. Failure to execute the charge or responsibility results in the forfeiture of those in custody, to the party (or parties) holding the individuals. The point of the exchange is not to mistreat those who are held but precisely the opposite: it is to ensure the execution of a prescribed duty; the value of the hostage is regarded as surety for an oath or obligation” (472-473). Morschauser cites numerous texts related to legal precedents, treaties, linguistic explorations, and Near Eastern cultural sources to solidify his argument.

³⁰ As there is not a proliferation of stories such as these, we cannot speculate as to whether or not this was common practice, both in the case of the townsmen demanding sexual access to guests and the giving over of women of the household in exchange for the safety of the guest(s).

³¹ While it may seem upon cursory reading that the honor as related to the daughters sexual status and purity was disposable and flippantly given, it should be noted that such a decision could not have been easy for Lot. Throughout the rest of the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, violations to the purity and sexual honor of women (as it affected the honor of the men in their household) were taboo and often punishable by death. See Mary Anna Bader, *Sexual Violation in the Hebrew Bible: A Multi-Methodological Study of Genesis 34 and 2 Samuel 13*, Studies in Biblical Literature, no. 87, (New York: Peter Lang, 2006) for an example of this scholarship as focused on the relationships of Jacob/Dinah and David/Tamar.

³² However, his daughters were pledged to marry men, as noted in v. 14. Lot does not offer his wife, who is mentioned later in v. 15, and so one might speculate there were culturally accepted limits to what one had the power to give to protect one’s guests from sexual threat. The same could be applied to the Judges 19 story to be considered later, as one could assume the Ephraimite host was most likely married, although his wife is never mentioned. As the Levite’s concubine was not a wife, such an insecure marital status would make her a permeable household boundary (see later references to Berquist) and subject her to the same possible fate as an unmarried daughter.

to protect his guests is a dishonorable or unethical act.³³ Instead, it illustrates that in this context, “the father controls the daughters’ sexuality and can bargain with it as a commodity, in a way that Lot could not do” with the bodies and sexuality of the guests in his house.³⁴

However, if Morschauser’s legal-oriented argument is correct, then Lot offers his daughters as hostages, “to be given in *equal exchange* for the two envoys: they are not valueless, but exceedingly valuable” as “Lot’s actions are neither an expression of patriarchal privilege, nor justification for its abuse, but are to be considered within the practice of ‘hostage-exchange’.”³⁵ According to Morschauser’s argument, the women, who are to be considered “legal detainees/captives,” were “to be held safely overnight” and were “to be released, unharmed” when Lot’s guests departed the following day according to Lot’s instructions. Morschauser claims that “by offering his daughters as hostages – *not sacrifices* – Lot demonstrates his good faith to his fellow officials, and the gravity by which he regards his legal obligations to his guests under his watch.”³⁶

Yet, the situation worsens since the demands by the townsmen now include threats to Lot if he does not give them over and, interestingly, also highlight that the townsmen see Lot as a foreigner who basically has no right to meddle in their affairs (v. 9).³⁷ According to Berquist, household codes at this time distinguished certain persons in the household as permeable or impermeable boundaries. Male guests were impermeable and outside of the

³³ While Berquist notes the “angels’ [later] action...prevents any rape from happening” which may point to the negativity of the scenario as a whole, there is no condemnation of Lot and his offer. Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 55, 90. See particularly chapter 5 “Foreign Bodies: Reactions against the Stranger.”

³⁴ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 55.

³⁵ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 474. He argues with the previous possibility by stating: “There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Lot regards his daughters’ lives as being qualitatively inferior to those of his guests; to be casually expended to uphold some ill-defined concept of ‘hospitality’ or ‘masculine honor’.”

³⁶ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 477-478. He also notes Lot’s daughters were pledged to marry men of the town as proof that Lot would not be surrendering their virginity to the sexual needs of the townsmen but instead he offers his daughters in exchange for his guests “fully anticipating that no harm will be done to his children.”

³⁷ This assertion by the townsmen would then bring into question Morschauser’s claims that Lot would be considered an elder, given authority to adjudicate.

host's control; unmarried females were permeable. As such, their violation would have precipitated "a forced building of alliances" because the unmarried women of a household were considered commodities to "be traded in order to purchase protection for others."³⁸

Moreover, both the offer of the daughters and their violation would constitute building connections between the households of the city and Lot's house since household codes required the rapists to pay the violated household "a purchase price and then take the women into their own households."³⁹ The household codes would not have allowed Lot to subject his guests to molestation of any kind – especially male-male rape – while they were under the protection of Lot's own household. "To rape these men would violate Lot's household protection, and would also destroy the boundaries of the men's own household," according to Berquist,⁴⁰ and would undoubtedly cast irreparable dishonor on both Lot and the guests.⁴¹

Not surprising, this particular sexual interpretation, as opposed to Morschauser's theory of hostage exchange, finds an audience with feminist theology. Theologian Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has critiqued the household codes as "the ethos of kyriarchy"⁴² as the codes seek to reinforce "hierarchical relationships in households, with the father, as head of household, being the one to whom all others owe obedience and

³⁸ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 93.

³⁹ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 91 with references to Deut 22:28-29. However, this is problematic in the case of gang-rape as seen here. To whose household would the no-longer-virgin daughters go? Who in the mob would be responsible for payment and restitution? While Berquist notes this code of law as seen in Deuteronomy which would be applicable in both the case of Gen 19 and Judg 19, there are dating issues that cause one to question whether or not this deuteronomic code would have existed in the time of Lot or the period of the Judges, and therefore, may not have been the particular code at the time.

⁴⁰ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 90.

⁴¹ In contrast, the cultural context seems to suggest an unmarried woman's honor could be restored or repaired once she is made honorable through marriage. The comparisons and contrasts between this scenario and current debates centered around so-called "honor killings" is not lost and would behoove further examination in another research context. See Amir H. Jafri, *Honour Killing: Dilemma, Ritual, Understanding*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); S. Ortner, "The virgin and the state," *Feminist Studies*, 4, 19-35; J. Schneider, "Of vigilance and virgins: Honor, shame, and access to resources in Mediterranean societies," *Ethnology*, 10, 1-24.

⁴² *Kyrios* referring to father, head of household, lord, slave master, emperor. See Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 151-152.

submission."⁴³ For Schüssler Fiorenza, the primary interest in texts concerned with household codes "consists in bolstering the authority of the *kyrios*, the *pater familias*, by demanding submission and obedience from the socially weaker group – wives, slaves, and children and the whole community."⁴⁴

Nevertheless, the narrative continues, Lot and his household are under threat, and to further complicate matters, Lot's guests have been sent by God to investigate the sinfulness of the city of Sodom, to announce its destruction, and to evacuate Lot and his family from imminent death.⁴⁵ Furthermore, when the threat to the protective hospitality of Lot's household becomes intractable, the messengers intervene, draw Lot back into the house from his attempts to negotiate with the crowd, and strike the townsmen blind (v. 10).⁴⁶ Ironically, in the end, the guests intervene to ensure their own safety and to preserve the honor of their host, yet the text invites one to question whether such actions were the typical or normally accepted outcome, or, instead, the result of special circumstances.

The text goes on to describe the process of evacuating Lot's household from the city of Sodom since, apparently based on the previous altercation, the messengers announce they are going to destroy the city of Sodom. Nevertheless, the text as it applies to protective hospitality more or less ends here.⁴⁷ Yet, as it applies to the previous actions, according to

⁴³ Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, 151-152 in Nancy E. Nienhuis, "Taming 'Wild Ass-Colts': An Analysis of Theology as a Kyriarchal Weapon of Spiritual and Physical Violence," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 25/1 (2009), 56.

⁴⁴ Schüssler Fiorenza, *Power of the Word*, 151-152, in Nienhuis, "Taming 'Wild Ass-Colts,'" 56.

⁴⁵ Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 90.

⁴⁶ Stuart Lasine in his article "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World," *Journal for the Society of the Old Testament*, 29 (1984), 54, fn 14 refers to the work of Hebrew Bible scholar Gerhard Von Rad, who notes: "It is ...a bit comical when this heroic gesture [of hospitality and protection by Lot] quickly collapses and the one who intended to protect the heavenly beings is himself protected when they quickly draw him back into the house and strike his assailants with a miraculous blindness." Von Rad also notes the word for blindness in the text is unclear but "apparently does not mean complete blinding, but rather to be dazzled, to 'see falsely' (II Kings 6:18)." (219). Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, from the Old Testament Library Series, (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1972).

⁴⁷ One could analyze the actions of the messengers as also acts of protective hospitality, but as they are described as "heavenly" or "divine" beings, constructing an authoritative ethical framework would present its own set of criteria and obstacles.

Morschauser, the “‘outcry against Sodom’ for its ‘grave sin’ (Gen. 18:20-21)” and its imminent destruction is justified because the “the rule of ‘law’ is duly rejected by the governing bodies” of Sodom for an undisclosed reason” accompanied by “threats of violence to Lot.”⁴⁸ For Morschauser, “the attempted attack on Lot validates the divine *casus belli* against the city, ensuring its destruction.”⁴⁹

While Morschauser’s interpretation has significant weight and removes the stigma of rape (homosexual or heterosexual) from the narrative, it stands against a well-established interpretative tradition that emphasizes the hospitality of Lot in the face of serious threat. If Morschauser’s interpretation is correct, hospitality becomes less emphasized in exchange for a stronger legal paradigm that legislates the practice of hospitality out of the realm of personal or communal conviction and into the realm of unsympathetic policy. Such an interpretation is possible. However, its power to motivate contemporary audiences toward hospitality, albeit with a negative example, would be lessened.

The emphasis placed upon hospitality as the antithesis to the sexual violence in this text, in comparison to the hostage exchange aspects pointed out by Morschauser, has a long-standing tradition that should not be ignored. Despite Lot’s offer of his daughters as hostages or demeaned sexual substitutes, Lot’s hospitality has been commended throughout the centuries.⁵⁰ The midrash *Pirke Rabbi Eleazar* 25 praises Lot for practicing hospitality at risk to his own life, and, in comparison, Sodom was destroyed

⁴⁸ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 479.

⁴⁹ *Casus belli* – Latin, indicating the case (or justification) for war. Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 479. He will also apply this argument to the Judges 19 text to be explored later.

⁵⁰ Rabbinic literature portrays Lot’s hospitality positively. However, Lot himself gets more of a mixed opinion. See the midrash examples in *Genesis Rabbah* 41-51 for more negative interpretations of Lot. Islam portrays Lot (Lut) as positive, a righteous man, in Qur’an 11:74-83; 15:51-84; 26:161-166; 29:31-35. One would think that if Morschauser was correct in his interpretation, these earlier texts would make mention of the legal ramifications of the actions of the city of Sodom, but they do not. Instead, they highlight the abusive relationship Sodom had toward strangers in need of hospitality.

because the inhabitants systematically oppressed the poor and stranger among them, as well as those who sought to show hospitality to them.⁵¹

c. Judges 19:14-27

According to Hebrew Bible scholar Stuart Lasine, the similarities in the narratives of the preceding text (Genesis 19) and the present text (Judges 19) is “an example of ‘one-sided’ literary dependence” whereby the Judges 19 text “presupposes the reader’s awareness of Genesis 19 in its present form, and depends on that awareness in order to be properly understood.”⁵² The similarities are remarkable. Guests have arrived in a host’s home, and over the course of their stay, men of the town arrive at the host’s door to demand access to the guest, again carrying connotations, in traditional interpretations, of male-male rape and violent subjugation.⁵³ Again, a daughter is offered in the guest’s stead, but in this story the guest’s concubine is offered as well. Yet, there are also some key differences in this text, which again provides a horrific and violent example of protective hospitality while, at the same time, having great value in shedding light on its practice.⁵⁴

Initially, this text portrays the guest – the Levite and his concubine⁵⁵ – differently by relating the account of events that led to their travel and need

⁵¹ T. Desmond Alexander, “Lot’s Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness,” *Journal for Biblical Literature*, 104:2 (1985), 289-290. See also Ezek 16:49; 22:29; II Pet 2:7; Josephus, *Antiquities* I: 194-5; *Genesis Rabbah* 49-51; *1 Clem* 11:1.

⁵² Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 38.

⁵³ Morschauser applies his theory to this text as well, although not in detail. His legal argument will be included where appropriate.

⁵⁴ Again, it is important to note that while this research is an exercise in feminist and liberation theology, the rape and death of the Levite’s concubine, while horrific and deserving of attention, is not the primary focus. The subject of this research is protective hospitality, namely at what cost a guest is protected. Obviously, the concubine was not protected although she was a guest and therefore this carries importance that will be explored, but there is a limit to which attention should be paid in this context. For an exploration in the scholarship related to the rape and other issues not explored here, see Karla G. Bohmbach, “Conventions/Contraventions: The Meanings of Public and Private for the Judges 19 Concubine,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 83 (1999): 83-98; Yani Yoo, “Han-Laden Women: Korean ‘Comfort Women’ and Women in Judges 19-21,” *Semeia* 78 (1997): 37-46.

⁵⁵ The fact the Levite is 1) identified as a Levite, a member of the priestly tribe of

for hospitality. The character development here suggests the utilization of tools of irony and absurdity in the narrative.⁵⁶ The author of this passage shares with the reader that the Levite's concubine has left him and returned to her father's house, signaling to the reader there is something amiss.⁵⁷ The

Israel, and therefore expected to live up to certain codes and behaviors and 2) never given a personal name plays with the reader in the narrative development of this story. Similarly, the concubine is never given a name, and is even more anonymous than the Levite, who at least can be identified by his tribe. Throughout Judges, there is a theme of excess, people not abiding by their prescribed roles and expectations of righteousness in a context described as "every man did as he saw fit" (Judges 17:6; 19:24; 21:25). Additionally, Judges 19 begins with an assertion these were in the days when Israel "had no king," signaling a deficiency in the rule of law. As such, the author of Judges is inviting the reader into a world where moral codes have gone awry. Additionally, the narrative of Judges 19 should be read in conjunction with the following chapters of 20 and 21. However, the emphasis upon protective hospitality forces one to focus upon the events of chapter 19 only as chapters 20-21 serve to expand upon other issues presented in chapter 19 such as ethnic identity, gender violence, false justification for going to war, and issues related to the establishment of an Israelite monarchy. There are also links in this narrative with Joshua 9, I Samuel 11 and Saul's act of cutting an oxen into twelve pieces to mobilize forces (11:6-11), unjust war and death, which a generation later comes back to haunt the house of Saul and becomes a bane of King David's reign in II Samuel 21 where he address injustice done by Saul to the Gibeonites. The original incident of violence of Saul against the Gibeonites is not told in the Hebrew Bible except in its reference in the II Samuel 21 passage. What we do know is that the people from Gibeah had been pledged safety within Israel by Caleb as seen in Joshua 9. But according to II Samuel 21, Saul decided to try to "wipe them out in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah." Nevertheless, the chain reactions of these events are beyond the scope of this research, but should be pointed out for further research as related to this passage. Nevertheless, Alice Keefe in her article "Rapes of Women/Wars of Men," *Semeia*, 61 (1993): 79-98 notes the "story of the concubine's rape serves effectively as propaganda to fortify the legitimacy of the Davidic lineage as Saul's birthplace, Gibeah, is defamed by association with Sodom." (93).

⁵⁶ Lasine, "Guest and Host in Judges 19," 38 and Kevin Frederick, "Clinging to the Threshold of Hope: A Sermon," *Family Matters*, 17:1 (Spring 2003), 55-71. There is a comedic factor that some interpreters have highlighted in this text, as the Levite serves as a comic character "in terms of his callousness, rigidity, absentmindedness, and inattentiveness to life, in particular, to the conventions of social life" (Lasine, 46). Lasine references H. Bergson, H. *Le Rire: Essai sur la signification du comique*, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) and R.G. Boling, *Judges*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975).

⁵⁷ For contemporary readers, the most likely interpretation is the concubine was in an abusive relationship with the Levite. The pattern fits, but in the context of this research, one should ask: who was protecting her? She returned to her father's house and, assumedly, was in relative safety there for four months (v. 2b). Bohmbach notes there are "textual lapses" that cause one to wonder under what circumstances the concubine left the Levite. The Masoretic text, affirmed by the Syriac, denotes she committed adultery and ran away to her father's house. Yet, if that were the case, her father would have been shamed and most likely would not have welcomed her back, especially for the four months she was there prior to the Levite arriving. Furthermore, the language used for the Levite refers to him coming to woo or speak softly to her, which would not be a typical response of infidelity but instead to suggest that the Levite was at some fault. However, the Septuagint and Old Latin versions refer to her leaving as a result of having "become angry with him" (v. 2), which reads easier in the larger narrative that gives no suggestion of adultery and seems truer to the spirit of the text. Some scholars suggest it is the Septuagint and Old Latin versions, instead of the Hebrew, that carry on the original meaning in this text. See Bohmbach,

Levite notices her departure and four months later decides to pursue her to her father's home and win her back (v. 2-3). After their stay in her father's home, which illustrates its own issues with hospitality codes since they are repeatedly asked to delay their travel,⁵⁸ the Levite departs with the concubine in tow, to return home. The concubine says nothing throughout the narrative.⁵⁹

On their way home, the Levite says he wishes to stop for the night where there are fellow Israelites and decides on Gibeah (v. 11-15).⁶⁰ Once they reach Gibeah, they take up the customary place to indicate they are in need of hospitality, the town square, where no one offers them hospitality (v.15). Later that evening, however, at the town square they meet the Ephramite,⁶¹ a non-Gibeonite living in Gibeah, who had come in through town on his way home from working in the fields (v. 16). Upon seeing the Levite and his concubine, he admonishes them to come home with him, implying that for them to remain in the town square would be unsafe (v. 20). Stone notes that, narratively speaking, the emphasis upon "a resident alien rather than a native of Gibeah [who] welcomes the travelers...[illustrates] the failure

"Conventions/Contraventions," 90.

⁵⁸ It was not customary or hospitable to force one's guest to stay longer than they wished to, yet the concubine's father continually persuades the Levite to stay one more day, delaying their return. In turn, this delay serves to build up the narrative tension in the text and adds to the overall theme of Judges with regards to people not abiding by the parameters set out for them for their own good. See Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 82-83. However, feminist interpreters see it another way. Yani refers to the work of two authors who argue with this. Koala Jones-Warsaw's "Toward a Womanist Hermeneutic: A Reading of Judges 19-21," 172-86 in *A Feminist Companion to Judges*, A. Brenner, ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 175 suggests the father may have been looking for assurances of safety for his daughter before allowing her to depart with the Levite. Likewise, Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn's *Gender, Power and Promise: The Subject of the Bible's First Story*, (Nashville, Abingdon, 1993), 133 speculate if the repeated requests to delay travel was an attempt by the father to delay the Levite because "he was hesitant to send his daughter back to possible mistreatment." Yoo, "Han-laden women," 40, fn 3.

⁵⁹ Lot's daughters were equally silent, but were not mentioned as often, nor play as pivotal a role, as the Levite's concubine in this text. In this narrative, all the men have something to say, but the women (the concubine, the presumed existence of the concubine's mother in her father's house or the Ephramite's wife) say nothing. But the concubine has been given agency in this text as it states she left the Levite and traveled "from the remote uplands of the hill country of Ephraim down to Bethlehem, a city in the southern tribal area of Judah." Bohmbach, "Conventions/Contraventions," 89.

⁶⁰ Gibeah is a town in the area allocated to the tribe of Benjamin. See Judg 20:4

⁶¹ Likewise, the Ephramite is never named.

of the citizens of Gibeah to offer hospitality...[and] is a means of characterizing the city of Gibeah negatively.”⁶²

The subsequent scenario resembles Genesis 19 as the men of Gibeah surround the Ephramite’s home and demand the surrender of the Levite, again so that the strangers may be “known.” The Ephramite begs the men not to commit such wickedness (v. 23),⁶³ declines their demand, and offers up not only his own daughter but also the Levite’s concubine (v. 24).⁶⁴

Morschauser makes the same arguments for this text that he did for the Lot narrative. In the same way as Lot, the Ephraimite agrees to provide hospitality to his guests for the night, and later finds his house surrounded by the townsmen.⁶⁵ Again, Morschauser asserts the verb “to know” in this case alludes to interrogation, but Morschauser does concede it would be “undoubtedly in a rough and tumble manner.”⁶⁶ However, as in the Lot narrative, Morschauser argues the Ephraimite offers the women as a hostage exchange, although this instance is “more exaggerated in tone” since the Ephraimite does tell the crowd they can “humble [the women] and do to them what is good” in their eyes, but to spare the Levite.⁶⁷ Morschauser

⁶² Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 74. Stone compares this with the Lot narrative as Lot rushes to welcome the messengers while the Levite and concubine “wait in the square for some time.” The same could also be said for Lot, who according to Genesis 19:9 is also a foreigner in Sodom and, yet, is the one who offers hospitality in what is otherwise an inhospitable town.

⁶³ What he is referring to as “wicked” is, however, unclear in whether he is speaking of their threatening his guest or their desire to rape another man. He presumably is not referring to male-female rape as wicked as he offers two women to the crowd, although perhaps he might see the rape of the women as being the lesser of two evils.

⁶⁴ The fact the Ephramite offers the Levite’s concubine is irregular, however. It would be assumed the concubine fell under the Levite’s realm of control, and, therefore, she would not be within the right of the Ephramite to offer. Nevertheless, the narrative arc of this text has been moving toward ill-treatment of the concubine, so the reader is not surprised that even a stranger offers her up to violation.

⁶⁵ Morschauser points out the townsmen are designated as “sons of Belial” (v. 22) which, he argues, is a “chaotic element...[who] are designated by the reactor as possible disrupters of order” (480-481). In footnote 65, Morschauser expands on the term as referring to “individuals or groups considered to be subverting legitimate authority, or to those who would instigate apostasy and idolatry.”

⁶⁶ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 480. He notes in footnote 66 that “suspicion expressed towards the sojourner is partially dependent upon inferences to be drawn from the surrounding literary context. In Judg. 18.3-6,14-30, a Levite plays a conspicuous role in the overthrow of Laish by the Danites” implying to the reader “that such events could also transpire in Gibeah.”

⁶⁷ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 481-482. However, the word

asserts such language is not foreign to this context pertaining to the “transfer of legal captives to authorities,” noting it signifies an admission on the part of the one who is surrendering the hostages that they are no longer within his power but there is an expectation that proper behavior will be upheld. The text appears to note the Ephraimite knows he is placing the women under the control of the “undependable...’sons of Belial” who have shown “themselves willing to overstep acceptable standards of behavior as it suits them.”⁶⁸ Yet, Morschauser maintains his argument, noting the “extreme imagery employed” in this text illustrates clearly “the dire allusion contained therein – ‘humiliation’ – *is precisely what should not occur.*”⁶⁹

The sexual subjugation/dishonor interpretation could also still apply to this text however. According to another biblical scholar, Ken Stone, “sexual misconduct committed against a woman is...an attack upon the man under whose authority she falls.”⁷⁰ The men of Gibeah only want the Levite and appear to harbor no hostility toward the Ephraimite as his host. Therefore, according to Stone’s argument, his offer of his daughter was rejected. In the Ephraimite’s eyes, “the rape of two women” was offered in order “to prevent the rape of one man.”⁷¹ As the tension increases and the Levite as the Ephraimite’s guest begins to feel more threatened, the Levite takes it upon himself to ensure his own safety by pushing his concubine through the door and into the mob (v. 25).⁷² For his purposes, the action worked. The mob left him in peace the rest of the evening and the text invites the reader to speculate he slept peacefully. His concubine, however, was raped and abused throughout the night and was found by the Levite, with her hands on

Morschauser translates as “humble” is translated elsewhere as “ravish,” connoting sexual actions.

⁶⁸ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 481-482.

⁶⁹ Morschauser, “‘Hospitality’, Hostiles and Hostages,” 481-482.

⁷⁰ Ken Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History: A Narratological and Anthropological Analysis*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 234. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 81.

⁷¹ Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 80. Two women were offered in Genesis 19, but Lot had two guests.

⁷² Bohmbach notes the woman “had little, if any, choice in the matter” and that “[b]eing outside is a result of an action taken by her husband, a panicked maneuver meant to save his own skin” (86).

the threshold of the door, the following morning as he prepared to leave (v. 27).⁷³

Stone notes the men were “not interested in attacking the host; rather, they want his guest” and that is why “the offer of the concubine alone is successful.”⁷⁴ As such, the rape of the Levite’s concubine was an attack on him by proxy, since the men could not “dishonor the Levite directly by raping him *as if he were a woman*...[they could] nevertheless challenge his honor in another way: *through his woman*.”⁷⁵ Stone also notes “the rape of the concubine is seen as the lesser evil of two alternatives available to the Levite” - his rape or her rape – and, therefore, requires one to consider the likelihood

⁷³ Biblical scholars have asked a few questions related to this text: 1) What is the purpose of this particular narrative? 2) Does the text want us to think the Levite was cold-hearted or cowardly, or are we missing an important cultural value in our interpretation? 3) Did the Levite assume he was consigning her to death when he pushed her into the mob, and, therefore, had no intentions of trying to find her the next day before he left? 3) Was the concubine dead when she was found on the doorstep or was she in shock or comatose and the Levite killed her later (v. 27-29)? Scholars have explored the fate of the concubine in depth, particularly the part detailing her hands were on the threshold of the door. Alice Keefe notes that “with her hands on the threshold...she seeks refuge with her last bit of strength” and although she has no voice in the narrative “the description is heavy with the violence she has endured” with the Levite’s callousness having “the rhetorical effect of heightening the reader’s empathy for the tortured woman” (90). The irony that the woman collapses while struggling to reach the door that ensured the protective hospitality given to the Levite is not lost either, but signals “the incongruity between her struggle and [the Levite’s] indifference,” according to Lasine (44-45). Additionally, Frederick, in his article “Clinging to the Threshold of Hope,” asserts: “After handing over his wife, one would hope that the Levite was racked by guilt, shame or remorse, but there is no hint of that in the text. He appears to get a good night’s rest and in the morning he does not even rush out to find her. In fact, only after the Levite has made provisions to leave, only at the last minute does he open the door to go on his way. Only then does he find his concubine, his wife, with her hands on the threshold. It seems ironic that in a culture so focused on biblical hospitality that none would be offered to this woman. Hospitality is as closed to her as is the door to security, the door to compassionate care and solace, the door of hope, a land where there is no king, where every man interprets truth for himself, biblical hospitality is even denied to a wife.” (59).

⁷⁴ Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 81. Stone goes further by noting that “[a]lthough the actions of the men of the city would, by thwarting his act of hospitality, certainly rob the host of an opportunity to increase his honor, the story turns upon the fact that the men wish to humiliate the Levite, not the host who dwells among them.” Another view could be that when the two women were offered to the Gibeonites, “they were part of a negotiation process and rejected because they wanted to humiliate the Levite. Later when the Levite shoved his concubine out the door to save himself, it was not an offer in a process of negotiation, but a diversion of the Levite, using his concubine as a living shield. The mob took it because it demonstrated that the Levite did not (or could not) protect her” (109-110) in Erik Eynikel, “Judges 19-21, An ‘Appendix:’ Rape, Murder, War and Abduction.” *Communio Viatorum* 47:2 (2005), 101-115.

⁷⁵ Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 81.

that the ancient and male audience of Israel would have felt the Levite's actions were justified.⁷⁶

This particular passage ends with the Levite leaving Gibeah with his either dead or unconscious concubine in tow.⁷⁷ After a time he dismembers her into twelve parts and disperses them throughout the country to show what the Gibeonites have done.⁷⁸ Yet, if one takes the sexual subjugation/dishonor interpretation of this text, one can note it was not the violence that had been done to the woman which necessitated the grisly message, but the damage to his honor.⁷⁹ It was for that violation that he requested retaliation from the various Israelite tribes, retaliation which resulted in wars which caused the deaths of at least 25,000 soldiers and the destruction of all the towns, their residents, and livestock throughout the territory of Benjamin (20:46-48) and further destruction to other tribes (21:10-25) as a result.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 82. Stone notes the ancient and male audience was probably "more influenced by notions of gender-based honor than, say, Anglo-American concepts of 'chivalry' or ideas about gender equity" that makes this text so difficult for the contemporary reader.

⁷⁷ Eynikel points out the Septuagint "says that the woman was dead" while "the Hebrew text does not tell us this when the Levite finds her on the threshold" (108). If one goes with the Hebrew interpretation, then it is possible the Levite killed her later as he dismembered her into twelve pieces that he then sent around to the twelve tribes of Israel, signaling the approach of civil war between the tribes. The text does not say one way or another. Phyllis Trible discusses this possibility in her *Texts of Terror: Literary Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) as well and notes "Of all the characters in scripture, she is the least....Captured, betrayed, raped, tortured, murdered, dismembered, and scattered—this woman is the most sinned against" (80-81) in Yoo, 40.

⁷⁸ One can only hope the irony in dismembering a dead or unconscious woman and using her body parts to show the violence that had been done to her - or the Levite's honor - was known to the author of this text.

⁷⁹ Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 83. If it had been to protest the violence done to her, he would not have thrust her out to them to be abused in the first place. See the Levite's speech in Judges 20:4-7 for his side of the story.

⁸⁰ Yoo refers to Trible, *Texts of Terror*, 83 which "points out rightly that the rape of one woman became the mass rape of 600 and the concubine's incident is used to justify the expansion of violence against women" (41). It causes one to wonder: would the Levite have saved the lives of 601 women if he had not thrown out his concubine to save his own skin? Furthermore, there is scholarship which asserts that the narratives in the Hebrew Bible pertaining to a woman's rape coincides with social unrest and acts as a precursor to "war between men," as seen here, in Genesis 34 (the rape of Dinah by Shechem) and II Samuel 13 (the rape of Tamar by Amnon). See Keefe, "Rapes of Women/Wars of Men," 88 where she notes "Tamar's violated body, like that of Dinah and the unnamed woman [in Judges 19], functions in the narrative as the field of representation upon which brokenness in the order of human relationships and sacred meanings within Israel is made manifest."

d. Combined Analysis of Genesis 19 & Judges 19

Unlike the Rahab narrative in Joshua 2 and 6, Genesis 19 and Judges 19 leaves the reader with feelings devoid of hope and grace, as, despite the interpretative lens one chooses, the practice of protective hospitality toward strangers appears perverted and taken to the extremes, filled with violence and abuse. Both texts, although Judges 19 is a stronger case, illustrate protective hospitality practiced by fallible people gone horribly wrong.⁸¹ Furthermore, the issue of women's voices in these texts is disturbing; in the Genesis 19 and Judges 19 texts, none of the women say anything, despite the risks they face, whereas in the Rahab narrative, she speaks, negotiates, maintains control of her person and is the main actor, the pivot upon which the story turns.

Most accept there are strong similarities between the Genesis 19 and Judges 19 texts, with Judges 19 dependent upon awareness of the Genesis 19 text. There are questions, however, about the "significance of that similarity,"⁸² which makes the purpose of these passages unclear. If one is to go down the route of the sexual subjugation interpretation of these texts, then the issues related to household codes and a host's obligation to protect the honor and welfare of his guest apply in both texts.⁸³ Furthermore, both texts detail that, in the end, the guest intervenes to ensure his own safety and to preserve his own honor and the honor of his host.⁸⁴ Lasine argues that awareness of the Genesis 19 text allows the reader to contrast the hospitality

⁸¹ The Judges 19 text is a stronger case than the Genesis 19 passage where the scenario is overturned by the magical powers of Lot's guests as they blinded/confounded and dispersed the mob instead of allowing Lot to subject his daughters to possibly the same fate. Furthermore, the Genesis 19 text does not allow much narrative space for the reader to question motivations and character as the Judges 19 text does.

⁸² Lasine, "Guest and Host in Judges 19," 38

⁸³ See Berquist, *Controlling Corporeality*, 91.

⁸⁴ Yet, it is easy to look unfavorably upon the Levite in this text for his actions whereas in Genesis 19 there does not appear to be the same judgment upon the messengers' or Lot's actions. This could be for one of three reasons: Either 1) the purpose of these narratives are different and seek to highlight distinct historical, ethical and situational contexts, 2) the magical/divine nature of the messengers in the Gen. 19 text abdicates them from ethical responsibility in the eyes of the reader or 3) a contemporary reader is simply unable to remove the lenses of bias in the reading of the Judges 19 text. I believe it is the former two options, as the text does seem to give hints throughout the narrative that allows the reader to believe the Levite is less than honorable.

of Judges 19 with it, so one can compare how the Ephraimite “inverts Lot’s hospitality into inhospitality, and how the action of the Levite-guest is the inverse of the action taken by Lot’s divine guests.”⁸⁵ Arterbury asserts the Judges text is just one example of many texts that “may be narrating the perversion of what on the surface appear to be ideal hospitality encounters.”⁸⁶ Lasine corroborates this view by noting that while one may be “astonished that Lot’s ‘hospitality’ extends so far as to offer his virgin daughters to the mob to save his two male guests...there is a world of difference between Lot’s offer and the analogous offer of the resident-alien host in Gibeah.”⁸⁷ According to Lasine, the Ephraimite perverts Lot’s example

⁸⁵ Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 37.

⁸⁶ Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 82-83. He notes that in Judges, “Jael kills her guest (Judg 4), the father-in-law attempts to delay his guest longer than the guest wishes to stay (Judg 19), and the Levite has to protect himself from the men of Gibeah because his host is inadequate (Judg. 19). These three instances may simply serve as examples in the book of Judges of how everyone is doing what is right in his or her own eyes, thereby illustrating the perversion of the Israelites and the need for a king (Judg 21:25)” Furthermore, Arterbury also compares this narrative arc with Homer’s *Odyssey* where “one way of demonstrating that a group of people was barbaric or uncivilized was to show them being either inhospitable or at least to show that they did not completely carry out the duties of hospitality (e.g., Homer, *Od.* 6.119-21; 9.175-76; 13.200-202; Cf. 9.161-505).” See also Simon B. Parker, “The Hebrew Bible and Homosexuality,” *Quarterly Review* 11:3 (Fall 1991), 4-19; David Penchansky, “Up for Grabs: A Tentative Proposal for Doing Ideological Criticism,” *Semeia* 59 (1992), 35-41; V. Matthews, “Hospitality and Hostility in Genesis 19 and Judges 19,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 22:1 (1992), 3-11; and Gale Yee, ‘Ideological criticism: Judges 17–21 and the dismembered body,’ in Gale Yee, ed., *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, (Minneapolis: Fortress; 1995), 146–170. However, while perhaps a minor point, I disagree with Arterbury’s assertion that the “Levite has to protect himself...because his host is inadequate.” I would argue the Ephraimite was not necessarily inadequate, but was placed in an impossible position. He responded to the needs of the strangers waiting in the town square, understanding their safety was at risk. His inability to provide safety for *all* of his guests illustrates the intractability of the scenario and the cultural values at the time which placed the honor and value of the men in the household over that of the women. He can only be considered inadequate by our current standards, by not placing himself in harm’s way instead, but while there are no guarantees that such an action would have been *successful* in this context, it probably would have been more *honorable*. Additionally, I am unaware of any biblical interpretation that explores the negative effects upon the Ephraimite’s honor as a result of the violence that occurred to the concubine. Such an exploration would be useful and interesting to this debate.

⁸⁷ Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 39. Lasine argues further: “It is one thing to offer one’s daughters to a mob in order to fulfill one’s duties as host, and another to offer one’s virgin daughter and the concubine of one’s guest! The words and actions of the old host are almost identical to those of Lot at this point, but their effect is to invert Lot’s overblown hospitality into inhospitality. The old host seems oblivious to the fact that his offer of the concubine is ‘inhospitable’. He follows Lot’s example so precisely that it is almost as though he were following a ‘script’. The ‘script’ calls for two women to be offered to the mob. The host has only one virgin daughter, so he must include the guest’s concubine in order to act out his role! Although this characterization of the host’s action exaggerates the

hospitality into a “ludicrous and absurd”⁸⁸ inhospitality by offering the Levite’s concubine, and by explicitly detailing to the mob that they can “ravish,” “humiliate,” or “rape” the women⁸⁹ (v. 24), which Lot never did.⁹⁰ Lasine also argues that the Ephraimite is “less ‘courageous than Lot” since he is never “in as much personal danger as Lot...[as] Lot had risked his life to go out to the crowd and shut the door behind him.”⁹¹ It was only during that negotiation and when Lot makes his offer that he was threatened. Instead, the men of Gibeah barely speak to the host and certainly never threaten him in the manner of Lot.⁹² Nevertheless, while Lasine may be correct or too harsh on the Ephraimite, this text highlights the risks involved in providing hospitality and also encourages the reader to imagine what *might* have happened if the situation were different.

In light of these texts, it is necessary to note that one must carefully construct the application of protective hospitality in the current context. Obviously, the examples of Genesis 19 and Judges 19 are not to be interpreted in this context as proof that one should be willing to expend non-consenting family members to ensure the protection of one’s guest. Present in these two texts are justice issues related not only to the townspeople/guest and townspeople/host relationships, but also in the relationship between family members. These texts highlight the intrinsic sexual subjugation of women in the context of ancient Israel,⁹³ as well as the injustice that takes place against women at the hands of those who had the responsibility to honor and protect them and their guests.

mechanical way in which his behavior ‘follows’ Lot’s, it does highlight the ludicrous and self-defeating nature of his action, when it is compared to Lot.”

⁸⁸ Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 40.

⁸⁹ Cf. Genesis 34:2; II Samuel 13:12, 14; N.M. Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis; The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989), 367, fn 6; N. Wyatt, ‘The Story of Dinah and Shechem’, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 22 (1990), 433-58; and C. L. Seow, “A Heterotextual Perspective”, in *idem* (ed.), *Homosexuality and Christian Community* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996), 26, fn 2.

⁹⁰ Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 39. To this end, Lasine argues “[t]he ‘frankness’ of the old host only serves to underscore his callousness as a father and host.”

⁹¹ Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 39.

⁹² Lasine, “Guest and Host in Judges 19,” 39.

⁹³ Although I am sure it was not limited to ancient Israel but was common among most, if not all, cultures in the geographic region.

Yet, these texts also highlight the lengths to which hosts were obliged to go in order to ensure the protection of their guests. If one remains with the sexual subjugation interpretation, it is clear that the honor attached to one's hospitality was more important than the chastity of one's own virgin daughters! Concurrently, like Morschauser, Derrida highlights the role of *hostage* in this context, wherein one is offered "as a pledge...in a kind of captivity,"⁹⁴ which in its own way is still caught up in concepts of honor since one commits to keep a pledge. While Derrida does not refer to these texts specifically, he does illuminate the idea that through the practice of hospitality "we substitute ourselves for the others in order to give ourselves as a pledge"⁹⁵ to the value of the life of those who have sought our sanctuary, a witness that resonates in these texts. Furthermore, while they do not provide literal examples of what one should be willing to risk in order to provide protective hospitality to the threatened other, these texts do challenge one to take seriously the notion that risk of harm to oneself, family members, or individual and communal purity is inherent in the practice. Such provision requires serious commitment and a willingness to face risk for everyone involved.

e. Cities of Refuge

Texts in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible also point to the obligation to provide protective hospitality not only for the innocent, but also for the guilty. This imperative occurs primarily in the texts related to the cities of refuge. Unfortunately, scholarship surrounding the texts related to the cities of refuge is extremely limited. Found in a total of five passages in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, the details regarding the establishment and implementation of the cities of refuge sit in the Deuteronomic history and literary tradition and are not referred to elsewhere in the biblical text as are

⁹⁴ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 376.

⁹⁵ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 376.

other deuteronomic principles, such as the year of Jubilee.⁹⁶ The silence regarding it elsewhere is curious; it indicates either that the cities of refuge were actually never implemented or that their presence was such an assumed part of life that the authors found it unnecessary to identify them further.⁹⁷

Nevertheless, contemporary religious scholars, philosophers, activists and politically-aware individuals continue to refer to concept of the cities of refuge as an example to be replicated or from which to draw inspiration and learn. Additionally, the Jewish community refers to these texts in the religious calendar year during the Days of Awe, often drawing parallels between finding physical safety within the cities of refuge and finding spiritual safety within the Torah, likening one's contemporary realities with the biblical scenario of committing a crime or sin unintentionally and, as a result, needing redemption and sanctuary from retribution.

Before interpretation of these texts can go further, they will be explored in turn. It is generally thought the passages in Deuteronomy were written first, and therefore, they should be considered first.⁹⁸ Deut 4:41-43 explains which cities were to be designated as cities of refuge and to which tribe each city would be allocated: Bezer in the desert plateau for the Reubenites; Ramoth in Gilead for the Gadites; and Golan in Bashan for the Manassites.

⁹⁶ The year of Jubilee is originally found in Exod 21:2; 23:10-11; Lev 25, 27; Num 36:4; Deuteronomy 15 and referenced elsewhere Neh 10:31; Jer 34:14. It is also thought that Jesus referred to the year of Jubilee in his declaration that he has come to "proclaim the year of the Lord's favor" in Luke 4:19. Mary Douglas discusses the issues with the implementation of the year of Jubilee in her book, *In The Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 158, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 238-247.

⁹⁷ The absence of biblical scholarship related to the cities of refuge is equally curious. The reasons for its unpopularity in scholarship are mostly likely because there are only four passages where it is detailed, all of which are literally interdependent and, therefore, only coming from one biblical witness. Additionally, the lack of evidence in narrative literature, archaeology and extra-biblical attestation that it was ever actualized makes interpretation extremely difficult.

⁹⁸ Although there is mention of the cities of refuge in Exodus 21:13, which does not name the cities outright, but refers to a place that will be designated in the future where someone who kills another unintentionally can flee.

Deut 19:1-10 is much more detailed regarding the three cities, yet never uses the term 'refuge' to describe them, but merely implies refuge can be taken with the phrase "*so that anyone who kills a man may flee there.*" These early verses also declare the three cities should be centrally located in the land with roads built to enable greater ease of travel for those who need to travel there. The Talmud interprets this need for easier travel through the imperative in Deut 4:42 which states "*and that fleeing until one of these cities he might live,*" arguing that it was the duty of the Israelites to provide the traveler "with whatever he needs so that he may [truly] live."⁹⁹ Of note in this particular text, however, is the presence of Hebrew casuistic law, "*if/when this happens...you shall set aside...*" signaling these passages are detailing a legal framework and system of asylum that was to be in place should the need arise.

The radicality of the idea of the cities of refuge in this text is characteristic of the deuteronomic witness. Unsurprisingly, there appears to be an emphasis placed not only on the refugee's welfare, but also that of the *go'el*, the kinsman redeemer who has a right to retribution, with the text implying an understanding that the *go'el* has the right to avenge, but reflecting a desire within the society to set up a system to keep the cycle of violence at a minimum. The deuteronomic witness goes even further in v. 8-9 in the condition – "*if you love the LORD your God and walk in God's ways*" – that three more cities should be set aside for refuge as territory expands, according to God's blessing. As a result, a direct relationship is drawn between providing refuge and being righteous. In the same vein, v. 10 emphasizes the sanctity of the land, which has been given as an inheritance by God to the Israelites, and that it is their responsibility to keep from polluting the land with innocent blood and the scourge of violence.

The texts then cease in Deuteronomy but are repeated in Josh 20:1-9. The first three verses are doublets from Deuteronomy, perhaps for the sake of continuity, as the Joshua text details the coming into and taking over of

⁹⁹ Extract from the Tractate Makkoth 10a in Emmanuel Levinas, *Beyond the Verse: Talmudic Readings and Lectures*, Gary D. Mole, trans., (London: Athlone Press, 1994), 34.

land whereas the Deuteronomic passages were to reflect the law given by God to Moses while the Israelites were still wandering in the desert. As a result, the Deuteronomic texts state “when you get to the land...” while the Joshua texts state “now that you are in the land...” but are otherwise strikingly similar in wording and detail. Another doublet to the Joshua text is found in I Chron 6:57, 67, which only refers to particular cities designated as refuge that were under the oversight of the Levites.

However, a couple of details in the Joshua text are worth noting. First, the tone differs from Deuteronomy, like an instructive and firm reminder of the law - “Now, I told you that when you get there, you...” – as if there is an assumption that forgetting to implement the law might be an issue. Second, the text is much more concerned about procedural justice in the immediate context than the Deuteronomic passage, giving even more specific detail about how the system should be carried out.¹⁰⁰

The final passage is Num 35:6-33, which is considered to be a much later text, most likely “belonging to the redactional unification of [the] Pentateuchal narrative and deuteronomistic historical work” and is “clearly dependent” upon the Joshua 20 text.¹⁰¹ What makes this particular text unique, however, is that it appears to be the first use of the term *arei miklat*, the actual origin of the term ‘city of refuge’. Yet, few additional details emerge in this text as the details of the cities is absorbed into the discussion of tribal allotments and the arrangements for the tribe of Levi in particular.

While some interpret the cities of refuge texts as a means to deal with blood feuds, the various texts never say this explicitly, despite the use of the term *go’el*, nor do they give a particular reason as to why the cities of refuge are declared a solution to a particular problem.¹⁰² There is no exposition as

¹⁰⁰ Including the detail that the Levites, the priestly tribe, are not to get a tribal allotment (see Joshua 21) because they do not need land to provide for themselves because God will provide for them.

¹⁰¹ Martin Noth, *Numbers*, Old Testament Library series (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press) (Eng. trans. 1968), 253

¹⁰² Was the issue of blood vengeance out of control? Was there such a high rate of accidental death – or murder that could have been blamed as an accident – that such a system needed to be put in place to adjudicate and protect those involved? The text never gives any of these details.

to why this solution, as opposed to another, was given, and there is no narrative framework or further reference to the cities and their implementation. However, there appears to be an indication that the development of the cities was perhaps a movement away from the practice of using the actual sanctuary altar as a place of safety.¹⁰³ Yet, there is no general agreement as to when this “transfer of asylum from altar to designated cities occurred,”¹⁰⁴ and, therefore, the interpretation as to the original need for and justification of this legal development remains, in essence, a mystery.

Despite the absence of detail and lack of evidence that it was ever implemented, the cities of refuge detailed in the texts above define and give structure to the “biblical institution of sanctuary”¹⁰⁵ for both the Jewish and Christian traditions. According to a progressive Jewish rabbi, Niles Elliot Goldstein, the establishment of the cities of refuge had three purposes:

- 1) “It was a protective measure, to give all of the parties involved a chance to let their passions cool” and to “let the wheels of justice...start to turn” as “witnesses would be called, trials held, and judgments made” by the priests who conducted the proceedings.¹⁰⁶

- 2) “It served as quasi-form of punishment for the manslayer, since exile, even in a place of refuge, constituted a form of social death.”¹⁰⁷
Emmanuel Levinas, in some reflections on the Talmud and its interpretation of these texts, notes this aspect as well, stating “[t]he ‘avenger of blood’ can no longer pursue the murderer who has taken refuge...; but for the manslayer, who is also a murderer through negligence, the city of refuge is also an exile: a punishment...In the city

¹⁰³ Thomas B. Dozeman, “Numbers”, *New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 2, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 264. Cf. I Kings 2:28

¹⁰⁴ Dozeman, “Numbers,” 264.

¹⁰⁵ Niles Elliot Goldstein, “The New Schul - Kol Nidre 5767,” 2 available at: <http://www.newshul.org/pdfs/sermon06yk.pdf>. Last accessed on 21 October 2009.

¹⁰⁶ Goldstein, “The New Schul - Kol Nidre 5767,” 2.

¹⁰⁷ Goldstein, “The New Schul - Kol Nidre 5767,” 2.

of refuge, then, there is the protection of the innocent which is also a punishment for the objectively guilty party. Both at the same time."¹⁰⁸

- 3) "It served to contain and isolate the sin that has been committed, a death – for killing was understood...as a contaminant to the community as a whole. The killing of a human being, even if it occurred without any malicious intent, was a moral wound to the entire household of Israel."¹⁰⁹

The issue of killing as a "contaminant" hearkens back to the previous discussion concerning issues related to purity. Since purity is based on concepts of holiness and ethical righteousness in these deuteronomic texts, the holiness of the land and its inhabitants is paramount. The importance of this aspect of holiness can be seen in the appointment of the Levites to be in charge of the cities of refuge and its resulting judicial processes as well as the underlying reason they were appointed: because there was fear that the administration of power justice by the tribes/landholders would be unfair.¹¹⁰ The Levites were given the responsibility of adjudicating claims of refuge and revenge as they were perceived to be perpetual outsiders who were less inclined to side with particular tribes as a result of land issues.¹¹¹

Nevertheless, some issues related to the cities of refuge texts need to be highlighted. The first is a textual issue: the witness of the cities of refuge

¹⁰⁸ Levinas, *Beyond the Verbe*, 39.

¹⁰⁹ Goldstein, "The New Schul - Kol Nidre 5767," 2-3. For example, Num 35:34 states the cities of refuge are to "protect from blood defilement 'for I the Lord dwell in the midst of the people of Israel.'" This emphasis upon purity and avoiding defilement is explored further by Mary Douglas in her book *In The Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 158, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 120, 147-148.

¹¹⁰ Eliezar Schweid, *The Philosophy of the Bible as Foundation of Jewish Culture*, vol .2, Leonard Levin, trans. (Brighton, MA: Academic Press, 2008), 59-60.

¹¹¹ Cf. Martin Noth, *Numbers*, The Old Testament Library series, (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1968); James Barr, "Migraš in the Old Testament," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29, no. 1 (March 1, 1984): 15-31; Yosef Ofer, "A diagram of the open land of the Levite cities in Nahmanides' Commentary on the Torah," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 99, no. 2 (March 1, 2009): 271-283; and D. L. Baker, *Tight Fists or Open Hands: Wealth and Poverty in the Old Testament Law*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press, 2009), 92.

texts are only from one witness, the deuteronomic source,¹¹² and the cities are not mentioned outside of that source in their capacity as places of refuge. Given their role as centers of justice, both socially and legally, one would think they would be mentioned later in the prophetic texts, but there is nothing.¹¹³

Second, one can see that the cities of refuge were to be set up as part of a more developed legal system. Now that the Israelites are based in a homeland and no longer wandering, they had the capacity to establish permanent courts and carry out justice as a rooted community. The attention paid in the Deuteronomy 19 passage defining what constituted an unintentional murder illustrates specific legal codes were being developed. Yet, since these texts mirror a social and religious progression of thought, one is aware these provisions would have continued in their development if cases in the cities of refuge were being heard.

Thirdly, while there are few options given for conditional legal trespass and very little allowance given for the guilty to pass without judgment in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, there are notable exceptions where those who violate the law are either not condemned or sometimes even celebrated.¹¹⁴ As such, one could assert the text is aware that there are extenuating circumstances that override a person's better judgment and established laws and traditions. Furthermore, the laws depicted here do not

¹¹² It is understood, however, that even the deuteronomic source is not monolithic, but probably exhibits a variety of voices and contexts over the period of its composition.

¹¹³ Unlike the year of Jubilee where its non-practice (and, as a result, Israel's deficiency of justice) is considered to be a reason why Israel fell apart and was exiled, and is referenced repeatedly outside of the deuteronomic witness. Cf. II Chron 26:20-23, 36:20-23; Isa 61:1-4; Jer 25 and 29; Ezek 40:1, 46:17; Dan 9:24-27. Yet, one could also argue that historical context and geographical placement of the cities may have played a role in their silence. Most prophetic literature in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible is attributed predominantly to the Southern Kingdom of Israel and written after the Assyrian exile in 722 BCE. Since most of the cities of refuge would have been located in the Northern Kingdom of Judah and would have been under Assyrian rule at the time when the prophetic literature was being formed, it may explain why they were not mentioned in the later texts.

¹¹⁴ Examples such as stories of incest/endangered survival such as the Daughters of Lot (Gen 19:30-38) and Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38); child sacrifice committed by Jephthah (Judges 11); a rash oath by Saul in the Saul/Jonathan narrative (I Samuel 14); and probably most interesting in this context is the account of the mark given to Cain (Gen 4:15), which served as protection from retribution despite the premeditated murder he committed. At the same time, these are all quite problematic texts in and of themselves.

seem to admit as much causal complexity as one considers human action to involve, so one could speculate there is room for re-interpretation to make the laws work in each particular scenario. Levinas highlights this issue in the texts by noting the “ancient status of the city of refuge – the ambiguity of a crime which is not a crime, punished by a punishment which is not a punishment – is related to the ambiguity of human fraternity which is the source of hatred and pity.”¹¹⁵ Additionally, Levinas declares the city of refuge “is a city of civilization or of a humanity which protects subjective innocence and forgives objective guilt and all the denials that acts inflict on intentions.”¹¹⁶

Nevertheless, in Elie Wiesel’s essay “The Refugee”, he argues the concept of sanctuary in the Jewish tradition

refers to human beings...[it] is not a place....Any human being is a sanctuary. Every human being is a dwelling of God – man or woman or child....Any person, by virtue of being a son or daughter of humanity, is a living sanctuary whom nobody has the right to invade.¹¹⁷

Wiesel concludes the “sanctuary concept in Scripture is rooted in...[the] cities of refuge....[and] the entire theme of sanctuary is always linked to war and peace.”¹¹⁸ Related to Wiesel’s radical inclusion, Levinas echoes similar ideas. In a reflection upon Talmudic writings, he focuses a large proportion of his time on the cities of refuge texts. Oona Eisenstadt records Levinas’ thoughts:

“Why, he asks, [is there] so much concern for the manslaughterer? He answers: because we are all manslaughterer....We all participate in structures of oppression – this makes us guilty – but we participate for the most part unwillingly – this makes us innocent.”¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Levinas, *Beyond the Verse*, 46-47

¹¹⁶ Levinas, *Beyond the Verse*, 51-52

¹¹⁷ Wiesel, “The Refugee,” 387.

¹¹⁸ Wiesel, “The Refugee,” 387.

¹¹⁹ Oona Eisenstadt, “The Problem of the Promise: Derrida on Levinas on the Cities of Refuge,” *Crosscurrents*, Winter 2000, 475.

Levinas continues elsewhere:

Do not these murders, committed without the murderers' volition, occur in other ways than by the axe-head leaving the handle and coming to strike the passer-by? In Western society – free and civilized, but without social equality and a rigorous social justice – is it absurd to wonder whether the advantages available to the rich in relation to the poor...whether these advantages, one thing leading to another, are not the cause, somewhere, of someone's agony? Are there not, somewhere in the world, wars and carnage which result from these advantages?...Does not the avenger or the redeemer of blood 'with heated heart' lurk around us, in the form of people's anger, of the spirit of revolt or even of delinquency in our suburbs, the result of the social imbalance in which we are placed?¹²⁰

Contemporary application such as Levinas has modeled encourages one to consider how such inequalities that lead to "someone's agony" can be interrupted and addressed. The cities of refuge texts offer substantial evidence of a restorative culture, both for the perpetrator – the manslayerer – and for the victim/survivor who has a right to justice and retribution, the *go'el*. Despite the references to guilt and innocence, Levinas highlights the questions inherent in this text and its application by universalizing the needs of the actors, and the respective rights of safety, protection, and calling for a fair accounting of events that necessitated a place of refuge in the first place.¹²¹

Despite the textual complications and lack of evidence that the legislation for the cities of refuge was ever enacted, these texts still capture the imagination.¹²² As a result, they are continually referenced as inspiration

¹²⁰ Emmanuel Levinas, *Beyond the Subject*, 40.

¹²¹ For further discussion of contemporary application of the cities of refuge biblical principles, see D. Auckelman, "City of Refuge," *Sojourners* 13 (January 1984): 22-26 and William C. Ryan, "The Historical Case for the Right of Sanctuary?" *Journal of Church and State* 29 (Spring 1987): 209-32.

¹²² It should be noted, however, that the principle of refuge is not a Hebrew concept. One particular example in another culture can be found in ancient Hawaii. If someone committed *kapu*, a forbidden action such as "broke a taboo, betrayed a trust, harmed someone, or was a non-combatant during a time of war," they were at risk, "regardless of whether they'd committed an act of actual transgression, or were just in the wrong place at the wrong time." There was a place of safety – a *pu'uhonua*, "a place of refuge." "Once

and looked to as an example of a more just society. Recent developments have been the establishment of International Cities of Refuge Network¹²³ (ICORN), a network of cities that welcome writers and scholars who are under threat in their home countries because of their work, and the City of Sanctuary movement in the UK,¹²⁴ which seeks to build a culture of hospitality for asylum seekers and migrants in need of sanctuary, designating various towns and cities as places of safety. Discussions are also taking place regarding the intersections between architecture, hospitality, and refuge,¹²⁵ and nations are considering the role of protection and intervention with current debates about developing international policies referred to as “Responsibility to Protect.”¹²⁶ The issue of refuge and protective hospitality is certainly a part of contemporary public discourse.

inside the boundaries of the pu’uhonua, nobody could touch you – no blood could be shed within its walls. The place of refuge was sacred ground, and anyone who violated its sanctity would themselves become guilty of a great and terrible offense. While inside this safe haven, those who had committed wrongs were given a second chance, a new lease on life. They had time to offer prayers, perform rituals of contrition, to ask for forgiveness...When time passed, emotions cooled, and wrong doings were eventually forgiven, the person left the place of refuge” in Goldstein, “The New Schul/Kol Nidre 5767,” 2. For more information, see also Rubellite Johnson, “Religion Section of Native Hawaiians Study Commission Report,” Honolulu: Office of Hawaiian Affairs, February 1983 and R.J. Morrison, Paul Geraghty, Linda Crowl, *Science of Pacific Island Peoples: Land Use and Agriculture*, vol. 2 (Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1994).

¹²³ See their website <http://www.icorn.org/> for more information.

¹²⁴ See their website <http://www.cityofsanctuary.org> for more information.

¹²⁵ The Skainos Project in Belfast, Northern Ireland is an attempt to transform a community through building of shared spaces in what is a divided community. For more information, see <http://www.skainos.org/2009/07/09/the-skainos-name/> where the importance of hospitality in their work is articulated. Also, Martin Villa is a Ph.D candidate in the Department for Design at Göteborgs University in Sweden, whose thesis is tentatively titled “Hospitality and Hostility in Design.” He has published an article on his own website titled “Opaque Hospitality: The experience of Hospitality-Hostility beyond the Human Factors approach,” available at http://www.martinavila.com/upload/avila_m_opaque_hospitality.pdf. Accessed on 18 July 2011.

¹²⁶ See page 232, ftn 232 in Chapter Four for more information.

2. Protection Themes in Qur'an and Islamic Tradition

As the composition of the Qur'an differs markedly from the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible, namely in the structuring of narratives, the coverage of Qur'anic themes of protection likewise differs. As a result, a selection of themes and pericopes will be dealt with in turn, exploring the variety of ways the Islamic tradition discusses protection.

Protection themes in the Qur'an can be divided into two different general groups: protection given by God and protection to be practiced by the Muslim, the latter of which is much more nuanced and will be given more specific attention in the context of this research. However, both groups are defined by a particular characteristic: an overarching concern for justice.¹²⁷ Protection in the Qur'an and the Islamic tradition are bound up in communal, social, and political ties, and those ties are defined by an understanding of justice closely connected to values of dignity and honor. Moreover, it is helpful to understand that the Qur'an's imperative for protection is informed by an ethical paradigm shaped by the recognition that right belief (orthodoxy) is a natural and required outcome of right action (orthopraxis).¹²⁸ This recognition implies orthopraxis involves striving for justice, out of which orthodoxy will arise tested by and reflective of that same justice.¹²⁹

a. Divine and Human Protection in the Qur'an

Throughout, the Qur'an speaks of God as a "protector" and frequently entreats and intercedes for God's protection. Four of the ninety-nine names for God in Islam deal with protection: The Bestower of Security (*Al-*

¹²⁷ One may temper this assertion, however, by noting that it could be said "justice for whom?" Justice within Islam is an ideal, but historically, it was often a factor in struggles for and maintenance of power. Nevertheless, this critique could be leveled at any cultural or religious tradition and is not solely an Islamic problem.

¹²⁸ Qur'an 29:69. Esack, *Qur'an, Liberation, and Pluralism*, 13. This connection between justice and dignity and honor, as well as the relationship between right belief and right action are also present in Judaism and Christianity.

¹²⁹ Esack, *Qur'an, Liberation, and Pluralism*, 13. Esack refers to orthopraxis that "supports justice" as "liberative praxis."

Muhaymin),¹³⁰ The Protecting Friend (*Al-Walí*),¹³¹ The Preserver (*Al-Hafiz*)¹³², and The Preventer of Harm (*Al-Mani'*).¹³³ Therefore, God's very nature is protective, providing security for, and preserves God's creation. Textual scholar Máire Byrne notes that while Muslims undoubtedly see God as an almighty Creator who "holds a dominant stance over all that has been created," it is completely logical to also believe the One who has created the world will also protect those in it. Byrne notes that within Muslim theological constructs the idea that God uses God's creative power "for protection is underlined by the Islamic idea that Allah bothered to create humanity in the first place...[and] it would be nonsense to go to so much effort for something that would not be safeguarded."¹³⁴

As such, it is understood a covenant with God provides one with protection (3:112). In conjunction with the name for God *Al-Walí*, the Qur'an asserts God

has attendant angels, before him and behind him, watching over [humanity] by God's command. God changes not what is in a people, until they change what is in themselves. Whosoever God desires evil for a people, there is no turning it back; apart from Him, they have no protector.¹³⁵

Similarly, God is described as giving refuge to those who believe in God:

Remember that you used to be few and oppressed, fearing that the people may snatch you, and He granted you a secure sanctuary, supported you with His victory, and provided you with good provisions, that you may be appreciative.¹³⁶

¹³⁰ Qur'an 59:23.

¹³¹ Qur'an 13:11, 22:7.

¹³² Qur'an 11:57. This text further notes God cannot be harmed either; therefore, to molest what God protects is futile.

¹³³ Qur'an 67:21. Cf. Byrne, *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 128 where she argues the names of God in the Islamic tradition are grouped according to similarity in order to highlight meaning, and the 'creation names' for God are linked to ideals related to protection and care.

¹³⁴ Byrne, *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 128.

¹³⁵ Qur'an 13:11. Arberry interpretation.

¹³⁶ Qur'an 8:26, Khalifa interpretation.

However, if there is sin/wrongdoing involved, no one and nothing can protect the wrongdoer from God's wrath.¹³⁷ As they are associated with God, holy places such as the Ka'aba (2:125; 3:96) and Mecca (29:67) are also described as a sanctuary.¹³⁸

However, protection as it is described within the human realm as practiced by followers of Islam is more detailed and complex.¹³⁹ Most of the references to protective hospitality in the Qur'an serve as imperatives for Muslims to provide a model and as motivation for action. This method is different from the examples heretofore analyzed in the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible that situate the practice of protective hospitality within a narrative from which one extrapolates meaning and lessons for behavior. The simpler, more straightforward instructions present a default standard by which Muslims abide in relation to protection. For example, Surah 4:75 exhorts the Muslim to be a protector of the threatened by declaring:

And what is wrong with you that you fight not in the Cause of Allah, and for those weak, illtreated and oppressed among men, women, and children, whose cry is: "Our Lord! Rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors; and raise for us from You one who will protect, and raise for us from You one who will help."¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ Qur'an 33:17, 71:25, 72:22 among many others

¹³⁸ The term "sanctuary" appears most often to be applied to physical places such as Mecca, the Ka'aba, or the place where Mary dwelled.

¹³⁹ An extreme example of the complexity can be seen in the case of "jihad etiquette," a term labeled in a New York Times article which detailed the various rules in place in the world of Islamic militants. Apparently, even in this context, one is not permitted to cause harm to another's guest without consent from the host. Like other aspects of religious extremism, it appears that essential values – including hospitality – may still play a role, although they are most likely twisted into a shadow of its former self. See Michael Moss and Souad Mekhennet, "The Guidebook for Taking a Life," *New York Times*, 10 June 2007, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/10/weekinreview/10moss.html>, last accessed on 21 July 2011.

¹⁴⁰ From the 1977 Hilali-Khan interpretation of Qur'an, sometimes referred to as *The Noble Qur'an*, considered an amplified version as parenthetical references are not in the original text but serve to define, explain or give further information. One should note the reference to "fight in the Cause of Allah" uses the Arabic word *jihad*, implying the term is not a negative one, but simply means "to strive, battle, or struggle for." See P.L. Heck, "Jihad Revised," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 32/1 (2004), 95-128 and Gabriele Marranci, *Jihad Beyond Islam*, (Oxford: Berg, 2006) for a discussion on the use and meaning of *jihad*.

Nevertheless, additional nuances in the text should be explored more closely. The following sections explore the issues present in the narrative of Lot/Lut, and analyze the development of the Constitution of Medina and the subsequent formation of legal obligations within the *ummah* and for the protection of the *dhimmi* in order to get a better understanding of the nature of protection within the Islamic tradition.

b. Thematic Analysis of Lot/Lut's Hospitality

Textual analysis of the Qur'an and later texts as they refer to Lot, or Lut as he is called in the Islamic tradition, has primarily focused throughout the centuries upon the issue of homosexuality and its prohibition rather than on the issue of hospitality. While some Islamic scholarship has sought to address homosexuality in a more inclusive way, the texts related to Lot were appropriated and interpreted by an anti-homosexual rhetoric that has made them difficult to reclaim for other purposes. Nevertheless, in recent years, a small yet profoundly significant amount of work has been done, primarily by Islamic scholar Scott Siraj al-Haqq Kugle in the area of a more inclusive, liberationist reading of the text that focuses on important aspects of the Lot narrative, namely the aspect of protective hospitality and related issues, that have been heretofore ignored. This section will attend to these voices and the Lot texts.

The traditional and, ultimately, conventional view in the Islamic tradition is that the Qur'an, *hadith*, and other texts are "very explicit in...condemnation of homosexuality, leaving scarcely any loophole for theological accommodation of homosexuals in Islam."¹⁴¹ However, the Lot text can be pruned from the strict anti-homosexual interpretation and considered in a broader way. To detour the homosexuality debate in the texts, one can look into the text beyond the issue of same-sex intercourse

¹⁴¹ Kecia Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam: Feminist Reflections on Qur'an, Hadith, and Jurisprudence*, (Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2006), 82, referring to the work of Khalid Duran, "Homosexuality in Islam," in *Homosexuality and World Religions*, Arlene Swidler, ed. (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1993), 181-197, 181.

and consider other factors that may have contributed to the destruction of the cities besides homosexuality.¹⁴²

Lot's persona in the Qur'an and extra-textual sources is that of a prophet, who, Kugle asserts, "hear[s] the speech of God because...[his] ears are opened by suffering oppression and struggling against it with endurance and patience."¹⁴³ In Islamic tradition, the prophets were those who did not "just believe in one God and reject the worship of false idols...[but] sacrifice[d] one's own well-being to protect the poor, the vulnerable, the strangers, and those who suffer, without which worship is incomplete, indeed hypocritical."¹⁴⁴

To understand the texts that relate to Lot, one consolidates them from many different places in the Qur'an, since the narrative is not told in full in one place but is diffuse,¹⁴⁵ and utilized in a variety of contexts to prove a point or refresh the memory of the reader pertaining to a particular issue. Therefore, textual interpretation is more difficult in that there are a variety of contexts to take into account. Nevertheless, Kugle refers to Islamic textual scholar Amreen Jamal and notes Jamal's argument that the terms used within the Qur'an to rebuke Lot's people "are not unique" in that some "imply sexual activity but are not limited to sexual activity."¹⁴⁶ Moreover, Jamal's

¹⁴² Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, 82. This approach is not new to the interpretation that has been considered in the Jewish and Christian traditions in Genesis 19 as explored previously. The development of more inclusive interpretations of the text in the Jewish and Christian traditions also had to take this approach at one time or another, as the Sodom and Gomorrah narratives have been used for centuries in anti-homosexual rhetoric. Only recent biblical scholarship (in the last two decades), with the help of disciplines such as anthropology and sociology, have seriously looked beyond the issue of same-sex intercourse and considered other issues present in the text.

¹⁴³ Scott Siraj al-Haqq Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam: Critical Reflection on Gay, Lesbian and Transgender Muslims*, (Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2010), 35-36

¹⁴⁴ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 35-36

¹⁴⁵ Qur'an 6:86; 7:80; 11:70-82; 15:59-84; 21:71-75; 22:43; 26:160, Kugle, "Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics," 207-209. See Amreen Jamal, "The Story of Lot and the Qur'an's Perception of the Morality of Same-Sex Sexuality," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 41/1 (2001): 1-88 as a contrasting example of semantic analysis. Jamal's purpose is to determine if "the Qur'anic terms that describe their wickedness and destruction are terms that specify same-sex relationships," according to Kugle, "Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics in the Agenda of Progressive Muslims," in *Progressive Muslims*, Omid Safi, ed., (Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2003), 206.

¹⁴⁶ Scott Siraj Al-Haqq Kugle, "Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics," 207, referring to Jamal, "The Story of Lot and the Qur'an's Perception...", 1-88.

work argues “the commentarial tradition and conventional wisdom have erred...[over the years] by placing undeserved emphasis on sexual deviancy as the particular sin of Lot’s people,” according to feminist Islamic scholar Kecia Ali.¹⁴⁷

Yet, for Kugle, Jamal does not go far enough and fails to identify the exact reason for their condemnation. Instead, Kugle argues “it was not sexual behavior or sexuality for which they were all punished, but rather something far more basic.”¹⁴⁸ According to Kugle, interpretation of the text over the centuries has included a condemnation of the tribe’s rejection of Lot’s authority as a prophet as seen in their prohibition of “the right to extend hospitality and protection to strangers, to the extent of demanding to use the male strangers in coercive same-sex acts.”¹⁴⁹ Yet, such an interpretation was tempered by some classical jurists with an overarching assertion Lot’s prophetic mission was “primarily to forbid anal sex between men.”¹⁵⁰

To circumvent this historical interpretation, Kugle asserts the use of thematic analysis in order to construct an overall narrative.¹⁵¹ As portrayed by Kugle and the 12th century narrative re-construction in Muhammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Kisa’i’s *Tales of the Prophets*,¹⁵² the Lot narrative is remarkably similar to the Genesis 19 account, with one exception: Lot’s prophet status places a much more serious emphasis upon his role as a model whose responsibility it is to “protect the weak, poor, and homeless with a Prophetic

¹⁴⁷ Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, 82, referring to Jamal, “The Story of Lot and the Qur’an’s Perception...” (2001): 1-88.

¹⁴⁸ Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 207.

¹⁴⁹ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 50-51.

¹⁵⁰ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 50-51. Kugle argues “[t]hese jurist interpreters created a legal term, *liwat*, as a shorthand for ‘the act of the people of Lot,’ meaning anal intercourse, and it corresponds to the English term ‘sodomy’...cement[ing] the close association of Lot’s Tribe with male anal intercourse.” However, Kugle asserts “[the] term is [not] found in the Qur’an itself, leading sexually-sensitive interpreters to question how jurists have read into the scriptural text terms and concepts that are not literally there.” The way in which biblical interpretation has effected English usage in this way as well is remarkable.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 207, 209.

¹⁵² Muhammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Kisa’i, *Tales of the Prophets*, Wheeler M. Thackston, Jr., trans. (Chicago: Great Books of the Islamic World/Kazi Publications, 1997), 155-159. Al-Kisa’i is thought to have lived in the 12th century, but may have been working with earlier narratives, redactions and interpretations.

ethic of generous hospitality.”¹⁵³ The purpose of the *Tales of the Prophets*, according to Kugle, “is to present each Prophet as a character who upholds ethical values in the face of rejection and opposition by their community,” while promoting a model for “ethical values that can and should inform the Muslim community that strives to follow the whole line of Prophets.”¹⁵⁴

Therefore, according to the narrative tradition, Lot was sent as a prophet to the prosperous Cities of the Plain.¹⁵⁵ In the Islamic tradition, Lot is also understood to be related to Abraham/Ibrahim, and, as a result, their prophetic callings were similar in their proclamation of monotheism and advocating a hospitable ethic of concern and care for those who are oppressed, vulnerable or under threat.¹⁵⁶ As in the Genesis version of the narrative, Lot’s guests had visited Abraham previously, who had welcomed them enthusiastically,¹⁵⁷ and this enthusiasm for welcome by both Abraham and Lot illustrates the values held by both men in their prophetic mission which contrasted sharply with the actions of the people who were residents of the Cities of the Plain. The residents are portrayed as extremely inhospitable: instead of showing welcome and an offer to host strangers, the residents chase them away; instead of offering food to travelers, they rob them; and instead of protecting the vulnerable, they rape and coerce them “as an operation of power over them.”¹⁵⁸

For Kugle, the Lot narrative does not condemn the same-sex acts per se, but condemns the lengths to which the residents of the Cities of the Plain went to reject Lot’s authority as a prophet. Their desire to rape his male guests was rooted in their oppression of Lot, an attempt to “prove him weak

¹⁵³ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 36.

¹⁵⁴ Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity, and Ethics,” 215.

¹⁵⁵ “Prosperous” is an important adjective here as in the narrative in al-Kisa’i, the cities are depicted to be prosperous precisely because of their inhospitality and injustice practiced at the expense of others.

¹⁵⁶ Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 212

¹⁵⁷ Kugle refers to a traditional Islamic attribute of Abraham whose custom it was to not eat “except with guests with whom to share his food, and he had not had any guests for three days in a row,” implying Abraham had not eaten in three days. Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 212, ftn 50. However, the source of this attribute is unknown.

¹⁵⁸ Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 212. See al-Kisa’i’s *Tales of the Prophets* for a vivid account of exactly how this turn of events comes to fruition in the Cities of the Plain.

by violating his dignity and abusing his guests”¹⁵⁹ to whom Lot had offered protective hospitality in accordance with his prophetic authority, and over whom the residents sought to “assert their own egoistic status and power, rather than by sexual desire and bodily pleasure.”¹⁶⁰

In the context of the Qur’an, Kugle argues that ethical values which honor another’s humanity arise from the belief in the unity of God, while abuse of that honor stems from idolatry. The unity of God, or *tawhid*, is “the basis for generosity, hospitality and an ethic of care for the needs of others,” whereas idolatry is “the basis for pride, hoarding wealth, denying the rights of others and exploiting their weakness in every way possible (through wealth, property, coercion, objectifying others, and using them.”¹⁶¹ For Kugle and other readers who seek a more inclusive understanding of these texts, the Lot narrative is “clearly about infidelity through inhospitality and greed, rather than about sex acts in general or sexuality of any variation in particular.”¹⁶²

As it applies particularly to protective hospitality, Kugle’s understanding of the social context resembles the previously explored interpretations of the Genesis narrative:

As the head of a household, Lut had the duty to protect two kinds of people: his kin and his guests to whom he had offered food and shelter. Offers of hospitality were not just a matter of sharing a meal, but also cemented a social bond including the duty to protect guests from threats in the surrounding community. The people of Lut rejected his prophethood by violating his right to offer hospitality and protection to strangers and visitors. Their attempt to abduct his guests and rape them most graphically demonstrates this rejection. When Lut offers up his family members (who happen to be female daughters) in exchange for his guests (who happen to be male visitors), he displays in most extreme terms the sacredness of protecting guests who are elevated even above the status of offspring. The difference in gender between the female characters in the narrative and the male characters

¹⁵⁹ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 36.

¹⁶⁰ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 54.

¹⁶¹ Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 212.

¹⁶² Kugle, “Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics,” 213. Kugle also refers to this interpretation as being utilized by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered Muslims in his book *Homosexuality in Islam*, 50-56.

obscures the more important underlying message, that caring for those in need is a sacred duty that overrides the duty to protect one's own family. How many of us, homosexual or heterosexual, can claim to live up to that ethical principle?¹⁶³

Nevertheless, the issue of Lot's daughters and the implications of consent are as equally problematic as they are in the Genesis text. Ali finds the inclusive interpretation of these texts based on the issue of consent versus coercive rape problematic as the "argument that the Qur'an objects [to the actions of the residents] because they intended non-consensual violation rests on an assumption that consent is necessary for an ethical or lawful sexual relationship," which, according to Ali, is not always the case, particularly since Lot offered his daughters "without any indication that their consent mattered."¹⁶⁴

To be fair, however, Kugle is not asserting that the consent is the main interpretative factor here; for Kugle, the key factor is the rejection of Lot's prophethood as seen in the *rejection of his practice of protective hospitality*. Kugle asserts his argument by asking, "Would anyone believe that a Prophet would offer his daughters to assailants intent on rape, as if their raping women would make the act 'pure'?"¹⁶⁵ The answer for Kugle is, of course, "no." In fact, it appears to be such a ridiculous possibility that Kugle argues Lot resorts to sarcasm "to show his assailants how wrong it is to rape guests over whom he has extended protective hospitality":¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Kugle, "Sexuality, Diversity, and Ethics," 214-215.

¹⁶⁴ Ali, *Sexual Ethics and Islam*, 83. Ali refers to a particular case where the Qur'anic text provides instruction related to female captives, illustrating "consent is not always relevant to the formation of licit sexual relationships." Additionally, in reference to the above cited in Kugle, "Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics," in *Progressive Muslims*, 215, 224, Ali argues the following: "One could argue that in the case of premodern patriarchal societies, only paternal consent mattered. In that case, could Lot have offered his sons to the men with equal impunity?" (83). I think this is a very insightful question. One also wonders how much of Kugle's interpretation is based upon the contemporary and inclusive Christian and Jewish examples of exegesis of the Lot narrative? His work makes no reference to similar biblical scholarship, but the similarities are so remarkable that one might wonder if there has been at least some cross-influence. Yet, it is entirely possible that Ali and Kugle's interpretations have arisen independent of Jewish and Christian scholarship in and around the same issue.

¹⁶⁵ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 56. Italics added.

¹⁶⁶ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 56.

And his people came to him, running towards him; and erstwhile they had been doing evil deeds. He said, 'O my people, these are my daughters; they are cleaner for you. So fear God, and do not degrade me in my guests. *What, is there not one man among you of a right mind?*'¹⁶⁷

Kugle continues by arguing Lot and those at his door know that "it is far from pure to take his daughters, whose dignity [Lot] protects," and as a result, Lot utilizes the offer of his daughter to illustrate the extremity of their actions, "that assaulting his guests is even worse in his sight than fornicating with his daughters."¹⁶⁸ Kugle further notes that

Far from giving them license to rape his women, he is expressing with sarcasm born of despair, that vulnerable strangers are as valuable to him as his own children. On the surface, he may appear to talk about the correct gender for men's sexual orientation, but in reality he is preaching that both men and women deserve protection from rape and humiliation. Such protection, extended to both women and men, is a consequence of the ethic of care that fuels his Prophetic mission. This ethical message comes through clearly...[elsewhere in Surah 15:68-71]...The comparison by gender is only to emphasize to his audience that strangers of either gender deserve the same protection one gives to daughters."¹⁶⁹

Interestingly, Kugle compares the Lot narrative with the story of the Prophet Salih, who "was sent to the people of Thamud, who built powerful cities that dominated wealthy trade routes...[and who] grew arrogant, hoarded their wealth, and refused to share equitably resources to protect the poor and vulnerable."¹⁷⁰ Salih, on God's order, set loose a "'sacred she-camel,' charging his people to allow this animal to roam their land and drink

¹⁶⁷ Qur'an 11:78, Italics added. From the Arberry interpretation also known as *The Koran Interpreted*, 1955. The text was interpreted from Arabic by A.J. Arberry and is considered to be scholarly and highly regarded by Muslims.

¹⁶⁸ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 56

¹⁶⁹ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 56. One cannot help but consider the applicability of this interpretation onto the Jewish and Christian interpretations of the text.

¹⁷⁰ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 58. Cf. Qur'an 7:73; 9:70; 11:61-95; 91:13 and al-Kisa'i's *Tales of the Prophets*, 117-127. Kugle further identifies the tribes of Thamud as those who "carved cities into the rocks of cliffs" (Qur'an 89:9) and also notes in ftn 44 (282) Salih is not mentioned in the Torah "for he belonged to the other Semitic tribes who were the ancestors of the Arabs" and was unknown to the Israelite tribes.

freely of their water, to be protected and cherished though she was vulnerable and had no owner,” serving as a “living metaphor for the poor and vulnerable people living under the rule of Thamud.”¹⁷¹ But the people rejected Salih and his teaching, ridiculing him and God, and, “instead of attacking him directly, [the residents of Thamud] attacked his sacred she-camel, tied her up, and slaughtered her,”¹⁷² again as a means of rejecting the prophethood of the one who protected her and was sent to them by God. In the end, the cities of Thamud suffered a fate similar to the Cities of the Plain and were destroyed.¹⁷³

Kugle’s interpretation of these texts resonates strongly with a social justice-oriented, feminist, and liberationist methodology. Therefore, it is no surprise that he refers to the foundational Islamic liberation theology work of Farid Esack as a textual interpretative model, wherein the Qur’an is found to be both “liberating and in need of liberation.”¹⁷⁴ As Islam continues to evolve within a lived context, its relationship to its texts and tradition will also change. For Kugle, the anti-homosexual nature of the interpretation of the Lot narrative is an example of “compromise and retrogression” into the false security of oppressive power of later generations after Muhammad’s radical and liberating vision of “an innovative new commonwealth, based on a brother-and-sisterhood of belief, shared wealth, and mutual protection.”¹⁷⁵ Through the process of conquest and expansion, Kugle notes Muslims “returned to the old inequalities and hierarchies” and in the course of “a few generations, the Muslims’ experimental commonwealth of liberation became an empire that rivaled Rome,” rendering the radical message of liberation in the Qur’an as “an Islamic charter for domination.”¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 58.

¹⁷² Qur’an 7:77.

¹⁷³ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 58

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Farid Esack, *The Qur’an, Liberation, and Pluralism*. Kugle argues that in order to “fulfill its promise of liberation, Muslims first free the Qur’an from partial, limited, and corrupted interpretations that enshrine injustice.” (*Homosexuality in Islam*, 38).

¹⁷⁵ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 36-37. This commonwealth will be explored further in the next section which explores the Constitution of Medina and the concepts of the *ummah* and the *dhimmi*.

¹⁷⁶ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 36-37. Such principles argued by Kugle could certainly be applied to Christianity and Judaism in the context of the nation of Israel as well.

Another Muslim liberation theology scholar, Ashgar Ali Engineer, echoes Kugle's argument, remarking that Muhammad's practices of protective hospitality on behalf of the weak, poor, and oppressed had given away to oppressive rule, causing Islam to lose "all of its liberative thrust (except in dissident movements and rebellions)."¹⁷⁷ Yet for Kugle and others in his interpretive tradition, the Qur'an's liberative message that upholds the values of hospitality, generosity, dignity, honor, equality and liberation is not lost. Instead, in order to rediscover the liberative spirit, the Islamic text relies upon interpretation conducted by those who suffer as a result of injustice. Such interpretative voices are, according to Kugle, in "a privileged position as interpreters of scripture precisely because they are in a disempowered position...[as] oppressed within their society"¹⁷⁸ as evidenced by Kugle's own work regarding the Lot narrative.

c. *The Constitution of Medina, the Ummah and the Dhimmi*

In 622 CE, the Prophet Muhammad and his followers left Mecca under continued threat of oppression and harassment, and migrated to Yathrib, renamed Medina by Muhammad, in order to establish and grow the Islamic community under more hospitable conditions. This year and the event of migration is known as the *Hijra*, and is so important to the history of the Muslim community that the Islamic calendar hinges upon this event.¹⁷⁹ However, this migration to Medina also ushers in a significant change in community relations as well since it provides the opportunity for the Constitution of Medina to be written and placed into law.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Engineer, *Islam and Liberation Theology*, 37.

¹⁷⁸ Kugle, *Homosexuality in Islam*, 37. One critique of this approach, however, is that it places a great deal of burden upon the oppressed to reform a tradition that, in many cases, oppresses them.

¹⁷⁹ Ali Khan, "Commentary on the Constitution of Medina," in *Understanding Islamic Law: From Classical to Contemporary*, Hisham M. Ramadan, ed., (Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2006), 205. Technically, however, this event is the second *hijra*, as the first *hijra* was the migration of the Muslim community to Abyssinia in 615 CE.

¹⁸⁰ The Constitution of Medina is accepted as authentic and authoritative by most scholars, although the original document has been lost. Instead, it has been included in Ibn Ishaq's 6th century biography of Muhammad. See Ibn Ishaq, *Life of Muhammad*, 231ff.

The importance of the Constitution of Medina is found in its usage of the principle of a social contract, which served to establish a formal relationship between different groups within Medina and, as a result, shaped the basis of a pluralist society. Scholars note the Constitution was remarkable in its concept and implementation,¹⁸¹ that its aims were “entirely practical” as “it contains little that can be ascribed to the religious sphere,”¹⁸² and yet, in the religious sphere it stands as a foundational document in the history of Islam.

Whether it is one cohesive document implemented immediately or a collection of different documents implemented over the course of several years,¹⁸³ its effect is the same in that it outlines the parameters for the establishment of a pluralist community, comprised of Muslims and non-Muslims, whose signatories commit to the mutual peace and security of each other as inhabitants of Medina. The document provides the details for a theocratic confederation (*ummah*), and according to Islam scholar Ali Khan, establishes “the reality of an actual agreement among real people of diverse ethnic and religious groups...in real time, in real space...through a real agreement, hundreds of years before the theory of...social contract gained widespread approval, mostly in the West.”¹⁸⁴ Likewise, fellow Islam scholar Abdulaziz Sachedina argues that of the Abrahamic traditions, which are rooted in the “ethos of shaping the public culture in accordance with the

¹⁸¹ Moshe Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries in the Middle Ages*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21; Khan, “Commentary on the Constitution of Medina,” 206.

¹⁸² Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 21. Gil argues one should remember, however, “how difficult it is to differentiate between the religious and other aspects of life in the history of early Islam.”

¹⁸³ Cf. Khan, “Commentary on the Constitution of Medina,” 205-206 and Paul Wheatley, *The Places Where Men Pray Together: Cities in Islamic Lands, Seventh Through the Tenth Centuries*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001). Wheatley argues the Constitution of Medina was made up of several different documents “spread over the first seven years or so of Muhammad’s Madinan period.” (26).

¹⁸⁴ Khan, “Commentary on the Constitution of Medina,” 206. Khan refers to Hobbes, Rousseau and Rawls’ ideas of social contracts as examples the Constitution precedes. There is debate among scholars, however, as to whether or not it was a treaty or a unilateral declaration by Muhammad. Moshe Gil argues it was had been a treaty or covenant, “it would have contained the parties’ oaths and pledges towards one another,” or it might have been an “oral agreement (which was recorded later on).” Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 21. See also Moshe Gil, “The Constitution of Medina: a reconsideration,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 4 (1974): 44-66.

divine will," Islam is quite "conscious of its earthly agenda."¹⁸⁵

There appears to be no solid evidence that Muhammad or his Muslim followers commonly used the term *ummah* prior to the Constitution of Medina, but scholars have noted its use in Christian contexts at that time. Its usage appears to refer to something akin to "religious community."¹⁸⁶ However, with the Constitution of Medina, its usage evolves from a theological concept to something that connotes a socio-religious ideal.¹⁸⁷ The Constitution recognized the possibility existed for several *ummahs* to exist within a greater *ummah*, as seen with the presence of the various Jewish communities situated as a distinct *ummah* alongside the emerging *ummah* of Muslims in Medina.¹⁸⁸ With the Jewish presence being assumed and encouraged within the larger *ummah*, the religious aspect of the term recedes in favor of a more social understanding.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁵ Sachedina, *The Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 24. He notes further that "[i]n comparison to the performance of the religious-moral duties (*takālif al-shar'iyya*) that are laid down in minute detail in the Sharī'a (the sacred law of the community), the official creed plays a secondary role in orienting the faithful in their social conduct."

¹⁸⁶ Wheatley, *The Places Where Men Pray Together*, 369, ftn 242; Frederick Mathewson Denny, "The meaning of *ummah* in the Qur'an", *History of Religions* 15 (1975), 37. Both of these sources provide more background on the term and its evolution of use in the Islamic context.

¹⁸⁷ Riaz Hassan, *Faithlines: Muslim Conceptions of Islam and Society*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 87. Cf. C.A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, "The *ummah* - an analytic approach," *Studia Islamica*, vol. 10 (1959), 5-22; G.E. Von Grunebaum, *Modern Islam: The Search for Cultural Identity*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1962); Denny, "The meaning of *ummah* in the Qur'an," 34-69; E. Giannakis, "The Concept of the Ummah," *Graeco-Arabica*, 2 (1983), 99-111; and F. Rahman, "The Principles of Shura and the Role of the Umma in Islam," *American Journal of Islamic Studies*, 1:1 (1984), 1-9. Sachedina also argues that without the early development of the principles of a pluralist society and concept of the *ummah* and *dhimmi* (as will be explored in the following pages, "the story of Islam's treatment of its religious minorities throughout history would not have been any different than Europe's treatment of the non-Christian other. One needs only to consider the violent forms that anti-Semitism generated by Christian redemptive theology took in Europe. The state policies of different Muslim dynasties are reflected in the legal decisions passed down by Muslim jurists that allowed for maximum individual as well as group autonomy in adhering to a particular religious tradition." Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 25.

¹⁸⁸ Hassan, *Faithlines*, 87. Hassan notes eventually "the term acquired a legal connotation. The Muslim scholars of the classical period defined *ummah* as a spiritual, non-territorial community distinguished by the shared beliefs of its members." Cf. A.S. Dallal, "Ummah," in J. Esposito, et. al., eds., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World*, vol. 2, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. W.M. Watt, "Ideal Factors in the Origin of Islam," *Islamic Quarterly*, 2 (1955), 160-174; J. Obermann, "Early Islam," in R.C. Denton, ed. *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, (New Haven, CT: Yale, 1966): 237, 30, 34; Robert B. Serjeant, "Constitution of Medina," *The Islamic Quarterly*, 8 (1964), reprinted in *Studies in Arabian History and*

Islamic scholar Frederick Denny argues this overlapping of the term and its evolution in the early years of Islam makes it difficult to define, noting if one were to speak of the *ummah* as depicted in the Qur'an, one "cannot without qualification assume that the term means the Muslim community only, as we can when we use the term to describe post-Muhammadan Islam."¹⁹⁰ Concurrently, Jewish scholar Moshe Gil notes the Qur'an uses the term *ummah* "extensively in the sense of 'group, 'community,' and especially to express the concept of 'successive revelation.'"¹⁹¹ The Islamic understanding recognizes humanity has been comprised of *ummahs* to whom God has revealed God's self throughout history with messengers and warners,¹⁹² whose "deeds [are] prescribed by God,"¹⁹³ of whom has been designated his or her "own time,"¹⁹⁴ and that there have been good *ummahs* and bad *ummahs*.¹⁹⁵ Over time, however, the term *ummah* took on more meaning in the Islamic context, coming to "symbolize and embody the very notion of the Islamic community."¹⁹⁶ According to Islamic scholar Riaz Hassan, the transformation of the meaning of *ummah* occurred as a result of the "change in the social structure of society...accompanied [by] the growth and development of the Islamic community," while further noting Muhammad "would not begin to differentiate between *ummahs* until the *ummah* he envisioned had established itself safely and concretely."¹⁹⁷ Whereas in the early days of Islam it was used primarily as a "universal monotheistic religious term,"¹⁹⁸ *ummah* began to evolve into a socio-religious-legal term in the later periods of the caliphs and after. Nevertheless,

Civilization (1981); P. Crone and M Cook, *Hagarism*, Cambridge, 1977, 7f; and Denny, "Ummah in the Constitution of Medina," 44. Referenced in Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 36.

¹⁹⁰ Denny, "Ummah in the Constitution of Medina," 39.

¹⁹¹ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27.

¹⁹² Qur'an 4:45; 10:48; 16:38, 86, 91; 23:46; 28:75; 35:22; 40:5; 45:25. Referenced in Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27.

¹⁹³ Qur'an 6:108. Referenced in Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27.

¹⁹⁴ Qur'an 2:128, 135; 7:32; 10:50; 13:29; 15:5; 20:35, 66; 23:45. Referenced in *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27.

¹⁹⁵ Qur'an 3:109; 7:159, 180; 7:164. Referenced in *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27.

¹⁹⁶ Hassan, *Faithlines*, 86-87.

¹⁹⁷ Hassan, *Faithlines*, 86-87. Italics added.

¹⁹⁸ Hassan, *Faithlines*, 86-87. Cf. W.M. Watt, "Ideal Factors in the Origin of Islam," *Islamic Quarterly*, 2 (1955), 160-174.

the precedent for an inclusive understanding of the *ummah* existed at the time and was utilized by the Prophet Muhammad.

The Constitution also details the expansion of the community, identifying in whose interest the confederation will act. Specifically, the Constitution mentions the Jewish tribes of Medina, and it grants “each tribe the right to be ‘one community with the believers’,” identifying the understanding that this new state will not be understood as “an exclusively Muslim nation.”¹⁹⁹ Khan also notes the Constitution’s inclusion of each distinct Jewish tribe as signatories. For Khan, this signals that Muhammad and the formation of the new authority recognized the diversity of the Jewish population and their “equal footing” with Muslims, and bestowed “equal dignity and respect upon all Jewish tribes with whom the social contract was made, rejecting the concept that some Jews...[were] superior to others.”²⁰⁰

Nevertheless, the Constitution was a pact first and foremost concerned about security.²⁰¹ It describes those who are a part of the pact are the believers (*mu’minun*) and Muslims (*muslimun*) of Quraysh and Yathrib as well as “those who follow, adhere to, and strive (*jāhadū*) with them.”²⁰² Additionally, it provides no space for neutral groups; those who have signed the document are no longer responsible for their own individual security, but were responsible for the security for the signatories, the *ummah*, as a

¹⁹⁹ Khan, "Commentary on the Constitution of Medina," 207.

²⁰⁰ Khan, "Commentary on the Constitution of Medina," 207.

²⁰¹ A criticism of this emphasis upon security is that, in the context of Muslim imperial power, security does not necessarily equal protective hospitality. In an idealized sense, it could, but political alliances based on the security of the powerful majority often do not provide an equality and justice-oriented hospitality for the minority. An awareness of the reality of the expansion of Islam (or Christianity, for that matter) through conquest and conversion must temper this discussion of security and protection within contexts of state power and authority.

²⁰² Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27; Denny, "Ummah in the Constitution of Medina," 40; and Ibn Ishaq, *Life of Muhammad*, 232. In his article "Ummah in the Constitution of Medina," Denny notes the term "Quraysh" designates in the Constitution "the Emigrants (see the preface and no. 2 of the document)" but later designates "the enemies of Muhammad from Mecca (nos. 20 and 43), who are not to receive 'neighborly protection'" as it appears that during this period "Muhammad no longer considered himself and the Emigrants to be Qurayshi except by descent." (43). Denny adds that such a move by Muhammad should not be surprising considering the treatment directed toward the Muslims by the leaders of the Quraysh prior to the *Hijrah*.

whole.²⁰³ Such stipulations were radical at this time since it publicly overrode tribal and clan ties and formed a new concept of *ummah* as the defining communal attribute.²⁰⁴ Gil notes that now "precedence would be given to the ties of the *umma[h]* over kinship or family ties; from now on, the individual would need the protection of the *umma[h]*: no longer that of the clan."²⁰⁵

This new communal solidarity centered on the issue of protection. As Jews, Muslims, and pagans are now part of a greater *ummah*, the safety of the groups is of utmost importance, and each group as signatories to the pact "will act together in war and peace" under the acknowledgement of the authority of Muhammad.²⁰⁶ Obviously, the peace provided by the Constitution depended upon two factors: submission to the authority of Muhammad and the consensus of the *ummah* through a spirit of equality and justice in internal matters.²⁰⁷ Moreover, it was understood that God oversaw the protection provided to signatories within the boundaries of the Constitution, and God also ensured God's own protection under whose watch "there should be no discrimination."²⁰⁸ Each group within the *ummah* were the "guarantors of the security" of each other in the face of those outside the

²⁰³ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27

²⁰⁴ Hassan, *Faithlines*, 87. The Constitution details later the particular responsibilities of each clan and the community as a whole related to blood money and the ransoming of captives, but that, even then, the community would assist if a particular contingent found itself in difficulty with their responsibilities. Gil notes the "significance...is that stricter attention would be paid to the taking of a life which calls for the payment of blood-money...[and] the redemption of prisoners would, as a matter of course, oblige the community, as people are taken prisoners only in battle and this could only occur on the orders of the leader, that is, the Prophet." (29). See Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 27-29.

²⁰⁵ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 30.

²⁰⁶ Daniel W. Brown, *A New Introduction to Islam* (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2009), 126. Brown cites the controversial 1977 work of Patricia Crone and Michael Crook, *Hagarism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), which controversially asserts Jews and Muslims were partners in conquest, evidenced by the placement of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem which "hints at this relationship." (127). However, Wheatley notes "Muhammad expelled the Jews from al-Madinah" in the years following the *Hijrah*, which would signal that the Constitution was only successful for a limited amount of time. According to Wheatley, their expulsion was a result of their rejection of Muhammad's legitimacy as a prophet, leading Muhammad "to reject not only Jewish customs and observances but also the Jews themselves," as seen in the shift from praying toward Jerusalem to praying toward Mecca" as detailed in Qur'an 2:144. Wheatley, *The Places Where Men Pray Together*, 28.

²⁰⁷ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 31.

²⁰⁸ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 30

pact, often referred to as the *kafir*.²⁰⁹

Certain issues were detailed specifically by the Constitution that are of particular interest to this research. One example can be seen in the regulation that a member of the community who provided aid to “a rebel evil-doer...and offered him shelter” risked invoking punishment from God to be “carried out on the Day of Judgment.”²¹⁰ The purpose for such a regulation is speculated by Gil to have been an attempt to “prevent protection from being offered to people whom the Prophet eventually intended to fight” for being spies or enemies “who were plotting against him.”²¹¹

Another regulation designated the city of Yathrib/Medina as *haram*, related to the Hebrew term *herem* (ban), referring to something that has been dedicated unto God, forbidden or sacred.²¹² Somewhat reminiscent to the Hebrew concept of the city of refuge, a new legal system emerged with the Constitution that enforced the sacredness of Medina by banning hunting or bearing arms within its city boundaries and prohibiting destruction of its trees. Gil argues the intention of *haram* was to create “a holy place, without violence or the spilling of blood,” forming “a sort of taboo...to make Medina a secure zone for both its inhabitants and its visitors.”²¹³

²⁰⁹ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 30. The term *kafir* (and its derivatives such as *kafirun*) is somewhat ambiguous in the same way *ummah* is. It refers to “infidel”, “unbeliever,” or “enemy,” depending on the context. In general, it carries a connotation of outside threat.

²¹⁰ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 31.

²¹¹ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 31. One cannot help but consider the case of Rahab in Joshua 2 and 6 in this scenario. Gil notes this particular purpose is shown in Muhammad's later praise of “the killers of 29 Jewish delegates from Khaybar, telling them God saved the *muslimun* from the hands of evil-doers...[and in the *hadith*,] the statement is preserved as directed against the [evil-doers] as well and not only against those who provided him with shelter” (31).

²¹² The Hebrew term *herem* (sometimes known as the “ban”) was used in reference to the acts of genocide as detailed in the book of Joshua where every living thing (man, woman, child, livestock, etc) was killed as an act of obedience and/or dedication to God. It appears, however, the Arabic use of the term is not used in this context in the same genocidal way, but simply refers to something being set aside for protection or dedication. See Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 32.

²¹³ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 32. Gil also notes that making a city *haram* (which existed in Mecca as well) had a practical and economic function as it was “essential for both commerce and overall urban development” ensuring “coexistence between merchants of Mecca and the nomadic tribes.” (32-33).

Additionally, since this pact was a “union of solidarity under Allah’s protection,” the welfare of each member of the *ummah* was important, carrying into this new *ummah* the “ancient obligation of the clan to avenge the blood of its members.”²¹⁴ As a result, those within the pact were known as “protected people” or *dhimmi*, those to whom the *ummah* were legally bound by the confines of the contract to protect.²¹⁵

The concept of the *dhimmi* began with the Constitution of Medina, but its example was implemented elsewhere in later agreements entered into by the spreading Islamic empires and the people they conquered. Often *dhimmi* are referenced in conjunction with another term *ahl al-kitab*, or “People of the Book,” which “applied primarily to Jews and Christians, but was eventually enlarged to include Hindus and others living in territories that came under the sway of Islam.”²¹⁶ Surah 9:6 of the Qur’an articulates the protection to be provided by them:

And if anyone of the Mushrikun (polytheists, idolaters, pagans, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah) seeks your protection then grant him protection, so that he may hear the Word of Allah (the Qur’an), and then escort him to where he can be secure, that is because they are men who know not.²¹⁷

The term *dhimmi*, or more formally *ahl al-dhimma*, became a legal one after the example of the Constitution of Medina, connoting *dhimmi*’s official standing as protected under the might and will of Islamic rule. Islamic scholar John Kelsay notes the governance of *dhimmi* was established by treaties, with the understanding that if those being protected violated the terms of the agreement, such as initiating an insurrection against Islamic rule, they were justifiably subject to discipline. However, according to Kelsay, the “overarching purpose of fighting is to restore peace, order, and justice to the

²¹⁴ Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 31. Gil does state, however, that this obligation to avenge will get shifted in later Islamic tradition – along with the term *ummah* -to a more exclusivist ‘only Muslims’ interpretation.

²¹⁵ The Constitution of Medina was the first of many such pacts that would be made that designated certain groups as *dhimmi*.

²¹⁶ John Kelsay, *Arguing the Just War in Islam*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 39-40.

²¹⁷ Hilali-Khan interpretation.

territory of Islam” and to return the *dhimmi* to “their rightful [protected] status.”²¹⁸

In the post-Muhammad years, the legal status of *dhimmi* ensured they lived within the state as “recognized minority communities, with their own structures of authority, religious observances, and laws.”²¹⁹ Islamic rule had an obligation to treat the *dhimmi* justly and to protect them “from persecution and violence,” but in exchange *dhimmi* forfeited rights and privilege that they enjoyed in their own domains,²²⁰ such as requirements to pay a poll tax (*jizya*), “observe restrictions on public demonstrations of worship, limit...build[ing] churches and synagogues,...and behave in ways that deemed respectful of the priority of Islam.”²²¹ As such, in certain ways Shari’a law held no authority for the *dhimmi*, but certainly “the terms of their protection were set according to the Shari’a standard.”²²²

Discrimination against the *dhimmi*, however, took root in the implementation of the provision of protection during the Caliphate period. In contrast to earlier years, the idea of “spiritual equity” lost importance, and “religious allegiance rather than righteous action” dictated social rank.²²³ The power dynamic between the Muslim ruling authority and the *dhimmi* became problematic, as under this discrimination, the *dhimmi* were second-rate citizens and their protection was in the interest of the security of Muslim power.²²⁴ Sachedina illustrates this point by noting that “even the most

²¹⁸ Kelsay, *Arguing the Just War in Islam*, 103

²¹⁹ Kelsay, *Arguing the Just War in Islam*, 39-40.

²²⁰ Frederick M. Denny, “Islam and Peacebuilding,” in *Religion and Peacebuilding*, Harold Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds., (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004), 137.

²²¹ Kelsay, *Arguing the Just War in Islam*, 39-40. Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 64 notes the “poor and dependents were exempt from paying this special tax, and it was progressive – it increased in proportion to one’s wealth – but not progressive enough to avoid creating substantial hardship in some cases.”

²²² Kelsay, *Arguing the Just War in Islam*, 39-40

²²³ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 64-65.

²²⁴ Such abuse of power in the Caliphate period at the expense of the *dhimmi* served to fuel inter-religious conflict for centuries to come, as the struggle for control over (rather than control with) dictated the terms of social interaction and legal rights for communities involved. In the contemporary context, Islamic scholar Hamid Dabashi argues that Islam “is only in power when it is not in power, and it loses legitimacy when it is in power.” He continues: “The only way that this innate paradox at the heart of Islam can be put to work for a permanent good is for Islam no longer to be triumphalist but tolerant, aware of its own

corrupt and misguided Muslim” would always rank higher than a non-Muslim *dhimmi*, in a court the word of a non-Muslim *dhimmi* was inferior to the testimony of a Muslim, and if a non-Muslim were murdered the crime was never treated as severely as that of the murder of a Muslim.²²⁵

Transgression against the practice of the early Islamic community and contrary to the principles of justice in the sacred text is visible in the policy of discrimination as seen by some scholars.²²⁶ It is thought that the Pact (*‘adh*) of ‘Umar officially began the policy of discrimination in exchange for protection. The Pact of ‘Umar was a document offered by the Christians of Syria to ‘Umar upon the emergence of Muslim rule, although there is debate whether it can truly be attributed to the 634-644 CE rule of the second caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khattab.²²⁷ For example, ‘Umar is credited with the following statement that was given to the residents of Jerusalem after their defeat in 638 CE:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. This is a written document from ‘Umar b. al-Khattab to the inhabitants of the Sacred House. You are guaranteed your life, your goods, and your churches, which will neither be occupied nor destroyed, as long as you do not initiate anything [to endanger] the general security.²²⁸

If the rule of ‘Umar had been truly discriminatory, the above letter would have made little sense.²²⁹ Instead, according to Sachedina, the development

polyfocality, and in that awareness and tolerance not just to resist the abuse of power but also the temptation of power." Hamid Dabashi, *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire*, (Taylor and Francis, 2008), 22. Of course, the same could be said for Judaism and Christianity.

²²⁵ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 64-65.

²²⁶ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 65. The Pact of ‘Umar can be found in English in Bernard Lewis, *Islam: From the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople, vol. 2: Religion and Society*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 217-222.

²²⁷ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 65, 66-67.

²²⁸ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 65 referring to an Arabic language source, Ahmad b. Abī Ya’qūb, *Ta’rīkh al-ya’qūbī*, ed. Muhammad Sādiq Bahr al-‘Ulūm, (Najaf: al-Maktaba al-Haydariyya, 1394/1974), vol. 2, 135.

²²⁹ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 65. Sachedina argues in footnote 9 (150) that “most of the major historical sources that deal with the caliphate of the Umayyad ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz (717-720) and of the ‘Abbasid al-Mutawakkil (847-861) mention carrying out such [discriminatory] measures against the people of the Book...[and

of these practices appears to have taken effect among the jurists of the eighth and ninth century who justified these practices the “documentary evidence...[from] the early community, whose prestige in such matters was a source of authentication for...[the] jurists’ extrapolations.”²³⁰ By contrast, Sachedina argues the Prophet Muhammad denounced injustice and the oppression of the *dhimmi*, saying: “On the Day of Judgment I myself will act as the accuser of any person who oppresses a person under the protection (*dhimma*) of Islam, and lays excessive [financial or other social] burdens on him.”²³¹ Moreover, the hadith *Sahih al-Bukhari* includes a chapter heading “One should fight for the protection of the *ahl al-dhimma* and they should not be enslaved,” and in that chapter Bukhari writes:

Umar (after he was stabbed), instructed (his would-be-successor) saying, “I urge him (i.e. the new Caliph) to take care of those non-Muslims who are under the protection of Allah and His Apostle in that he should observe the convention agreed upon with them, and fight on their behalf (to secure their safety) and he should not over-tax them beyond their capability.”²³²

Derrida notes that in Muslim contexts, one can draw a connection between the term *ger* (stranger, *hôte*) and the terms *giwar* and *dakhil*. Derrida describes *giwar* as a “noun of action” that “means both protection and neighborliness, protection of him who is *gar*.”²³³ Similarly, according to Derrida, *dakhil* refers to an “intimate, [an] *hôte* to whom protection is due,

t]he latter is also well known for his persecution of the Shi’ites.” Therefore, one wonders if it is the wrong ‘Umar to whom this pact has been attributed?

²³⁰ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 65. Sachedina gives the following example: “Thus, for instance, the prohibition against building new churches or repairing old ones, which was instituted under some Umayyad and ‘Abbasid caliphs, did not prevail in the early decades, because it is well documented that non-Muslims erected such places of worship following the conquest.”

²³¹ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, fn 12 (151) from Ahmad b. Yahya al-Balādhūrī, *Futūh al-Buldān*, ed. M.J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1866), 162. English translation in Philip Khuri Hitti, *The Origins of the Islamic State*, vol. 1, (New York: Columbia University, 1916).

²³² *Sahih al-Bukhari* vol. 4, bk. 52, no. 287. Referenced in Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 66-67. As a result, Sachedina argues it could prove difficult to verify the authenticity of Pact of ‘Umar in relation to “its representation of the situation of the non-Muslims in the early days of Islam.

²³³ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 401

stranger, passing traveler.”²³⁴ In the same vein as *dhimmi*, the “right of *dakhil* would be a right of asylum witnessed everywhere in the Semitic world.”²³⁵

Derrida declares these two terms also “share a connotation of holiness when they are both invoked...to refer to the protection of a holy site or to what is protected by a holy site or by a deity,” implying “the *hôte* or stranger is holy, divine, protected by divine blessing.”²³⁶

In addition to the legal obligation of *dhimmi*, there is another important form of protection provided under the realm of later Islamic rule. It was traditionally accepted that any Muslim could grant “an individual or a small group of *harbīs* (‘combatants,’ citizens of Dar al-Harb)...a certificate of safe conduct,” or *amān*.²³⁷ A leader or commanding official could also grant *amān* “to a whole city, region, or to traders, religious pilgrims (e.g., to Jerusalem), and travelers as a class.”²³⁸ A certificate of *amān* was temporary, however, and upon its expiration, those under its protection who wished to remain within the jurisdiction of Muslim rule “could then assume the status” of *dhimmi*.²³⁹ In later years, certificates of *amān* “were largely replaced by state treaties between Christian and Muslim authorities” because of an expansion in trade.²⁴⁰

²³⁴ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 401. Edward Said emphasizes *al-dakhil* in his writing based in the context of Palestine, giving two possible meanings that are not necessarily contrary to Derrida’s claim, but portrays it in a different light. According to Said, *al-dakhil* refers to the interior, and, in the first instance, refers to the “regions of the interior of Israel, to territories and people still Palestinian despite the interdictions of the Israeli presence,” (269) whereas, in the second instance, “it refers to privacy” so that what is “on the inside is protected by both the wall of solidarity formed by members of the group, and the hostile enclosure created around us by the more powerful” (270). It would seem *dakhil*, then, is closely linked with boundaries of protection of or from threat. Edward W. Said, *The Edward Said Reader*, Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin, eds. (London: Granta Publications, 2000).

²³⁵ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 401.

²³⁶ Derrida, *Acts of Religion*, 401.

²³⁷ Denny, “Islam and Peacebuilding”, in *Religion and Peacebuilding*, 137. Denny attributes his material on *amān* is derived principally from Joseph Schacht’s article “Aman,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), vol. 1, pp. 429-430. He also notes “a great deal of important as well as detailed and fascinating information on the *amān* is contained in Al-Shaybani’s (750-803/805 CE) *Siyar* (conduct of war and peace), translated by Majid Khadduri as ‘The Islamic Law of Nations,’...[whose] contents are based on the teachings of the great Iraqi jurisconsults Abu Hanifa (d. 700-767 CE), and Abu Yusuf (d. 795), two founders of the most flexible and liberal of Sunni legal schools, the Hanafiya.”

²³⁸ Denny, “Islam and Peacebuilding,” 137.

²³⁹ Denny, “Islam and Peacebuilding,” 137.

²⁴⁰ Denny, “Islam and Peacebuilding,” 137.

Another legal obligation for protection in the context of Islamic rule occurs in the case of those who have been exiled under threat of persecution or have emigrated in order to spread the cause of Islam.²⁴¹ Surah 8:72 details a situation in which believers – although, in all likelihood, it applies to fellow Muslims – need protection, assistance, and mutual support:

Surely, those who believed, and emigrated, and strove with their money and their lives in the cause of GOD, as well as those who hosted them and gave them refuge, and supported them, they are allies of one another. As for those who believe, but do not emigrate with you, you do not owe them any support, until they do emigrate. However, if they need your help, as brethren in faith, you shall help them, except against people with whom you have signed a peace treaty. GOD is Seer of everything you do.²⁴²

Later, Surah 8:74 notes those who give these individuals – refugees, exiles, and emigrants – shelter and protective hospitality are “indeed...true believers.”²⁴³ This text parallels Surah 4:100 which exhorts those who emigrate or are refugees for the cause of God to remember there will be many refuges available to them throughout the earth, along with a reward from God for his/her obedience, even unto death.

Ideally, the legal emphasis in Islam informs its ideals of protection and gives the various imperatives described above legal and moral authority. Development of a system of protection over the centuries formed what are now considered “human rights” in Islam, rights available to each person “regardless of his or her religion or nationality: the right to life (*nafs*), the right to religion (*din*), the right to freedom (*‘aql*), the right to property (*mal*),

²⁴¹ There are some obvious parallels here with the cities of refuge idea – protection given to those who must flee, who are under threat of a persecutor – although the structure by which this protection is given as well as the connotations of manslaughter that are present in the Hebrew text are absent here. Instead, here the emphasis is upon alliance and mutual support in the cause of God.

²⁴² From the Khalifa interpretation, known as *Quran: The Final Testament*, originally published in 1981 and revised in 1989, 1992. Again, the use of *jihad* is present in the phrase “strove with their money and their lives in the cause of GOD.”

²⁴³ From the Sher Ali interpretation, also known as *The Holy Qur’an*, 1955.

and the right to dignity (*'ird*).”²⁴⁴ Within those rights lies the imperative for protection of the threatened other as a part of Islamic spirituality and legal tradition.²⁴⁵ Concurrently, the development of the idea of the *ummah* and role of the *dhimmi* in a pluralist Islamic society has an authoritative precedent in the tradition and its implementation; and the silence of a more inclusive interpretation in the development of later ideas signals additional consideration to be made regarding its recovery in a contemporary context. As has been explored here, the evolution of this radical idea that “the People are one community” provides a basis for an ethical paradigm and “theological pluralism that presupposes the divinely ordained equivalence and equal rights of all human beings,” enabling the possibility for members of the faithful community to work together in order to “build a working consensus of values and goals.”²⁴⁶

²⁴⁴ Mustafa Čerić, “Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Hope or Fear of our Times,” in *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, James L. Heft, ed., (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 53. In the context of human rights, Čerić gives the example of Turkey and the Ottoman empire preceding it, declaring that for centuries it has “served as major places of refuge for people suffering from persecution, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, from the fourteenth century to the present” (52) referring to the work of Jewish scholar Stanford J. Shaw, *Turkey and the Holocaust* (London: Ipswich Books, 1993), 1. It would seem that in the current context related to uprisings and political violence in Syria, it may continue to be true.

²⁴⁵ A critique to this is that in some contexts Muslims do not always grant these rights to each other, let alone anyone outside of Islam. The power dynamic (whether or not Islam is in control) and Islam’s relationship to state authority historically and in the contemporary context serve to temper the ideal presented here. Nonetheless, the ideal exists, is considered authoritative by Islamic scholars as presented here, and should be analyzed. See Akbar S. Ahmed, *Discovering Islam: Making Sense of Muslim History and Society*, revised ed., (New York: Routledge, 2002) and Yohanan Friedmann, *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) for more moderate, yet realistic, analyses of these issues.

²⁴⁶ Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 28. Sachedina refers to the development of a “global ethic” in the form of Hans Küng, which he describes in footnote 12 (146) as “the fundamental consensus relating to binding values, ultimate standards, and basic personal attitudes between the religions that enable them to lead the way for society as a whole by their good example.” See Hans Küng and Karl-Josef Kuschel, eds. *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World’s Religions* (London: SCM Press, 1993), 21.

3. Observations

Clearly, Islam's more legal and justice-oriented approach to its relationship with the other has different emphases from the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible texts explored previously, yet this difference is not negative. In the Jewish and Christian traditions, the approach to strangers has primarily been less concrete.²⁴⁷ Islam's contribution to this discussion is a more direct approach, a declaration of who is to be protected, how one should be hospitable, and the development of a culture that continues to enforce its practice.

Islamic scholar Farish Noor argues that for a religious tradition "to engage in any meaningful dialogue with the Other, [they] first begin by opening the way for dialogue within."²⁴⁸ Noor's claim highlights the delusion that each tradition – Judaism, Christianity and Islam – is pure and monolithic, a perception upheld by conservative voices fearful of risk, "dissent and heterodoxy."²⁴⁹ This delusion stands in direct opposition to the reality that each tradition's internal heterogeneity requires its adherents to come to terms with internal and external pluralism if they desire health and wellbeing for their own followers and the neighbors God has commanded them to protect. Noor encourages this need to come to terms with pluralism by stating that "[r]ecognizing the multiplicity within ourselves opens the way for us to recognize the multiplicity of the other as well," and opening the eyes of the faithful to the reality that the threatened or poor "in the Muslim world may come to realize...their poverty [and danger] is shared by others beyond their faith community as well."²⁵⁰

For Noor, and as it has been argued in these chapters, "recognition of the other as similar to the self is the first step toward building effective collaborative coalitions and alliances" that can address the needs of the

²⁴⁷ At least in contemporary application. One could argue, however, that the injunctions to welcome the stranger in Leviticus and Deuteronomy *are* concrete, and certainly carry legal weight.

²⁴⁸ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 326.. Noor is speaking on behalf of Islam, but the assertion is not unique to the Muslim context.

²⁴⁹ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 326.

²⁵⁰ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 327.

global community and ensure one another's safety as relationships are inevitably formed.²⁵¹ In order to do this, protective hospitality is a contributing factor to this outcome. The foundations are present with the Abrahamic traditions, and as the texts explored here illustrate, they continue to inspire protective hospitality centuries after their composition and canonization. It is time for this positive potential for cooperative theology and practice related to protective hospitality to be given specific attention by the Abrahamic communities themselves.

Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed significant textual traditions of the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible and the Qur'an and extra-textual sources of Islam to consider the theology and practice of protective hospitality. The honor code discussed in previous chapters has been made all the more apparent as interpretations of the texts highlighted the overall values of protection of guests and affirmation of life as an expression of honor, even in the face of serious threat.

Though the texts reveal both positive and negative examples of protective hospitality in the texts, the imperative that hosts are required to

²⁵¹ Noor, "What is the Victory of Islam?," 327. Noor cites the examples of the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa or the civil rights movement in the U.S. where inter-religious cooperation served to address needs greater than the boundaries of particular religious communities. Furthermore, Noor argues from a Muslim context stating, "If we as Muslims are able to engage the world, we can help them see the tragedies in Bosnia, in Palestine, in Gurjarat, in Kashmir, and elsewhere are not just 'Muslim issues' but are human catastrophes and gross violations of universal human rights. Only if we can engage the Christian and the Jew and the Hindu and the agnostic who care about the well-being of all human beings will we get them to care about the well-being of all Muslims. That will only happen if Muslims reciprocate by being as concerned about the welfare of all as about that of Muslims." (329). Noor makes a very important point here: concern for the other requires an ability to look outside of one's tradition and self for the needs of others. Therefore, for example, Noor's statement would require Muslims to be concerned about the safety and security of Israeli Jews as well as the needs of the Palestinian Muslims. Similarly, fellow Islamic scholar Abdulaziz Sachedina argues for religious pluralism as a working paradigm "for a democratic, social pluralism in which people of diverse religious backgrounds are willing to form a community of global citizens." Sachedina, *Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*, 35. Sachedina uses global ethic in the form of Hans Küng, described in footnote 12 (146) as "the fundamental consensus relating to binding values, ultimate standards, and basic personal attitudes between the religions that enable them to lead the way for society as a whole by their good example. See Küng and Kuschel, *A Global Ethic*, 21.

go to extraordinary lengths to protect those who are guests and be willing to commit to or give oneself over for the life of another is apparent.

Furthermore, the sanctions in texts related to the cities of refuge and the Constitution of Medina assert the social and legal constructs in the Jewish and Islamic traditions to provide refuge and protection for endangered others.

Overall, however, the textual emphasis on the practice of protective hospitality reflects the direct relationship protective hospitality has with justice. This emphasis also illustrates the positive potential that exists for protective hospitality to inform and perpetuate a cooperative theology and ethic among the Abrahamic traditions of solidarity with individuals, groups and communities who are threatened by injustice and violence.

Chapter Six: Protective Hospitality in Bosnia

Real religion teaches us that we must assume responsibility for helping the weakest, most damaged people around us. We must stand up for them inside our own communities. If we don't, we become partners in the evil...

- Rusmir Mahmutćehajić¹

Introduction

Throughout this research, a methodology which emphasizes inter-religious life together, the realities of the marginalized and seemingly powerless, and the importance of grounding theological thought in lived experience has been utilized. Furthermore, this research argues that there is merit to the idea that there is a common theology and ethic of protective hospitality in the Abrahamic traditions, that Christian practice of protective hospitality can be enhanced by considering the same practice in Jewish and Muslim communities, and that there is a positive potential for protective hospitality to make a contribution to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, reconciliation, and the development of an inter-religious “cooperative theology” on behalf of the threatened other. In light of this, the inclusion and analysis of a few case studies that both illustrate and problematize the research presented thus far is useful. Therefore, this chapter examines examples of protective hospitality as practiced in Bosnia which were chosen based on the following five criteria.

First, adherents of each of the Abrahamic traditions are present in Bosnia, including both Eastern and Western Christianity represented by Croat Roman Catholicism and Serb Orthodoxy.² Because of the sustained presence

¹ Mahmutćehajić is a scholar and Muslim theologian who works for International Forum, Bosnia and was quoted in Donald W. Shriver, Jr. and Peggy L. Shriver, “Open Wounds,” *Christian Century*, 6-13 June 2001, 5.

² I recognize that there is some tension between this case study and the earlier emphasis on Western Christianity detailed in the introduction. However, this tension is inevitable given Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Western Roman Catholicism is the reality

of Jewish, Muslim, and Christian communities over the centuries in Bosnia, it provides a context whereby inter-religious relationships can be legitimately considered and analyzed through the lens of protective hospitality.

Second, the context of conflict, both in the 1990s and the vivid legacy of historical conflicts from the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires to World Wars I and II, give a very practical dimension to the realities of memory and the threatened other. Memories of evil and good in the context of various conflicts are very present in the memory of Bosnians, regardless of their ethno-religious identification. Any evidence of protective hospitality being practiced will be inevitably tempered by the equally evidential reality of the horrors of genocide and crimes against humanity that were committed, allowing for both illustration and problematization of previous chapters' arguments.

Third, the religious contributions and complexities to the aforementioned conflicts in relation to Bosnia make for richer and more realistic case studies. The methodological approach of this research necessitates that any theological constructions be built with the complexities and conflicts of religious life as a matter of course. On a theoretical level, it is tempting to apply the arguments of this research to Abrahamic life and practice. This temptation, however, should be indulged only so far as the realities of religious experience in contexts of conflict, such as in Bosnia, allow.

Fourth, the nominal adherence to religious life in contemporary Bosnia mirrors in many ways the same approach to religion in most Western societies, particularly seen in religious service attendance and attitudes toward religion in civil discourse.³ Such a criteria is valuable in an effort to

in the Bosnian context.

³ See David Herbert, "Religion and European Identities," in *Exploring European Identities*, Christina Chimisso, ed. (Milton Keynes, UK: The Open University, 2003), 183-226 and *Religion and Civil Society: Rethinking Public Religion in the Contemporary World*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 229-264. Noel Malcolm refers to survey results published in 1985 which determined only seventeen percent of Bosnians were religiously active. Hugh Poulton, *The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict*, (London: Minority Rights Group, 1991), 43 in

counteract potential critiques that theological and ethical formulations in relation to protective hospitality are irrelevant to an increasingly secular Western context. Despite the ethno-religious identifications that are prevalent in Bosnia, secularity and popular responses to religious conversations will have an impact on this research and must be taken into consideration.

Lastly, my own personal understanding of the Bosnian culture, 1990s conflict, and the various related dimensions provided familiarity making nuanced analysis more possible. As a result, I was able to return to Bosnia to pursue first-hand the questions pertaining to this research, speaking with religious leaders, laity, and practitioners of protective hospitality, in order to supplement the research with case studies based on lived experience.

Yet, as indicated in the criteria, there are aspects that make Bosnia as a context for case studies pertaining to this research problematic. A defining issue in the conflict with Bosnia is religion, for religion and its corresponding communal, national and political identities dictated accent, language, particular traditions and way of dress regardless if one were devout or secular. To say that religion had no role in this conflict is to say that the various expressions found within Bosnia had no importance to the people who identified themselves by their ethnic group's religious identification and its accompanying accoutrements, which is simply not true in most cases.⁴ For an outsider, it is easy to experience Bosnia and think that faith plays little or no role in the lives of the majority of the people who live there.⁵ Nevertheless, religious traditions define each of the ethnic groups, whether the religious faith is actively embraced or only nominally held.⁶ Much of the

Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*, (London: Macmillan, 1996), 222.

⁴ Zoran Brajovic reflects this argument in his essay "The Potential of Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *Peacebuilding and Civil Society in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ten Years After Dayton*, Martina Fischer, ed., (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007), 185-214, see 195.

⁵ Conversely, one could also argue that faith *must* play an important role considering the number of religious buildings that are present. Neither perception provides an accurate picture.

⁶ When using the word "ethnic", one must be careful to understand ethnicity as it is found in Bosnia. It is not ethnic division as seen in the U.S. between African-Americans, Hispanics, and Caucasians. Instead, ethnicity is defined in Bosnia by one's faith – Muslim, Roman Catholic, Serbian Orthodox, or Jew, for example. There are no marked differences in

material in the following case studies is not directly or overtly theological. Nonetheless, it can be used to illustrate and complicate the research argument by exploring and analyzing the realities, triumphs and challenges of protective hospitality in a context where Abrahamic traditions exist, noting the positive potential and obstacles that exist for the development of a contextual, cooperative theology that is focused upon providing sanctuary for the threatened other.

In pursuing this task, certain acknowledgements need to be made. First, the practice of hospitality existed long before organized, institutionalized religion took root. In many cases, the invasion of armies with their corresponding religious beliefs served to give additional meaning or a new lens through which to view an ethic of relating to others that may have existed in an earlier form.⁷ Yet, for the purpose of this research, what is important is what adherents of the Abrahamic traditions do here and now, informed by their current religious practice.

Second, for reasons given in the next section, I will not go into detail on the religious motivations for providing protective hospitality in the context of wartime Bosnia. Instead, I will utilize the cases to highlight both positive potential for faith-based resources available and how these might have informed behavior despite the reality that oftentimes people find it difficult to articulate why they do what they do. While most often the answer is “It’s just what we do,” analyzing those actions in light of the resources within the Abrahamic traditions for protective hospitality provides a means to open up new ways of thinking.

appearance to ascertain one’s ethnicity, but one’s ethnicity is primarily known by one’s given name, family history, and annual holidays (if faith is only nominal). Therefore, “ethnic” is often interchangeable with “religious” in the Bosnian context. The Roma, on the other hand, are an anomaly to this framework in almost every respect, but will not be discussed here since the community was not a major player in the conflict either positively or negatively as far as has been documented.

⁷ For example, some attribute the code of besa in Albanian culture (as mentioned in Chapter Two), which obligated someone to provide sanctuary to anyone who came to one’s door and requested it, as an ethic given stronger by Islam. It may have existed and was practiced by Albanians before the advent of Islam, but some argue that Islam helped to improve and codify it further, going so far as to say “there is no Besa without the Qur’an.” “BESA...When Muslims Saved Jews,” *Islam Times*, 31 August 2009, <http://www.islamtimes.org/vdgc379q.ak9zz4j5ra.html>, last accessed on 19 September 2011.

The absence of articulation is significant, but it should not, however, be viewed negatively. Interpretations of culture are normal and are not predicated by articulation, or even awareness, by individuals and communities themselves as to the reasoning for their beliefs and practices. While people may not be able to detail the *why*, it does not mean that the *why* is absent. In this way, it is possible that an observer might be able to infer religious values in the experience and actions of individuals and communities of which the community itself may be unaware.⁸

In the context of post-war Bosnia, this was the case for protective hospitality, even where individuals do not seem to be conscious of its imperatives within Abrahamic belief and practice. Therefore, the purpose of these case studies is to identify elements of protective hospitality that can be best understood and interpreted in the context of religious traditions.⁹

The chapter begins with an exploration of the inter-religious and cultural as well as historical and political context of Bosnia as it pertains to the case studies and the practice of protective hospitality. The inter-religious and cultural context is presented in order to illustrate the ethno-religious diversity in Bosnia and the cultural values of hospitality and honor in Bosnian culture. The historical and political context is provided to highlight the reality that each particular ethno-religious collective and its corresponding resurgence of communal memory of past suffering and concerns about purity had higher value than one's neighbors after the fall of communism.

The second, third and fourth sections are three case studies centered upon the Jewish Community of Sarajevo, the village of Baljvine in

⁸ Such an exercise of inference and interpretation is often utilized by anthropologists, who identify meaning, background and contextual information to explain cultural and social values of a community or group.

⁹ Throughout the conversations conducted in Bosnia for the purposes of this research, the answer "I don't know why...I just did" was given in relation to question such as "Why did you provide protective hospitality?," indicating an inability to articulate theological or ethical motivation for their actions. While some may attribute this to the absence of religious motivation, within the context of the methodology of this research, I argue that perhaps I can say why: because they're Muslim, or Christian, or Jewish. Just because they cannot articulate theologically motivated ethics does not mean they do not exist. Additionally, in the post-communist context of Bosnia, such actions on behalf of the threatened other indicate at least a belief in *something*, either in religious faith, faith in humanity, etc.

northwestern Bosnia, and the life and work of Franciscan Friar Ivo Marković, respectively. Each case study is presented in two parts: a narrative that tells a story of protective hospitality as practiced in each setting, and an analysis which examines the factors that informed the practice of protective hospitality and lessons that can be extrapolated from the narrative. Themes related to the practice of protective hospitality that arise within the case studies are: power and use of memory and reciprocity; the significance that hospitality is practiced in the margins of society; the risks and threats to purity involved; and the clear links hospitality has with peacemaking, conflict transformation and reconciliation efforts.

The fifth section provides a brief final analysis, in light of the three case studies and the research as a whole. First, the final analysis considers the role of religious faith and theological understanding to the articulation of meaning and motivations of protective hospitality and its practice. Second, it argues that the credibility of positive narratives hinges upon the confession of negative narratives if they are to be used to form greater communal narratives of protective hospitality. Third, it calls for an understanding of difference and value for diversity as embodiment of hospitality within inter-religious cooperation rather than attempting to build foundations upon false ideas of homogenization. Finally, it addresses the relationship between protective hospitality and a wider framework of peacemaking, conflict transformation and reconciliation in contexts of conflict.

1. Setting the Stage: Overview of Bosnia

Within the confines of this dissertation, the English term “Bosnian” (*bosnac/bosanci* in the local language) will be used to refer to anyone who is a citizen of Bosnia and Hercegovina, regardless of ethno-religious identity.¹⁰

¹⁰ This decision is merely pragmatic, with an acknowledgement that the inclusive use of the term “Bosnian” to refer to everyone in Bosnia is still problematic. It is commonly known that many (but not all) Serbs and Croats in Bosnia do not refer to themselves as Bosnian (*bosnac/bosanci*) in an effort to differentiate themselves from what they perceive to be an appropriation of the term “Bosnian,” as well as the nation itself, by the Muslim community within Bosnia.

As for the ethno-religious labels used herein, “Serb” is commonly used to refer to someone who identifies oneself as Serbian Orthodox within the boundaries of Bosnia, whereas “Serbian” is used to refer to a citizen of Serbia; “Croat” is the Roman Catholic equivalent in Bosnia, while “Croatian” is a citizen of Croatia.¹¹ These terms will be used as they currently stand. However, since the war, the academic literature has utilized the term “Bošnjak”¹² which was adopted in 1993, and serves to differentiate the ethnic group from the religion.¹³ This differentiation is similar to how “Serb” and “Croat” function linguistically and ideologically in Bosnia.

Yet the distinction is also problematic, as are “Serb” and “Croat,” in that it further embeds the national division implying for some that Bosnians are Muslims, and if one is not Muslim, one is not Bosnian.¹⁴ For a Serb or Croat in Bosnia to refer to himself or herself as Bošnjak would be almost comedic, or, alternatively, a strong political statement. The problem lies in the reality that the term Bošnjak does not encourage Serbs or Croats to consider themselves “Bosnian” or to invest in a nation in which they reside as they do not identify with it on an ethno-religious level. Their ethnic, religious, cultural and political home is, for many, ultimately in Serbia or Croatia respectively, not Bosnia. Nevertheless, while they need to be acknowledged, the tensions in language and labels within the context of Bosnia is greater than the remit of this chapter or even this dissertation.

¹¹ However, the terms “Serb” and “Croat” are used outside of Bosnia as well, in cases where the two groups live in proximity to one another, such as in the Eastern Slavonian region of Croatia, where the 1990s conflict was primarily between Serbs and Croats.

¹² Sometimes seen as Bosniac or Bosniak in anglicized spellings.

¹³ However, the religious identification is still one of the most important defining markers in ethno-religious classification in Bosnia. The usage of “Muslim” (or *Musliman* in Bosnian) was historically used to describe this group and continues to be used in informal conversation. Yet, in September 1993, the *Bošnjački sabor* (Bošnjak Assembly) “declared ‘Bosniac’ (*Bošnjak*) to be the new national name,” and was adopted in 1995 into the post-Dayton Agreement Bosnian Constitution as an official term. It is noted, however, that the term Bošnjak “should not be confused with the term ‘Bosnian’ (*Bosaniac*), which applies to all inhabitants of Bosnia-Herzegovina.” See “Introduction,” in Xavier Bougarel, Elissa Helms, and Ger Duizings, eds. *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*, (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 1, ftn 3.

¹⁴ This issue has been dealt with in a variety of ways in Bougarel, et al, *The New Bosnian Mosaic*.

a. Inter-religious & Cultural Context

Bosnia is situated in southeastern Europe among the Dinarian Alps with terrain that is as beautifully diverse as its people. While Bosnia today is still largely rural and comprised of villages and towns that are mostly homogeneous in their ethnic make-up,¹⁵ the cosmopolitan nature of Sarajevo connects Bosnia culturally with the rest of Europe. Both aspects - the traditions, values and communal identity of rural life and the cosmopolitan, pluralistic nature of Sarajevo's city center - exemplify Bosnian culture and tradition.¹⁶

Within Bosnia, either in rural or urban contexts, the ritual of hospitality is quite important. According to anthropologist Tone Bringa, who conducted field research in a mixed Muslim and Croat village in Central Bosnia in 1987-1988, she determined hospitality and its "related social exchange was the basis for neighborliness."¹⁷ While Bringa's research was conducted prior to the war and the ethnic make-up of the sample village has shifted, the customs related to hospitality remain the same even in Bosnia's

¹⁵ The ethnic make-up of Bosnia shifted dramatically after the war. In towns and villages that were historically mixed, the population shifted after the war towards one majority ethnic group over another, which serves as an proof that in a post-conflict context marked by sectarianism, people most often return to areas where they feel safe by being in a majority population. Within the entities set up by the 1995 Dayton Agreement, the Bošnjak-Croat Federation of Bosnia and Hercegovina (51% of the territory) is comprised of towns and villages which are majority Muslim or Croat. Within Republika Srpska (49% of the territory), most towns and villages are majority Serb, with a few enclaves of Muslims in places where refugees and displaced persons have returned. For those who have returned as minority groups, such as Bošnjaks who have returned to Foča and Višegrad which are now in the Republika Srpska, it is understood that they take greater risks in returning to a place where they are in the minority. See Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2008 - Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 31 January 2008, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/47a87bf91d.html>, accessed 29 August 2011 and Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council, *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Sectarian divide continues to hamper residual return and reintegration of the displaced*, 25 October 2006, available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/560E20B7FCCB0555C1257212003CA532/\\$file/Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina%20-October%202006.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/560E20B7FCCB0555C1257212003CA532/$file/Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina%20-October%202006.pdf), accessed 29 August 2011.

¹⁶ There is a clear cultural divide between the urban heart of Sarajevo and the rural/village influences of the rest of Bosnia. During the war and the post-conflict climate afterwards as the population of Bosnia shifted dramatically, native Sarajevans were distressed that the cosmopolitan city they once knew was disappearing as those from rural areas who were not as accustomed to living in close proximity to the other began to inhabit the city, bringing more exclusive ways of being with them.

¹⁷ Tone Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 65-66.

post-war context.¹⁸ For Bringa, the ethno-religious composition of the Bosnian village required “at one level, sharing certain characteristics with covillagers irrespective of *nacija*” (“nationality,” used in the context of communal identity).¹⁹ However, she acknowledges, there is another level of living together in the village that “meant belonging to an exclusive *nacija*.”²⁰ It is safe to say that most everyone in Bosnia is aware of which community they belong to and what is expected of them as a result.²¹

The rituals of hospitality within both urban and rural contexts are found in the social activity of individuals and communities. The most important of these is found in the ritual of coffee visits. “*Dođi na kafu*,” meaning literally “Come on a coffee”²² is a common informal invitation extended to a potential guest, although it is given more as an imperative or command, such as “You will come to me for coffee.” These coffee visits are, “not only the major social activity...but [also]...critical in integrating” individuals and communities of different ethnic groups in a particular area.²³ Bringa articulates this importance by noting that the visits enhance “Bosnian identity by the act of sharing the cultural value of hospitality and using a shared cultural code.”²⁴

Furthermore, the rituals of hospitality, exemplified in having coffee but present in other situations, form a system of “social exchange” within Bosnian culture. This system of exchange takes many forms and can entail the giving of gifts and voluntary work in addition to the “institutionalized visiting patterns” and other rituals of hospitality. The exchange is formed by

¹⁸ I know this from my own personal experience living and working in Bosnia for three years and visiting various locations and communities throughout the country during that time and in subsequent visits.

¹⁹ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way* 66.

²⁰ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way* 66.

²¹ The division seen in Bosnia in many ways mirrors similar ethno-religious divisions in similar contexts, like Northern Ireland. The difficulty arises, however, in cases of mixed relationships and the children that are produced as a result, or in cases where individuals for whatever reason do not live up to the accepted nationalist standards related to language, accent, religious identity (not necessarily adherence), cultural heritage of given name, dress and appearance, schooling, etc.

²² The preposition *na*, literally meaning “on,” indicates the cultural idea that coffee is an event to be experienced rather than a beverage to be consumed.

²³ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 67.

²⁴ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 67.

obligations that arise as a result of actions and serve to inform and uphold a wider “cultural ethos of honor and hospitality.”²⁵ Therefore, according to the rule of exchange and honor as seen in the practice of hospitality, if one receives an invitation to coffee, one is obliged to return the invitation within a reasonable amount of time; if one assists in the construction of a neighbor’s house, the neighbor is then obliged to assist in similar work. This voluntary work carried out and shared by neighbors is an expression of hospitality within the Bosnian context, as it carries with it “a strong moral obligation to help all those who had once helped you,” according to Bringa.²⁶ Therefore, to neglect reciprocity, either in refusal or in delay, is equated with “refusing to accept...[and] to reject the bond of alliance and commonality.”²⁷ For this reason, hospitality provides a “central ritual of...social relations” outside the exclusive confines of ethno-religious identity.²⁸

As has been noted earlier, hospitality is closely connected with honor in the Bosnian context, for the Serb, Croat and Bošnjak. Similar to what was noted in Chapter Three in relation to the Muslim concept of *adab*, hospitality as it is practiced in Bosnia for each of the groups is “closely related to the reputation of individual households,” as seen in the usage of the verb *častiti*, meaning “to offer hospitality,” which is taken from the noun for honor (*čast*).²⁹ Bringa notes that a Bosnian household “gains social standing (“honor”) from the way it receives a guest.”³⁰ Similarly, the noun for hospitality, *gostoprinstvo* in Bosnian and Serbian or *gostoljubivost* in Croatian, connotes the importance of hospitality in the literal translations of

²⁵ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 68-69.

²⁶ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 70.

²⁷ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, (London: Routledge, 1990), 13 in Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 68-69.

²⁸ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 68-69, who also makes reference to the work of Sherry B. Ortner, *Sherpas Through Their Rituals*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

²⁹ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 69.

³⁰ Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 69. Yet, in my experience, this gain in social standing is not an end by which hospitality as a means is practiced. While such a statement reads as if the motivation for hospitality is quite self-centered, I never felt as if the potential to increase one’s honor was the reason I was invited into anyone’s home.

the terms, the state (*stvo/vost*) of putting the guest (*gost*) first (*prim*) or the state of loving or caring for (*ljubi*) one's guest.

Additionally, the role of the Muslim influence within Bosnia helped to form a historical reputation of hospitality. The conquest and rule of the Ottoman Empire in Bosnia was not without its faults, but it did serve to establish throughout the region a series of *tekija*, complexes built by the ruling sultans which usually included an inn (*han*), a kitchen, stables for traveler's animals, a mosque, and often a *madrasa* (Islamic school) as well as other amenities. Similar to the Christian monasteries throughout Europe, the establishment of *tekija* throughout the region helped to systematize hospitality, as the *tekija* was known as a place for guests to come and stay for three days without charge, to recuperate, or to find sanctuary.³¹

Nevertheless, the importance of individual hospitality remained within Bosnia and its various codes of practice continue to be in place in the current context. For example, guests are to be provided with all comforts, comforts even greater than the hosts, and are to be made to feel as a part of the family. Additionally, it is relatively common for a host not to bother one's guest with one's own personal problems or oppose the opinions of one's guest.³² Perhaps more problematic and less-practiced in a post-war context, hospitality is also to be given to all, even to one's enemies.³³ Finally, according to Bošnjak community leader Amra Pandžo, the command within the Islamic tradition to provide hospitality for a guest without question for three days remains. Yet, interestingly, within the context of war, Pandžo

³¹ Amra Pandžo, Bošnjak community leader and Islamic theologian, interview with author, 30 July 2010, Sarajevo, Bosnia. A *tekija* is also seen as *tekke* or called a *khanqah* in other geographic contexts. *Tekija/tekke* appears to be the term used within the realm of the Ottoman Empire and its corresponding Sufi influences. Some perceive them to have been more like Sufi monasteries. Cf. Bringa, *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*, 176-177; Noel Malcom, *Bosnia: A Short History*, (London: Macmillan, 1996); and Robert J. Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006). The limit to free hospitality for three days was as a result of an Islamic mandate found in the *hadith*, as has been mentioned previously in Chapter Three.

³² Pandžo, interview. It was my experience while living in post-war Bosnia that those who "bent the ear" of one's guests in order to gain something in return suffered in their reputation among the local population (and, as a result, international as well) with respect to honor and hospitality.

³³ Hospitality to enemies was justified in the preceding code of not opposing the opinions of one's guest. Pandžo, interview.

notes the three day limit does not apply and one is called upon to provide hospitality as long as one's guest needs it.³⁴

b. Historical & Political Context

Prior to the 1990s war, conflicts that occurred within Bosnia were largely brought in by outside forces, on whose opposing sides various groups in Bosnia gave allegiance. Intercommunal conflict is not documented on a widespread scale except for two occasions: when the newly independent Kingdom of Yugoslavia³⁵ was formed after World War I and then during World War II when allies to both sides of the conflict were found within Yugoslavia.³⁶ Nevertheless, within much of the literature and in current day discourse, one will encounter the over-simplified and perhaps naïve opinion that after World War II and prior to the fall of communism, the uniting factor between all Yugoslavians was the fact that they were Yugoslav above and beyond any ethnic or religious identification.³⁷ As was the case in most Eastern European communist block countries, religion was marginalized in both public and private life for most citizens.³⁸ On a personal level, a minority found it

³⁴ Pandžo referred to the efforts of her mother (Bošnjak) who continued to let a displaced Croat family live in a flat she owned for several years after the war rent-free because they had nowhere else to go and could not afford to live anywhere else. Pandžo, interview.

³⁵ Its official title was "Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes."

³⁶ Shriver and Shriver, "Open Wounds," 4. The reasons for this, however, could be that the rule of empires within the region (Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian) until those times served to quell any uprisings or conflict.

³⁷ Such an opinion assumes that there were no nationalist or ethnic tensions at any time prior to Tito's reign from 1943-1980. Historical record prior to the advent of Josip Broz Tito's reign refutes this, particularly in the time of World War II through which Tito fought. In fact, it could easily be determined that Tito's insistence upon a Yugoslav identity might have been directly related to the sectarianism he witnessed as a guerilla resistance leader for the Partizans during that same time. To wit, Tito's reign was based on suppression of national identity, not eradication or equalization. A concise but helpful discussion of the various theories as to the root of the conflict in Bosnia can be found in Douglas M. Johnston and Jonathon Eastvold, "History Unrequited: Religion as a Provocateur and Peacemaker in the Bosnian Conflict," in *Religion and Peacebuilding*, Harold Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds. (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004), 215-237.

³⁸ Marko Oršolić, Franciscan priest and Director of Zajedno (International Multicultural and Inter-Religious Cooperation), interview by author, 22 May 2003, Sarajevo, Bosnia.

important, but on the average, adherence to any particular faith was nominal and took precedence after loyalty to national interests.

As such, Yugoslavia's communist history inadequately prepared the nation for the rise in nationalism based on ethno-religious identity after the death of political leader Josip Broz Tito. The previous tendency within communism to marginalize faith had effectively disabled the ability to write and discuss religious ideas.³⁹ While such an ability would have encouraged a more dialogical environment in such an inter-religious population, the reality in Bosnia, and neighboring Serbia and Croatia, remained that the leaders and their populations had no vocabulary or model in their history at their disposal to keep nationalism within religious identification at bay. Theological understanding between the representative faiths was non-existent, which in turn allowed the heinous stereotypes and generalizations that led to objectification.

With the vacuum of religious language and meaning, religious identity that had at one time been ignored by political leadership was appropriated by the same and became synonymous with ethnic identity in post-communist Yugoslavia.⁴⁰ As nationalism began to increase, political factions developed claiming to defend their respective ethno-religious assets to create an environment for war and the breakup of the Yugoslav nation. During that war (1991-1995), religion was used by these nationalists to justify campaigns of evil, including systematic rape, genocide, and ethnic cleansing of entire towns and villages on every side. This abuse use of religion, however, according to Pandžo was an expression of collective religion, as opposed to individual religion. For Pandžo, collective expression of religion as seen in its nationalistic appropriation is "political and divisive," while individual religion is just that: "individual, private, and for the most part peaceful."⁴¹ Nevertheless, during the war, the individual aspect of religion abdicated

³⁹ Oršolić, interview.

⁴⁰ Johnston and Eastvold, "History Unrequited," 232-233.

⁴¹ Pandžo, interview. Similarly, Svetlana Broz includes a testimony in her book *Good People in Evil Times* that "politicians think one thing; the people think otherwise." Azra G., "Little Moscow," November 1998, in Broz, *Good People in an Evil Time*, Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans., (Sarajevo: Grafičar promet), 2002, 54.

much of its moral and ethical responsibility in the face of the collective. Conversely, the case studies that follow are instances where that abdication of responsibility to provide protective hospitality for the threatened other did not take place.

In Bosnia particularly, given the fact that it had a much more inter-religious population than neighboring areas, religion played an important nationalist role. Even though the religions represented (Judaism, Eastern and Western expressions of Christianity, and Islam) are faiths found throughout the world, adherents to each saw their faith as that which defined them as a people group.⁴² Furthermore, as nationalists with each ethnic sector raised tensions, the corresponding religion was called upon to sponsor the identity, creating a national religion.⁴³ As each group began to feel threatened and devotion to religious identity began to surge, leaders eventually used those same religions to justify campaigns of evil.⁴⁴

Ideally, one would hope for the divide to no longer be national and for religious identification to be according to personal convictions, but this has not happened and is unlikely to in the future. In today's Bosnian society, it is extremely unlikely that any Muslim will ever become Serbian Orthodox, nor will a Serbian Orthodox become Roman Catholic, for to change faiths is, in essence, to change ethnic identity. Religious conversion in the Bosnian context "is viewed as both religious apostasy and political treason," according to scholars Douglas Johnston and Jonathon Eastvold.⁴⁵ This awareness of one's identity as a Muslim, Roman Catholic, or Serbian Orthodox functioned as a dividing characteristic of defense from the other groups before the war and continues even in present Bosnian culture.⁴⁶

⁴² The Jewish presence in Bosnia played no role in the conflict whatsoever. Their role during the conflict and how they were/are perceived within Bosnian society will be explored in the case study related to the actions of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo.

⁴³ Ivan Cvitković, "Religions in War: The Example of Bosnia and Herzegovina," Paul Mojzes, trans., *Religion in Eastern Europe*, (December 2001), 33.

⁴⁴ U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), "Can Religion Heal Bosnia?," U.S. Institute of Peace PeaceWatch, October 1996, (<http://www.usip.org/pubs/PW/1096/bosnia.html>), accessed on January 14, 2003.

⁴⁵ Johnston and Eastvold, "History Unrequited," 232

⁴⁶ Cvitković, "Religions in War," 33. Even in the case of evangelical Christian missionary groups going into Bosnia after the war, there was a great amount of difficulty for

The rise in devotion among Bošnjaks is particularly interesting.⁴⁷ Prior to the war, most Bošnjaks were more folk-oriented instead of strict adherents to the tenets taught by the Qur'an and the prophet Mohammed. While not universal, many Bošnjaks had no reservations about eating pork, drinking alcohol or working throughout the day without stopping to pray. Only the devout fasted the month of Ramadan and for most everyone else the holidays of *Bajram*⁴⁸ gave great occasion for feasts and parties to which they would invite their Catholic and Orthodox neighbors before the war. Yet, when the winds of nationalism began to blow, a return to Islamic origins began to be discussed among political and religious leaders, not in the sense of a religious revival and renewed commitment to Islamic law but because there was a contemporary issue which necessitated it.⁴⁹ Anyone who was circumcised by Muslim practice was considered a Muslim, regardless of one's devotion to his faith. Their ethno-religious identity as a Bošnjak (Muslim) defined them as different from those of their neighbors' Christian life, and so many began to take those differences more seriously. Furthermore, Islam began to "symbolize belonging not only to a separate culture but also to a national community...and resistance to aggression."⁵⁰ Bošnjaks who actively practiced Islam often practiced as an act of defiance as the threat of annihilation became greater.⁵¹

converts, who were accused of betraying their people and "switching sides." Even then, most converts would still refer to themselves as a Muslim, Serb or Croat, and observe their tradition's holidays and customs in addition to the new practices they had adopted within evangelical Christianity.

⁴⁷ Cf. David Herbert, *Religion and Civil Society: Rethinking Public Religion in the Contemporary World*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 229-264; Mitja Velikonja, *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, Rang'ichi Ng'inja, trans., Eastern European Studies Series, (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2003), 278; and Johnston and Eastvold, "History Unrequited," 228-229.

⁴⁸ *Bajram* is the Bosnian name for *Eid* holidays during the month of Ramadan and at the end of the Hajj. The term *bajram* is a remnant of the Turkish influence in the region. The first *Ramazanski Bajram* ("Ramadan Bajram") is known as *Eid-ul-Fitr* in much of the Muslim world and *Drugi Bajram* ("second Bajram") or *Kurban Bajram* is known elsewhere as *Eid-al-Adha* or "Festival of Sacrifice," celebrating Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Ishmael in obedience to God's command.

⁴⁹ Cvitković, "Religions in War," 33.

⁵⁰ Cvitković, "Religions in War," 34.

⁵¹ Cvitković, "Religions in War," 35. For further discussion related to the rise of Islam in the discourse about national and political identity in Bosnia, see Kjell Magnusson, "Bosnia and Herzegovina," in *Islam Outside the Arab World*, David Westerlund and Ingvar Svanberg,

To further protect their respective communities from threat, nationalist political powers began to seek control over geographical territory.⁵² Under this grasping for territory lived a desire for homogeneity that sprang up from a fear of the other. This, in its simplest form, is the main cause for the spread of genocide and ethnic cleansing throughout the Bosnian war. While greed undoubtedly played a large role, nationalist politicians fed their constituents stories about the capabilities of the other and incited fear and animosity stemming from warped versions of history.⁵³ As a result, Johnston and Eastvold note that within each community some good people “believed that the other ethnoreligious groups were conspiring to exterminate them, [and, therefore,] they saw no choice but to resort to violence to protect themselves, their families, and their nation.”⁵⁴

One anomaly to this paradigm was the multi-ethnic city of Sarajevo.⁵⁵ While it would be naïve to portray it as a utopia, it was still a cosmopolitan city filled with every ethnic group who were living peacefully with one another before the war. But for four years, the former 1984 Winter Olympics city was under a siege that has been labeled as the longest and most brutal siege in modern history. Approximately 11,000 adults and 1,500 children were killed in Sarajevo as part of a larger war throughout Bosnia that claimed between 100,000-110,000 lives, displaced two million persons and destroyed tens of thousands of homes.⁵⁶ During the siege, Sarajevo became a prison for

eds. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 295-314; Velikonja, *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance*; and Ray Takeyh and Nikolas K. Gvosdev, *The Receding Shadow of the Prophet: The Rise and Fall of Radical Political Islam*, (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004), 77-104.

⁵² USIP, “Can Religion Heal Bosnia?”

⁵³ All sides were guilty of this, but the nationalist rhetoric within the Serbian context, particularly in relation to religious leadership, is well documented. Serbian Orthodox bishops from Bosnia have been criticized for scaring their Serb followers into believing that the Catholic Church was the “great enemy of Serbian Orthodoxy,” and had the ultimate goal of returning all “Orthodox Serbs to the ‘Mother Church.’” Furthermore, Serbian extremists preached that all Muslims were fundamentalists who have forgotten that they were all Serbs at one time, turning on their roots and callously attacking that from which they came. Cvitković, “Religions in War,” 36.

⁵⁴ Johnston and Eastvold, “History Unrequited,” 222

⁵⁵ Another anomaly was the village of Baljvine, which will be explored in the second case study.

⁵⁶ Cf. Eqa Tabeau and Jakub Bijak, “War-related Deaths in the 1992-1995 Armed Conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Critique of Previous Estimates and Recent Results,” *European Journal of Population*, 21/2-3, 187-215, available at

those trapped by the frontlines set up by Serb forces along the mountains overlooking the valley in which the city lay. If one did not have money, power or connections, one was forced to stay and endure with every other resident of Sarajevo.

While ethnic cleansing still occurred in Sarajevo, it was primarily in areas along the frontlines, such as in Grbavica and Ilidža, and not further into the city where the violence was much more indiscriminate. As a result, those within the city during the siege understood that the underlying cause of the war was not truly about religion, despite what they were being told by the media and their political leaders. If there was bitterness and hatred toward the other (the Serbs in this case), it was primarily because they were killing and maiming Sarajevo citizens and destroying the beautiful city with their brutal siege and invading snipers.⁵⁷ For native Sarajevans, as seen in the case of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo that follows, there was solidarity in their suffering.⁵⁸

One can argue that life lived during war and its ensuing wartime morality and frequent collective psychology is often such a complete break from the normal that it makes efforts to draw any conclusions extremely difficult.⁵⁹ In peacetime, people who act on behalf of the threatened other

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/w288118j50758360/>, accessed on 20 September 2011; Marko Attila Hoare, "What do the figures for the Bosnian war-dead tell us?," *Bosnian Institute*, 5 January 2008, http://www.bosnia.org.uk/news/news_body.cfm?newsid=2336, accessed on 20 September 2011; Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography*, 334; and Shriver and Shriver, "Open Wounds," 4.

⁵⁷ The city of Sarajevo changed somewhat, however, after the war and the resulting influx of displaced persons who arrived, bringing with them their experiences and perceptions that served to imbalance, in some ways, the multi-ethnic peace of Sarajevo. Serbs who were born and stayed in Sarajevo during the war are now subjected to discrimination by their Bošnjak neighbors, many of whom are new residents to Sarajevo from outlying areas.

⁵⁸ Interview with Entoni Šeperić, Sarajevo, Bosnia, 27 July 2010.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, first published in 1895, (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2002) or available online in the public domain at <http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/BonCrow.html>, accessed 18 August 2011; Michael L. Gross, *Ethics and Activism: The Theory and Practice of Political Morality*, Chapter 5, "The politics of rescue: Ethics and activism during wartime," 127-157, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Susan R. Grayze, *Women's Identities at War: Gender, Motherhood and Politics in Britain and France During the First World War*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); and Jocelyn Alexander and Jo Ann McGregor, "Hunger, violence and war in Zimbabwe," in *Violence and Belonging: The quest for identity in post-colonial*

often have the luxury of time and process of reasoning and conceptualization upon which their actions are dictated and determined. Conversely, in times of war it is common to hear people reflect upon their actions without mentioning rational or irrational reasons acknowledged at the time of the event, often noting "it is just what happened."⁶⁰ For Croat theologian Entoni Šeperić,⁶¹ wartime is different from peacetime in relation to interaction with others as "only those who were in war know that the things that...would not have happened in normal circumstances did happen."⁶² Šeperić also confirms that Bosnians often claim

people were nicer to each other during the war; they were exceptional times...and I hear people saying they were capable of doing things then that they are not capable of doing in peace...[as] there is the challenge to be human, to reclaim one's humanity. They were reduced to basic human relationship.⁶³

While Šeperić's observation may, on the surface, deny the argument of this research, I would argue, instead, it confirms it. Obviously, in the context of mass atrocities that occurred in Bosnia carried out by actions dictated by violence, trauma, greed, or abdication of responsibility, the claim "people were nicer to each other during the war" cannot be upheld as an overarching rule for all actors in the conflict. Nevertheless, Šeperić's claim that contexts of conflict appear to challenge those caught up within it to assert their humanity points to a reality that protective hospitality and goodness shown to others affirms life above and beyond the violence and cruelty which, at times, seems pervasive.

The Jewish Community of Sarajevo was one group whose humanity shined through in the context of siege-laden Sarajevo. Their actions, so

Africa, Vigdis Broch-Due, ed. (New York: Routledge, 2005).

⁶⁰ Entoni Šeperić, Bosnian Croat Roman Catholic theologian, interview with author, 27 July 2010, Sarajevo, Bosnia.

⁶¹ Šeperić is a Catholic theologian trained by the Franciscans who also served as director of Abraham Interreligious Service, an organization established in Sarajevo as a cooperative theological and ethic among the inter-religious communities of Bosnia. Due to funding issues and lack of support among the established religious hierarchies in Bosnia, it ceased to function in 2006 and its membership has dispersed into other work.

⁶² Šeperić, interview.

⁶³ Šeperić, interview.

substantial considering their small number, affirmed life in ways that will forever be a part of Sarajevo's communal narrative.

2. Case Study No. 1: The Jewish Community of Sarajevo⁶⁴

a. Narrative

The Jewish community of Sarajevo is quite small now with less than forty families, but that was not always the case. According to documentarian Edward Serotta, prior to 1941 and the advent of World War II's reach into Bosnia, the number of Jews living in Sarajevo numbered around 12,000, comprising about thirteen percent of the overall population. Two-thirds of that population (about 8,000) were Sephardic Jews and direct descendents of many who had been expelled from Spain by the Alhambra Decree in 1492.⁶⁵

Customs from that era continued in the new context of Bosnia. Members of the community still spoke the 15th century dialect called Ladino, a mixture of Spanish and Hebrew written in Hebrew alphabet. From Spain they brought with them the *Sarajevo Haggadah*, a now world-famous 14th century illuminated manuscript.⁶⁶ Yet, over the years, the Jews integrated into life in Sarajevo. They lived peacefully with Muslims in Spain and now they found refuge and a home within what was Ottoman territory when they arrived. Unlike elsewhere in Europe, Jews in Bosnia were never restricted vocationally, they never endured a pogrom, nor did they live isolated from

⁶⁴ The story of Jewish Community of Sarajevo is comprised mostly from personal interviews by the author with community members Eli Tauber and Moris Albahari as well as the photographic record of the community's actions during the 1990s war by Edward Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo: How a Jewish Community Came to the Aid of its City*, (Vienna: Central Europe Center for Research and Documentation, 1994). Where other sources are used, they will be noted.

⁶⁵ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 8. For more information on the Alhambra Decree and the expulsion of Jews as a result of the Spanish Inquisition, see Norman Roth, *Conversos, Inquisition, and the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain*, (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 2002) and Howard Morley Sachar, *Farewell España: the world of the Sephardim remembered*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008).

⁶⁶ See *Sarajevo Haggadah*, text by Cecil Kugel, (Beograd: Jugoslavia, 1975) and Fran Markowitz, *Sarajevo: A Bosnian Kaleidoscope*, (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010), 112-143, especially 141 in relation to the *Sarajevo Haggadah*. There is a fictionalized account of the history of the *Sarajevo Haggadah* in Geraldine Brooks', *People of the Book*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2008).

the rest of the city in a ghetto. Instead, over the years, they were quite active in the city's business and political life.⁶⁷

In recent history and in the current day, the Jewish Community of Sarajevo remains unique in the Southeast European region in that it is one of only two primarily Sephardic communities,⁶⁸ it is one of the most civically engaged Jewish communities with members on city council and government advisory panels, and the community center and synagogue remain open, without armed guards at the door allowing anyone to enter. Members attribute this engagement and openness to their Sephardic heritage.⁶⁹ Today, the synagogue of Sarajevo is a warm, friendly and hospitable place, beautifully set among the trees along the Miljačka River in Sarajevo's city center. The synagogue's communal area is often inhabited by older members who wile away the hours by sitting, drinking coffee, telling stories of the past and talking about the price of vegetables, while occasionally being interrupted by grandsons or great-nieces who come into the center for youth club.

However, during World War II, Jews were targeted in Bosnia as they were in other places in Nazi-occupied Europe. The Croatian Ustaša regime, who collaborated with the Nazis, assisted in the cleansing of Jews, Roma, Serbs and others from Bosnia during that period, carting them to camps in Croatia such as Jasenovac and Đakovo.⁷⁰ As is the case in the rest of Europe, the majority of Jews fell victim to the genocidal mania that swept the continent. Of those who were able to escape, almost 1,000 Sarajevo Jews

⁶⁷ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 8. Cf. Yale Strom, *The Expulsion of the Jews: Five Hundred Years of Exodus*, (New York: SP Books, 1992), 13-14; Markowitz, *Sarajevo: A Bosnian Kaleidoscope*, 112-143; and Robert J. Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006).

⁶⁸ According to Eli Tauber, a leader of Jewish Community of Sarajevo, the other Sephardic community is located in Thessaloniki, Greece. Interview with author, 23 July 2010, Sarajevo, Bosnia.

⁶⁹ Tauber, interview.

⁷⁰ The term *Ustaša* is still very much a part of current vocabulary and consciousness, and was used in the 1990s conflict, primarily in a derogatory way, to refer to Croats or Croat armies. See Velikonja, *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance*; David B. MacDonald, "From Jasenovac to Srebrenica: Subaltern Genocide and the Serbs," in *Genocides by the Oppressed: Subaltern Genocide in Theory and Practice*, Nicholas A. Robins and Adam Jones, eds., (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009), 103-121; Ivana Maček, *Sarajevo Under Siege*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 169.

joined the Partizans,⁷¹ a resistance group led by Josip Broz Tito, and hundreds of others were taken in and protected by Bošnjak, Serb, Croat and Albanian neighbors, friends, and others. Refuge was given by these individuals in Bosnia as well as in places such as the Italian-occupied Dalmatian coast, Italy and Albania.⁷² Within Sarajevo, several families such as the Hardagas, who were Bošnjaks devout to their Islamic heritage, put themselves at significant risk in order to protect their Jewish neighbors.⁷³

Despite the provision of protective hospitality by many, a mere 1,400 Jews returned to register at the Jewish Community Center in Sarajevo in 1945 after the war ended.⁷⁴ Yet, because of the hospitable actions of non-Jewish neighbors and the very nature of the Jewish community in Sarajevo, the place of Jews within the fabric of Sarajevo society remained strong. Sarajevo was their home; they had traditionally mixed with everyone else and relationships had been built or strengthened due to the efforts made to protect them during World War II.

It is out of this context that the actions of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo during the 1990s conflict in Bosnia arose. Serotta writes that “for the first time during a modern European war, Jews [were] actively saving and

⁷¹ Serotta notes that this en masse joining of a resistance movement was unique to the activities of Jews during this period. Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 9.

⁷² Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 9. See Eli Tauber, *When Neighbors Were Real Human Beings* (Sarajevo: University of Sarajevo, Institute for the Research of Crimes Against Humanity and International Law, 2010); Norman Gershman, *Besa: Muslims Who Saved Jews in World War II* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008); and Peter Hellman, *When Courage was Stronger Than Fear: Remarkable Stories of Christians and Muslims who Saved Jews from the Holocaust*, (New York: Marlowe and Co., 2004). As of the submission of this dissertation, Eli Tauber and the Jewish Community of Sarajevo are still in the process of researching leads and stories related to rescuers that have not yet been recognized by Yad Vashem as Righteous Among the Nations.

⁷³ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 9, 28-33, 77-79, 117-118 and Tauber, *When Neighbors Were Real Human Beings*, 40-43. Both authors give a detailed account of the story of the actions of the Muslim Hardaga family (Mustafa and Zeineba Hardaga, Mustafa's brother and sister-in-law, Izet and Bahrija Hardaga). They also tell the story of Zeineba Hardaga's father, Ahmed Sadiq-Saralop, who was arrested, deported to Jasenovac concentration camp, and killed for harboring Jewish friends and neighbors. Sadiq-Saralop, and the four Hardaga family members have been recognized as Righteous Among the Nations by Yad Vashem. Zeineba Hardaga was the remaining survivor when the family was recognized by Yad Vashem, and she and her daughter moved to Israel, and the daughter and her family converted to Judaism.

⁷⁴ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 8.

rescuing Christians and Muslims wherever, whenever they could.”⁷⁵ They had foreseen an imminent war and what others refused to believe; the community was keenly sensitive to the winds of war and knew it was coming. Before the conflict had broken out the community had stockpiled food, medicine and other necessities in preparation.⁷⁶ At that time, the community – particularly those who remained in Sarajevo – was mostly comprised of “middle age, middle class, professional men and women” who were “assisted by friends and neighbors of every age and nationality” to meet the needs of their fellow Sarajevans under siege.⁷⁷

However, many of the community members left Sarajevo either just before or as the war broke out in Bosnia. As Jews, they were assured asylum in Israel but many also went to England and elsewhere and, in the end, the majority of the community totaling about 1,000 - 1,500 left the city.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, about two hundred stayed in Sarajevo, forming a core group who decided to open the synagogue and the community to everyone who needed it. This core group re-opened the Jewish humanitarian aid organization called La Benevolencija, which was run by fifty-four volunteers of Bošnjak, Croat, Serb and Jewish background, none of whom had ever “done a day’s social work in their lives.”⁷⁹

Through the work of La Benevolencija between May 1992 and February 1994 as the city of Sarajevo was under siege, the Jewish community and its volunteers

- opened three pharmacies and gave away 1,600,000 medical prescriptions
- cooked 110,000 hot meals (up to 300 per day) in an impromptu kitchen

⁷⁵ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10.

⁷⁶ Tauber, interview.

⁷⁷ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10.

⁷⁸ Tauber, interview. Although it cannot really be substantiated within the confines of this thesis, Entoni Šeperić noted that the members of the Jewish community who had been evacuated to Israel were “totally manipulated and marginalized by Israel, forced to live in settlements, and were traumatized by those experiences...[as they were] in between...[since] Israel is not their homeland and they realized it and Sarajevo wasn’t the same when they came back.” Šeperić, interview.

⁷⁹ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10.

- distributed 360 tons of food in the synagogue's social hall
- treated 2,500 patients in a makeshift medical clinic and made 650 house calls with the help of three staff doctors and three staff nurses
- started its own post office with the help of those who were able to travel freely (such as international workers) carrying 100,000 letters in and out of Sarajevo.
- set up a two-way radio telephone system linked with the Jewish Community in Zagreb, enabling people in the city to talk to loved ones elsewhere making 9,500 connections to the outside world and received 10,000 messages.⁸⁰

Additionally, the Jewish Community rallied together its connections and resources, enabling it to send eleven convoys out of the city helping approximately 2,500 Sarajevans escape to safety, and less than half of that number were Jewish.⁸¹ The community also subverted the Israeli asylum system in order to get more people to safety. First, they did this by arranging with the Israeli Jewish Agency for nearly 650 Bosnians to go to Israel and in so doing, stretched the 'Who is a Jew' law in creative ways. Second, they went further by forging and sending back to Bosnia legitimate identification cards of Bosnian Jews who had already fled to Israel in order to enable others to evacuate.

What was the motivation for such a small, minority community to do so much during this time? "We are Jews; we are ready to help everyone. If we can, we do it," declared Eli Tauber, a leader within the community.⁸² Tauber also noted that the community sees itself as a "local population," that Bosnian is now their native tongue, and he emphasized the following: "We've been part of Sarajevo for over five hundred years. This is our home. We belong here. These are our people."⁸³

In 2004, there were thirty-seven Jewish families in Sarajevo, along with many others families who are Jewish but in mixed marriages. In total the Jewish Community of Sarajevo has approximately seven hundred members

⁸⁰ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10-11 and Tauber, interview.

⁸¹ Three convoys were by plane; eight were by bus. Tauber, interview.

⁸² Tauber, interview.

⁸³ Tauber, interview.

remaining.⁸⁴ La Benevolencija, which had the post-war honor of having a prominent Sarajevo street named after it, continues to operate, working primarily in the area of microcredit, assistance for retired persons, and youth clubs.

b. Analysis

Proportionally speaking, the Jewish Community of Sarajevo was able to make an enormous contribution to those in need and under threat during the siege of Sarajevo. The fact that their actions were primarily in the vein of hospitality is not accidental. Their experience of history had taught them the necessity and value of food, safety, and open welcome in an environment of sectarian violence. Their collective memory of actions taken on their behalf in the past and the horrors faced when one is not benefited with assistance served to inform their actions.⁸⁵ Those memories - not only the negative but also the positive - are an integral part of their communal narrative. As a result, their hospitable approach to their fellow Sarajevans “stands as a model for religious behavior under the conditions of the war in Bosnia” as well as a beacon of hope for those who work for that same cooperation in post-war Bosnia.⁸⁶

Significant attention has been given in the preceding chapters on the theoretical and textual witness related to hospitality, and, more specifically, the practice of protective hospitality. Previous chapters have illustrated that the practice of protective hospitality is not a recent invention and is part of the discussion of what it means to live an ethical and faithful life as an adherent of one of the Abrahamic traditions. Yet, it is easy for the theoretical, ancient or historical examples to lose their power to illustrate the practice or inspire further action over time. This loss occurs when these examples are forgotten or disregarded as an important characteristic in one’s

⁸⁴ Tauber, interview.

⁸⁵ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 11.

⁸⁶ David Little, “Cosmopolitan Compassion and Condemnation,” *Religion and Values in Public Life*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Divinity School, 2000), 172.

self-identification as a follower of the God of Abraham. However, if examples of protective hospitality are remembered, looked to as authoritative, and referred to in the formation of ethical practice as an example of behavior, like the Jewish Community has done, then loss is minimized.

How collective memory is formed and integrated into faithful life was referred to previously in this research, namely in relation to Johann Baptist Metz's concept of "dangerous memory." Scholars who have built upon Metz's idea illustrate its use in the remembrance of historical events that inform current and future action and belief.⁸⁷ Ethicist Sharon Welch argues that dangerous memory "leads to political action" as those memories "fund a community's sense of dignity; they inspire and empower those who challenge oppression" and they are "a people's history of resistance and struggle, of dignity and transcendence in the face of oppression."⁸⁸

Furthermore, memories of "defiance and victory become dangerous as they serve as the spur to further action and critique, an ennobling reminder of the good that can be attained by ordinary people."⁸⁹

Subsequently, dangerous memory can be contagious since good is "attained by ordinary people" and provides an example for more ordinary people to act who refer to prior events as proof that their actions are not idealistic or in

⁸⁷ Metz does this himself in light of the events of the Holocaust in Ekkehard Schuster, *Hope against Hope: Johann Baptist Metz and Elie Wiesel Speak Out on the Holocaust*, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999). See Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983); Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn, eds. *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989); Cynthia L. Rigby, "Is There Joy Before Mourning? 'Dangerous Memory,' in the work of Sharon Welch and Johann Baptist Metz," *Koinonia* 5 (Spring 1993): 1-30; Elizabeth A. Johnson, *Friends of God and Prophets* (New York: Continuum, 1999), chapter 8; Flora Keshkejian, *Redeeming Memories: A Theology of Healing and Transformation*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 2000); and Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Ann Parker, *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering and the Search for What Saves Us*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002). Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza also describes a hermeneutic of remembrance for historical reconstruction and rewriting, noting that a "hermeneutics of remembrance engages rhetorical analysis and historical re-construction for rewriting biblical history in terms of wo/men's struggles against empire and for well-being. It thereby reconstructs a different context for biblical texts and interpretations" in *The Power of the Word*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 163.

⁸⁸ Welch, *A Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 154-155. Welch also refers to Martin Luther King's "Letter from Birmingham City Jail" as an example of the use of dangerous memory as "[t]he memories evoked by King are indeed dangerous. They endanger the continued acceptance of racial injustice as they propel people to courageous acts of resistance." (155).

⁸⁹ Welch, *A Feminist Ethic of Risk*, 155.

vain. This capacity for dangerous memory to be utilized as a motivating factor in the practice of protective hospitality is obvious in the case of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo.⁹⁰

One could argue the Jewish population is so small and insignificant that it plays no role in the current discourse. Yet, because of the history of the city and the presence of the Jewish community in Sarajevo over almost five centuries, their small number still has “enormous symbolic value.”⁹¹ One must weigh, however, the negative and positive aspects that are inherent as a result of the size of the community. On one hand, the community is in crisis: it has no rabbi, the population is rapidly aging, it is a largely secular community with no particular interest in day-to-day religious practice, and without its vocal and city-wide engaged members⁹² the community’s presence in Sarajevo would be largely forgotten. In the current post-war climate of Sarajevo, the Jewish Community has been reduced to a “cultural aspect” of the city and has very little power in a traditional sense in comparison to the Bošnjak, Serb and Croat communities.⁹³ Yet, because of their size, they are seen as removed from the sectarian conflict that

⁹⁰ As it was for the earlier cases of Le Chambon and the Sanctuary Movement presented in the first chapter, and will also be seen in the preceding case studies as well.

⁹¹ Šeperić, interview.

⁹² Jakob Finci serves as president of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo and was a leader of its charity La Benevolencija during the 1990s war. Finci is well known in political circles of Bosnia, particularly for chairing a national committee to develop a truth and reconciliation commission related to the 1990s Bosnian conflict. Finci serves on the Inter-Religious Council of Bosnia and is the Bosnian ambassador to Switzerland. Eli Tauber is leader in the Jewish Community of Sarajevo and is a writer and researcher, focusing upon recovering stories of survival and protection during the Holocaust as experienced in Bosnia, and he claims that there are approximately fifty stories of rescue and protective hospitality given to Jews that are not yet recognized by Yad Vashem. Tauber also serves on the current transitional justice strategy committee appointed by the Bosnian Ministry of Justice and Civil Affairs to explore and recommend a transitional justice solution for Bosnia’s post-war context. Of his work, Tauber insists he “must try to save Bosnia; I may not be successful, but to try to save I must.” Interview.

⁹³ Šeperić, interview. This is evidenced by the power-sharing agreement reached with the Dayton Peace Accords which determined that the parliament and presidency would be shared amongst Bošnjak, Serb and Croat, completely ignoring smaller groups in Bosnia, such as Jews and Roma, who seek input into the process as well but were not among the three main actors of the conflict to be there when the decisions were made and formed into the Bosnian constitution. Jewish Community leader Jakob Finci recently partnered with Dervo Sejdić, a leader in the Bosnian Roma community, to win a legal action within the European Court of Human Rights in 2009 against the Bosnian government for human rights violations in relation to this, forcing Bosnia to re-consider its Constitution which would allow minority groups greater flexibility in government positions.

surrounds Bošnjak, Serb and Croat communities, and such removal enables them to offer a refuge from the nationalist rhetoric that is still pervasive in Bosnia.

Similar to the village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon, the Jewish Community of Sarajevo sees itself as the paradigmatic other. They do not fit the mold or the commonly held narrative which shaped the 1990s conflict in Bosnia. But this aspect brings to light an important theme: those who put themselves at risk to provide protective hospitality for the threatened other rarely fit the mold that appears to shape mainstream society.⁹⁴ While the Jewish Community was affected by the conflict, they were not main actors; it was not their fight. Therefore, the actions they took to provide protective hospitality were enabled by the awareness within the community that they were non-combatants and that their power was not at stake by assisting a potentially threatening other. This role allowed them to escape and usher others to safety in ways, perhaps, a Bošnjak, Croat or Serb community could not have done. Serotta noted that many within the Jewish Community “refused to condemn one faction or the other, while remaining fiercely loyal to the city they have lived in and loved for over four hundred and thirty years.”⁹⁵ Serotta also notes that members of the community who have memory of the Holocaust remember “their lives were saved by Croats, Serbs and Muslims” causing them to “refuse to issue a verdict of collective guilt” but to, instead, assert that “they were saved by individual acts of bravery.”⁹⁶ Therefore, they understood their place within Bosnian society and utilized it for the greater good.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ The cases presented here and in Chapter One – Le Chambon and the Sanctuary Movement – show that these actions are often undertaken on the fringe, and not in the mainstream.

⁹⁵ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10.

⁹⁶ Serotta, *Survival in Sarajevo*, 10.

⁹⁷ Additionally, even the opinions of Bošnjaks related to the Israel/Palestine issue are not applied to the Jewish Community, as it is known that while many Bosnian Jews escaped to Israel during the war, most returned to Bosnia, effectively removing themselves from the narrative within Muslim discourse in Bosnia related to Israel/Palestine. Tauber, interview; Šeperić, interview. Not long before the interview, the events related to the Gaza flotilla had occurred with corresponding demonstrations by Muslims in Sarajevo city center to protest

Yet, this same place in society comes with a price. Their history and experiences during the Holocaust have been largely appropriated by the narrative of Serbs and Roma throughout former Yugoslavia. According to Šeperić, “their story of suffering [in World War II] was stolen from them” by the communist era of the former Yugoslavia with its slogans of unity and brotherhood that implied their suffering was not considered special or different from anyone else’s.⁹⁸ Even in death, the Jewish Community is not afforded proper respect since the Jewish cemetery of Sarajevo lay on the hills above Grbavica and was a no-man’s land on the frontline of Sarajevo, demarcating the boundary between parts of the city held by the Serb army and the Bosnian army who sought to defend the city. As a result, the cemetery was mined and gravestones destroyed by shells, further serving to erase the Jewish community’s place in the history of the region.⁹⁹

One example of the cost of Jewish life in Sarajevo is found in Moris Albahari, an elderly Sephardic, Ladino-speaking member of the community who, in 1941 at the age of eleven, was rounded up with many others in Sarajevo by the Nazi and Ustaša forces, and shot and dropped into a mass grave with fellow Jews. However, he had not been seriously wounded, and so he waited in the grave until nightfall, climbed out, and sought refuge with the Partizans. Of his experience, he noted:

I’m lost now. I’m the tenth generation from Spain, and I’m not in Israel. I’m seventy-four now. And I never dream nice dreams. In five years I’ll be dead. I want to die with an identity. But in Bosnia, Jews have no identity....”¹⁰⁰

the actions of Israel in solidarity with Palestinians. Tauber noted a communal “holding of breath” to see if there would be a backlash, but there was not.

⁹⁸ Šeperić, interview. Both Šeperić and Tauber noted in their interviews that the average Bosnian has very little knowledge of the events of the Holocaust which occurred in their own area.

⁹⁹ It is understood, however, that the destruction of the cemetery was not an intentional act to destroy Jewish heritage, per se. It simply happened to be placed where the frontlines were drawn and held no sacred value for those who desecrated it. The Jewish Community has since restored the cemetery.

¹⁰⁰ Moris Albahari, a Sephard (speaks Ladino) and a member of Jewish Community of Sarajevo, interview with author, January 2004, Sarajevo, Bosnia. He was one of the two hundred who stayed in Sarajevo during the war and is still alive at the age of eighty-one in 2011.

The nationalism that contributed to the 1990s war in Bosnia is often connected to efforts to protect and ensure communal purity or identity that defines the nation in question.¹⁰¹ In comparison, the communal witness shared here clearly establishes that the Jewish Community of Sarajevo could never be described as nationalistic. Their secular orientation, desire to provide protective hospitality to everyone, rate of mixed marriage within the community and their decision to allow two hundred of their small number to remain and assist their fellow Sarajevans signals little concern for purity. According to Tauber, the Jewish Community operates on the idea that a “feeling of belonging is more important than purity.”¹⁰² For example, requirements for membership within the community are uniquely inclusive for the region and are as follows:

- 1) if one’s grandmother or grandfather or a nearer relative was/is Jewish;
- 2) if one enters into a mixed marriage with a Jew which entitles one to the right to vote and be elected into the community even if oneself is not Jewish;
- 3) all members who left before the war can still be members in diaspora if they choose;
- 4) any Jew from the world living temporarily in Sarajevo can be a member and be a part of the community while they remain in the city.¹⁰³

The priority over hospitality and welcome over religious, ethnic, or moral purity has previously been discussed in this research. Therefore, such a stance provides an invaluable model for how a community can value and support the diversity of an inter-religious community such as Sarajevo. However, one wonders how long the Jewish Community can sustain itself and its role in Sarajevo society in the face of such inclusivity. Only time will tell.

However, there is another community that deserves attention in the context of a discussion related to protective hospitality in Bosnia. The village

¹⁰¹ See Viranjini Munasinghe, “Nationalism in Hybrid Spaces: The Production of Impurity out of Purity,” in *American Ethnologist*, 29/3 (August 2002), 663-692 and Elizabeth Mavroudi, “Nationalism, the Nation and Migration: Searching for Purity and Diversity,” in *Space and Polity*, 14/3 (December 2010), 219–233.

¹⁰² Tauber, interview.

¹⁰³ Albahari, interview and Tauber, interview.

of Baljvine also provides a model for how a community can value its own diversity and bear witness to a peaceful, cooperative life together in the context of surrounding and seemingly pervasive violence.

3. Case Study No. 2: The Village of Baljvine¹⁰⁴

a. Narrative

The village of Baljvine is remotely situated on a plateau in the mountainous terrain of northwestern Bosnia within the boundaries of what is now Republika Srpska.¹⁰⁵ The village is accessible up a mountain road and the nearest town, Mrkonjić Grad, is twenty kilometers away. Those from the village mark its existence from at least pre-Middle Ages during the period of the Bogomils as evidenced by the *steći* that still stand in the village.¹⁰⁶ While there is historical debate as to who exactly the Bogomils were, scholars agree that they were primarily dualist in their cosmology and gnostic in their doctrine, known for their rejection of materialism, their insistence for self-sufficiency, and their refusal to fight in the conquering wars raging around them.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ The narrative of this village is compiled from two main sources: a personal interview with Samira Murica-Lennox conducted on 3 October 2010 and a written source by village imam Salih Deliç called "Can You Count on Your Neighbors" found in Sveltana Broz's compilation of stories of altruism during the 1990s Bosnian war called *Good People in an Evil Time*, Ellen Elias-Bursac, trans., (Sarajevo: Grafičar promet, 2002), 15-20. The story is also confirmed in the short documentary, *The Village the War Forgot*, done by Institute of War and Peace Reporting (IWPR) during their conference "Tales of Transition", <http://iwpr.net/report-news/village-war-forgot>, 29 September 2010, last accessed on 24 August 2011. Other sources used to corroborate and expand upon these testimonies will be noted accordingly.

¹⁰⁵ or "Serbian Republic" in English.

¹⁰⁶ Samira Murica-Lennox, former resident of Baljvine, Skype interview with author, 3 October 2010. *Steći* are carved stones which may have been markers, gravestones, or mediums for storytelling (perhaps similar to the Celtic crosses in Ireland) that are thought to be the remnants of Bogomil antiquity.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Dimitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948); *Byzantium and the Slavs*, (Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994), 259-278; Janet Hamilton, Bernard Hamilton and Yuri Stoyanov, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650-c. 1450*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998); and Florin Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500-1250*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) which details the

With the Roman Catholic expansion into northern and western Bosnia, the Bogomils were branded as heretics and subjected to inquisitions. Many were expelled from the region, but current inhabitants of the village of Baljvine believe the tradition may well have lived on in remote areas such as theirs. As the years passed and conquering armies came through the region, Bogomilism as a system of faith slowly died out and over time the residents of the village eventually converted to other traditions, albeit not Catholicism.¹⁰⁸ It is unclear as to how the village divided itself prior to or after the conversions, but in recent memory, the village has existed in two parts: the upper half of the village, Gore Baljvine, is Serb (Orthodox Christian) and the lower half of the village, Donje Baljvine, is Bošnjak (Muslim).

Nevertheless, according to the villagers, some of the roots of Bogomilism remained within the culture of the village, despite the veil of a "new" religion. The residents still maintain their self-sufficiency, or as one resident put it, "we keep ourselves to ourselves."¹⁰⁹ There also remains a

persecution endured by the Bogomils at the hands of the Byzantine church. Their influence upon the Cathar movement in Western Europe has also been documented in Malcolm Lambert, *The Cathars*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1998), 34.

¹⁰⁸ Kathleen Young notes: "Religion had been used to manipulate local populations by the various powers trying to conquer the area since the first Slavic tribes had established themselves. In 1415 the Islamic Turks offered the Bogomils military protection, secure title to their lands, and freedom to practice their religion - if they counted themselves as Muslims and did not attack their Ottoman forces. The Bogomils could not refuse and Turkish rule brought about wholesale conversions to Islam. Such voluntary conversions occurred in huge numbers partly because of the political and economic advantages gained by joining the state religion and the Turkish promise that the Bogomils could be Muslims in their own Bosnian way. Bosnia became a Slavic state within the Ottoman Empire - a state in which Bosnian Bogomils enjoyed special autonomy and status." From "The Former Yugoslavians," in *Endangered peoples of Europe: Struggles to Survive and Thrive*, Jean S. Forward, ed. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), 201. However, there is debate about the wide-scale conversion of Bogomils to Islam as depicted by Young, chiefly due to the idea that the Bogomils had resisted various empires for so long, it makes no clear sense that they would convert en masse to Islam. This theory, however, has become popular among the national narrative of the Bošnjak community, as it depicts their community as stemming from a small, persecuted group who even in their origin defied the Catholic (Croat) and Orthodox (Serb) authorities. For further discussion on this debate, see John V.A. Fine, Jr., *The Bosnian Church: A New Interpretation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975); H.T. Norris, *Islam in the Balkans: Religion and Society Between Europe and the Arab World*, (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1993); Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*, (London: MacMillan, 1994), 27-42; and Robert Bideleux and Ian Jeffries, *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*, (London: Routledge, 1998), 65-66. It is important to note, however, that regardless of whether or not it is actual fact, this communal narrative of early persecution still informs their practice of hospitality now.

¹⁰⁹ Murica-Lennox, interview.

deep commitment to each other as a community; residents are taught from an early age to not harm one's neighbor. As such, there is no record of inter-communal violence in the village at any stage in its history, nor has anyone in the village ever gone to court over land disputes, despite adjoining lands belonging to both Serb and Bošnjak.¹¹⁰ Residents of the village have lived at peace with one another since before anyone can remember. Even in the most recent war in the 1990s, not even one member of the community lost his or her life because of the violence.¹¹¹

According to the residents, the cultural values within the village are essentially the same for both the Bošnjak and Serb neighbors. While there are superficial differences – the women may wear the traditional clothing of their religious grouping and there may be different rites that take place over the course of the year or one's life – the values which underpin the cultures are the same.

"Hospitality is key. You always help. You always welcome. You always do favors for one another. Hospitality is ingrained into us. It is how we function. It becomes second-nature," asserted one village resident.¹¹² It has been common in the life of the village to invite one's neighbors – be they Bošnjak or Serb – to family events such as *slavas*,¹¹³ funerals, weddings, Christmas, Easter or *Bajram* feasts, as well as for no particular occasion at all.¹¹⁴

"We're just one big family," declared Samira Murica-Lennox, a woman interviewed who grew up in the village. To solidify this family bond, the village practices a tradition that does not seem to exist elsewhere in Bosnia wherein each child born in the village is appointed a *dostovi* and *dostinice*,¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Murica-Lennox, interview and Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 15.

¹¹¹ Murica-Lennox, interview; Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 19.

¹¹² Murica-Lennox, interview.

¹¹³ These are occasions within the Serbian Orthodox tradition where the family or individual's saint day is celebrated.

¹¹⁴ Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 16.

¹¹⁵ *Dostovi* is the masculine while *dostinice* is the feminine term for what might be called "godfather" or "godmother" in English, although it carries slightly different connotations and obligations than the 'godparent' equivalent of *kum/kuma* seen elsewhere in the region. Speculation from those surveyed regarding the tradition did confirm that the root *dost* means "close friend" in more archaic forms of Bosnian, which may have derived

but those who are appointed must be from the other side of the village.¹¹⁶ So, a Bošnjak child has a Serb *dostovi* and *dostinice* and vice versa. Such a practice acts as an unwritten alliance between Serbs and Bošnjaks of the village.¹¹⁷ For this reason, it is not common practice for life-long members of the village to intermarry as the men of the village have been taught for generations that such a thing “would be wrong [since the women]...are like family to us.”¹¹⁸ Intermarriage between Bošnjak and Serb is accepted, but one is discouraged from choosing a partner from one’s own village.

Moreover, the community holds high respect for each other’s religious traditions. The mosque in the village was built with donations from the community, including the Serbs, sometime prior to 1934.¹¹⁹ However, the Bošnjak part of the community felt shame that their Serb neighbors had to travel approximately ten miles to the nearest Serb Orthodox church and, therefore, in 1990 put together a delegation to seek permission from the Mrkonjić Grad municipality to build a church on behalf of their fellow community members. “We have our mosque, but the Serbs have no place of worship. We feel this is disgraceful and we have come to right this wrong,” the Bošnjak members of the Baljvine delegation declared to the amazed municipal president.¹²⁰ Once permission was granted, everyone from the village contributed either financially or with labor to building the church, which apparently was the same way the mosque had been built years before.

The break-up of Yugoslavia and the ensuing war in 1992-1995 halted the construction efforts of the church. The religious buildings within the

from the Persian term *dost*, which was absorbed within the Turkish language as well. If that is the case, then the tradition could well have arrived at some point with the expansion of Islam with the Ottoman Empire throughout the Balkans, although that does not explain why it is only known and practiced in Baljvine and not elsewhere in Bosnia.

¹¹⁶ Or at least the tradition has died out and is not commonly practiced elsewhere. Through social and familial networks in Bosnia, I sought to find out if anyone outside of Baljvine had ever heard of this practice. Of the approximately twenty people from all over Bosnia who were asked, no one had heard of it.

¹¹⁷ Murica-Lennox, interview.

¹¹⁸ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 15.

¹¹⁹ The date of the erection of the mosque is unknown to this author. Delić’s story notes that “the mosque was built before [he] was born” in 1934. Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 15-16.

¹²⁰ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 16.

village encountered invasions from two different sides: the Serb and Croatian armies, respectively. When Serb armies invaded, their primary targets were Bošnjak communities and mosques. When Croatian armies invaded, they primarily targeted communities and cultural aspects that were viewed as Serb in that particular area of Bosnia. The Serb armies invaded the village first, and surprisingly, the mosque remained untouched. In fact, the Baljvine mosque and its minaret is thought to be the *only* mosque to have remained intact throughout all of what is now Republika Srpska, despite mosques being specifically targeted throughout the conflict.¹²¹ According to International Court of Justice records from The Hague, the mosque survived because “local Bosnian Serb villagers protected their Bosnian Muslim neighbours from Serb troops and would not let the troops destroy the mosque.”¹²² Unfortunately, when Croatian Defense Forces overran the village in 1995, they destroyed the unfinished church and all of the houses in the village.¹²³

This element of protection extended beyond the places of worship to the community members themselves. There is a history of protecting one another; solidarity is a tradition within the village.¹²⁴ While the tradition may go back further, the history of protection is seen in both the most recent 1990s war as well as World War II. One resident believes that Baljvine was “the only village in [the] whole region that wasn’t burned during World War II, because the neighbors protected one another.”¹²⁵ A resident of the village, Salih Delić, tells the story as follows:

¹²¹ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 16 and International Court of Justice (ICJ), The Hague, CR 2006/22, 17 March 2006, *The case concerning the Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro), Verbatim Record, 18. Available at <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/91/10628.pdf> accessed on 3 Sept 2010.

¹²² ICJ, CR 2006/22, Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro, 18.

¹²³ The church was finally finished in 1998. Delić, 19-20. Fifteen years post-war, it is estimated that about 80% of the village has now been rebuilt according to Samira Murica-Lennox, interview with author, 3/10/2010.

¹²⁴ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 15.

¹²⁵ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 15. Further documentation of this period in Baljvine history is documented in Marija Arnautović, “Bosnia: The Village Where Hate Never Triumphed”, Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR), TRI issue 642, 10 April 2010, available at <http://iwpr.net/report-news/bosnia-village-where-hate-never-triumphed>, accessed on 3 Sept 2010.

“Once *Ustasha* fighters came to our village to torch Serbian homes. The Bosniaks rushed out of their houses and raised barricades on the street. They wouldn’t let anyone by.

“If you feel like torching houses, start with ours. Only then, with theirs. You aren’t touching our Serbian neighbors,” they told the *Ustasha*.

“Why won’t you let us by?”

“We all get along just fine here. We won’t let you hurt them. Once you’ve torched all our homes, you can go burn down theirs, not before.”

“If you all are so crazy about each other, you can have your Serbs. We’ll leave you be,” the *Ustasha* replied, and left.

Meanwhile some Bosniaks went off to the Serbian village of Bočac to warn the people there to hide because the Bosniaks wouldn’t be able to protect them all. The Serbs got out of Bočac in time. The *Ustasha* did torch their homes, but the peoples’ lives were saved.

After the *Ustasha* retreated then the Chetniks¹²⁶ came, but none of our Serbian neighbors would let them attack the Baljvine Bosniaks. In that war and now in this one we have all survived pretty well.”¹²⁷

Therefore, habits of protection and hospitality are not only part of the village’s current reality, but also part of its history, and the dangerous memories of their communal narrative of protection served to inform their actions when the most recent war in Bosnia broke out. As a result, ethnic conflict has never festered in Baljvine, making it an exception to what is thought to be the norm in Bosnia. When asked why this is the case, one Serb villager, Miroslav Tešanović, notes that residents of the village have always taken a “long and enduring common stand against extremism.”¹²⁸

At the time of the 1992-1995 conflict, Baljvine was comprised of about four hundred households. Approximately half of those households were

¹²⁶ The term *Četnik* (anglicized as *Chetnik*) originally referred to the Serb loyalist paramilitary forces during World War II, but is also still very much a part of current vocabulary and consciousness in the context of 1990s conflict, where it was used primarily in a derogatory way to refer to Serbs or Serb armies.

¹²⁷ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 15.

¹²⁸ Arnautović, “Bosnia: The Village Where Hate Never Triumphed.”

Serb; the other half were Bošnjak. When the war began, Serb villagers gave their Bošnjak neighbors weapons with which to defend the village and their families. The village council also organized a joint patrol of Bošnjak and Serb men around the village's perimeter. Such a patrol was enacted because the residents were aware of the possibility of someone from the outside coming into the village and wreaking havoc by committing an act of violence, which if done secretly may be blamed on a resident – Serb or Bošnjak – and incite ethnic tension and unrest. They were determined to not let anyone “poison [their] good relations at any time during the war,”¹²⁹ and, therefore, the joint patrol served as an intentional preventative measure to ensure the safety of the residents and their harmonious way of life.¹³⁰

As an additional preventative measure, the village set up an outpost to meet Serb troops who would undoubtedly come into the community with their own prejudices and conflict-related “baggage.”¹³¹ This was done in order to keep the Bošnjak residents and the mosque of Baljvine safe, knowing that some Serb troops could come into the village not knowing its history or how the residents live at peace with one another.

This tactical move on the part of the village residents was successful. According to Delić, Bosnian Serb army General Talić entered the village late in the night in 1992 as the war began and attempted to cleanse the village by informing the Bošnjak residents of the village they must leave as they were not permitted to remain in the village with Serbs. The village president at the time, a Bošnjak by the name of Šaban Habibović, informed the general that the villagers lived at peace with one another and that there was no reason for them to leave their homes.

Talić refused to believe such a possibility and ordered Habibović to walk to the Serb side of the village, call out to a neighbor, and ask for help to demonstrate if whether or not what he had said was true. Talić watched, hiding in order to witness the interaction. As Delić tells the story, Habibović

¹²⁹ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 17.

¹³⁰ Delić, “Can You Count on Your Neighbors,” 16-17.

¹³¹ Murica-Lennox, interview.

arrived in the Serb section of the village, called out to a neighbor who promptly rushed out of his house in his pajamas, asking "What's wrong, Šaban? Something happen? You need help? ...Say the word, Šaban. What can I do?"¹³² Shocked at the exchange, Talić conceded that what Habibović had said was true, saying "God help us! You Bosniaks aren't Muslims, and you Serbs aren't Serbs! You must be from somewhere else. In that case, go right ahead and live together if that's what you want!"¹³³

Delić asserts that after the incident with General Talić the village remained at peace throughout the war, like an island in the sea of violence that was waging around them, "until the bad days came and hit [Bošnjaks] and Serbs alike" with the invasion of the Croatian forces.¹³⁴ Interestingly, it was Bosnian Serb military who, on 15 September 1995, alerted all of the villagers that Croatian forces were coming and that they all should leave immediately, advising them on which routes to take.

According to Delić, the villagers fled to the nearby Serb village of Bočac where the Baljvine residents took refuge under a bridge for four days. During that time, Bočac residents watched over them and guarded their safety by enacting a "Civilian Protection" force, while also providing them with bread, milk, and medical care for the children and elderly. On the fifth day, safe passage was arranged via bus to the town of Tešanj, from where the Baljvine residents dispersed until the war was over and they could return to their own village to begin work on rebuilding their ruined homes and interrupted lives.

After the war ended in 1995, residents began returning to Baljvine, and as they had done before, the villagers helped each other rebuild their homes as time and money allowed, living with each other until their homes

¹³² Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 18.

¹³³ Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 18.

¹³⁴ Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 18.

were ready.¹³⁵ With the financial assistance from international organizations approximately eighty percent of the village has been rebuilt to date.¹³⁶

b. Analysis

This story is almost utopian, and it is difficult to believe, requiring substantiation through several sources. But such a reaction is often the case in contexts where good takes such a substantial role in the narrative. The case of the village of Baljvine lends credence to the idea that more good happened during the 1992-1995 war in Bosnia than one might think, which was suggested by two interview sources during my field research in Bosnia and by publication of Svetlana Broz's 2002 collection of narratives in *Good People in an Evil Time*.¹³⁷

"We remember the bad things more often than the good; good stories aren't as traumatizing and are easier to forget," noted Danijela Đurić, a Serb who had been evacuated by a Bošnjak neighbor before the war and has now returned to Sarajevo.¹³⁸ Similarly, Šeperić argues that religion in Bosnia "was more destructive than constructive," and that if religion is to be redeemed, the positive stories must be told in order to address individual and communal responsibility in the face of violence and to balance an unhealthy, but natural, fixation upon the negative in Bosnia's formation of historical narrative of the conflict.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 20; Broz, *Good People in an Evil Time*, 356; and IWPR, *The Village the War Forgot*.

¹³⁶ Delić, "Can You Count on Your Neighbors," 20 and Murica-Lennox, interview.

¹³⁷ Danijela Đurić, Bosnian Serb protective hospitality practitioner, interview with author, 2 August 2010, Sarajevo, Bosnia; Zilka Spahić-Šiljak, Feminist Islamic scholar and coordinator of the Master of Arts in Religious Studies at the University of Sarajevo, interview with author, 2 August 2010, Sarajevo, Bosnia; Svetlana Broz, *Good People in an Evil Time*, Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans., (Sarajevo: Grafičar promet, 2002).

¹³⁸ Đurić, interview.

¹³⁹ Šeperić, interview. Šeperić argues that as "religion [was] the main accomplice" in the conflict, there is a lack of desire to "hear the good stories because they are not useful for projects that are still very destructive." He also argues that telling the good stories (such as stories of protective hospitality) will be difficult because religious communities have been unable "to distance themselves from the negative, and, as a result, lost their credibility even if they tell good stories because they are seen as violent accomplices."

Accordingly, positive stories that arose from the conflict are now being noticed and given overdue attention. Svetlana Broz's book, which includes the narrative of Baljvine, plays an important role in this development. The late Yugoslavian leader Josip Broz Tito, whose death created a power vacuum that contributed to the most recent conflict, was Svetlana Broz's paternal grandfather, and according to Broz, her family tree included Serb, Croat, Bošnjak, and Jew.¹⁴⁰ She came to write the book in response to the number of people who told her their stories while she was serving as a cardiologist during the 1992-1995 Bosnian war. As she treated patients, she heard what she called "short, spontaneous confessions."¹⁴¹ These confessions prompted her to collect interviews from those who wished to tell the story of what had happened to them during the war and how they remembered the good that was done, in spite of the accompanying horrific tales that also occurred.

Over the course of the years Broz's work took on a new dimension. She started a non-government organization which focused on telling the story of acts of civil courage during the Bosnian war and helping people explore means of resistance in order to maintain commitment to good during times of conflict. To date, the work Broz has done has been secular, but there is no reason it strictly should be so. In fact, the purely secular approach, according to religion and peace scholar Zilka Spahić-Šiljak, is a flaw in Broz's methodology as it never even asked about religious motivation.¹⁴² Spahić-Šiljak argues that while it is not addressed in Broz's collection of narratives related to altruism and risks undertaken on behalf of the threatened other,

¹⁴⁰ Broz, "Beacons of Humanity," *Spirit of Bosnia: An International, Interdisciplinary, Bilingual Online Journal*, vol. 1, no. 4 (October 2006), 2, Available at <http://www.spiritofbosnia.org/volume-1-no-4-2006-october/beacons-of-humanity/?output=pdf>, accessed on 20 August 2010 and Broz, "Moral Courage and Civil Society: Lessons from Yugoslavia," Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans., (Sarajevo: Gariwo, 2003), 14, Available at <http://www.gariwo.org/gariwosa/www/UserFiles/File/Moral%20Courage%20and%20Civil%20Society.pdf>, accessed on 20 August 2010.

¹⁴¹ Broz, "Beacons of Humanity," 2.

¹⁴² Spahić-Šiljak, interview.

religious motivations may, indeed, still exist and were simply not articulated or included as such.¹⁴³

Šeperić suspects that the nature of religious life in Bosnia is such that lay adherents to the respective traditions are “reluctant to conceptualize [protective hospitality] in religious terms: they either have no knowledge about it, or they do not know how to say it, or, perhaps, their faith is so simple that they do not think...what they did was something special.”¹⁴⁴ Spahić-Šiljak considers it differently, asserting that perhaps it is not part of the civic discourse because of humility, as seen in a principle found in the Abrahamic traditions which teaches that generosity should be given in secret.¹⁴⁵ Despite the reality that there were religious undertones to the conflict and sectarian behavior was encouraged by some religious leadership throughout Bosnia, there were undoubtedly many who defied the nationalistic corruption of their faith and resisted in whatever way they could. Resistance to abusive power is not purely a secular phenomenon as has been evidenced throughout this research.

Yet, one could also argue religion’s absence from the conversation as it relates to protective hospitality as practiced in Bosnia during the most recent war is, perhaps, a good thing. As religion is perceived to have colluded with nationalism to fuel the conflict, it “depreciated the value of religion,”¹⁴⁶ as the language of religion had been largely appropriated by those who used it for their own gain rather than for the good of the community. Accordingly, Nicaraguan theologian Juan Hernández Pico may be right when he argues that “those who are faithful to the God of history may be those whose motivating convictions stand outside religious categories,” noting further that

[In the revolutionary process] seeing people die for others, and not hearing any talk from them about faith in God being the motivating factor, liberates Christians from the prejudice of trying to encounter true love solely and exclusively within the

¹⁴³ Spahić-Šiljak, interview.

¹⁴⁴ Šeperić, interview.

¹⁴⁵ *Mishneh Torah*, Laws of Charity, 10:7–14; Matt 6:1-4; Al-Baydawi, *Anwar al-Tanzil*, 2/211.

¹⁴⁶ Šeperić, interview.

boundaries of faith. It also helps to free them from the temptation of not considering a revolutionary process authentic unless it bears the label 'Christian'.¹⁴⁷

While everyone in Bosnia are not Christians, Pico's argument highlights the reality that those who are engaged in resistance and life-affirming work such as protective hospitality may often have more in common with those of other faiths who are working toward the same goals than with those of their own religious tradition who are not. As a result, while this research considers an Abrahamic theology and practice of protective hospitality, it recognizes that such labels in certain contexts may not be helpful.

In the village of Baljvine, the people who live there are religious, as evidenced by their mosque and church as important landmarks in the community and, even though they are buildings, are essential players in the communal narrative. However, according to Murica-Lennox, "their lives are greater than just [their religious adherence] and they do not force it on each other."¹⁴⁸ At the same time, one could also argue that it may be the very nature of their living together in sustained and intentional peace that has shaped their religious life, providing further motivation for their understanding of hospitality, rather than the other way around.

So, one may wonder what makes Baljvine special? On one hand, asking such a question can be counterproductive. To refer to Baljvine as special is to remove it from the possibility of normative existence, to set it up on a pedestal making it difficult to identify, develop, and apply similar factors in other contexts. Protective hospitality *did* happen there, and the reality of the war they faced side by side was evidenced by the physical destruction of the entire village that has taken them over a decade to rebuild.

Yet, the answer to why protective hospitality was given in Baljvine and not in other areas is found in several factors. Similar to the imperatives for

¹⁴⁷ Sergio Torres and John Eagleson, eds., *The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities: Papers from the International Ecumenical Congress of Theology, February 29-March 2, 1980, Sao Paulo, Brasil*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1981), 64 in Golden and McConnell, *Sanctuary*, 178.

¹⁴⁸ Murica-Lennox, interview.

hospitality within desert climates as discussed in the fourth chapter of this dissertation, one factor that contributes to Baljvine's hospitality is the village's remoteness and geographical placement high in the mountains of Bosnia. Because the members of the community are so far removed from other sources of assistance on a daily basis, it is of the utmost importance for the residents to look after one another. To not provide and care for one another in times of harsh weather or hardship would be detrimental to the village as a whole as well as devastating to the individual who is left to his or her own devices. Therefore, protective hospitality serves a practical purpose as it ensures the survival of the village.

Another factor is seen in the continued relations between the village and those who have emigrated. Even for those who have not returned to live in the village, it remains home, according to Murica-Lennox, who now lives in London. She argues "everyone remains tied to the village, including new generations born in Sweden or Australia who call it home even though they may only visit once a year on holiday."¹⁴⁹ The hospitality and mutual care present in the village capture the imagination and serves as a model of life together with the other. For those who know of Baljvine and its history, the village serves as an example of something to strive toward.¹⁵⁰

Additionally, the village worked hard to intentionally build a culture of hospitality, safety, and protection with one another, which was undoubtedly formed by their cultural values of honor, dignity and welcome. The historicity of debates related to its Bogomil origins and values aside, such a culture is not formed overnight; it requires trust, mutual sacrifice, shared celebration, and willingness to risk oneself for the other. The established traditions of

¹⁴⁹ Murica-Lennox, interview.

¹⁵⁰ This story, in some ways, reminds me of the material related to the cities of refuge in the Hebrew scriptures as considered earlier in this thesis. While the scriptural tradition is considered much more authoritative by many and plays a role in the lives of the faithful, unlike the story of Baljvine, it is similar in two ways. First, beyond the testimony given by Delić and Murica-Lennox, proving the facts and historicity of events as detailed here is difficult in an outsider context such as this, although the IWPR documentary does corroborate their stories albeit from the same source (i.e. the village). Secondly, despite the difficulty in proving it actually happened, it still captures the imagination and shows an alternative to the overwhelming testimony of destruction, exclusion and xenophobia seen in other accounts related to the 1990s conflict in Bosnia.

appointing a *dostovi/dostinice* to newborn members of the community strengthens the intentional relationships. Furthermore, within the wartime narrative, the detailed example of setting up a joint Serb and Bošnjak patrol as a preventative measure illustrates an intentional decision by the village, made with awareness of reality and risk, understanding what trauma war could bring into the village, and deciding their village would be a safe place - a place of hospitality - for those who want to reside in peace. The village understood that the Bosnian war would not begin "with neighbors attacking neighbors" but instead, it would catch fire and become uncontrollable when "someone from the outside, from one of the neighboring countries came and committed the first atrocities, killing the first victim."¹⁵¹

A final, related factor to the intentionality highlighted may be found in the reciprocity inherent in building cross-community relationships through cultural memory. The reciprocity of protective hospitality is born out of memories of good done in the past and creates a cycle that feeds further acts of hospitality when the need arises. This understanding of dangerous memory as a component of protective hospitality is in direct opposition to the cycle of violence seen in the nationalist rhetoric that arose in the conflict in Bosnia. For example, retribution over memories of atrocities committed by the Ustaša (Croat nationalist) and Četnik (Serb loyalist) forces in World War II served to fuel the 1990s conflict.

The cyclical nature of protective hospitality is hinted at by Broz, who asserts "[r]econciliation is the key issue in post-war societies" and that an "archive of stories of people who defied the evil imposed on them by warmongers can provide a model for future acts of kindness, resistance and civic courage."¹⁵² Broz argues further that these stories

restore faith in humanity, remind citizens that in each of us lie the seeds of goodness, and that even if we have been unkind or unethical at one point, the next moment we may find the strength to turn this around. Goodness allows for the redemption of the individual and the collective self. It creates

¹⁵¹ Broz, "Moral Courage and Civil Society," 9.

¹⁵² Broz, "Moral Courage and Civil Society," 14.

a sense of dignity and allows us to act from a more mature perspective rather than from a stance of unmitigated blame.¹⁵³

While peace in and of itself as a state of being does not have the same cyclical life, I would propose that *active* peacemaking – particularly seen in the provision of protective hospitality by putting oneself at risk for the threatened other – does have a cyclical nature and is fueled by reciprocity and honor, rather than by retribution and revenge. The aforementioned preventative measures taken by the villagers in the narrative are an example of this, in that they are based upon similar actions taken in history that, in turn, set a precedent for protective hospitality. One could argue that the decision to set up joint patrols and other protective actions taken was a result of the dangerous memories of actions taken by Bošnjak residents who set up a barricade to protect Serb residents during World War II. In essence, actions are reciprocated and repeated, creating a cycle of protective hospitality, and with each movement to protect one another, life together becomes more and more solidified, like threads of a tapestry. The more threads of action taken on behalf of the other that are woven together, the stronger the fabric becomes.

The witness of active peacemaking as seen in the village of Baljvine can also be extended to the witness of individuals who have inspired a multitude of others to work for and support peace through actions of protective hospitality. The next example of Friar Ivo Marković is one such individual.

¹⁵³ Broz, "Moral Courage and Civil Society, 14-15. Broz's point is reminiscent of the apostle Paul's admonition in Rom 12:17-21 to resist evil with good in order to obtain the redemption and repentance of the perpetrator.

4. Case Study No. 3: Friar Ivo Marković¹⁵⁴

a. Narrative

Friar Ivo Marković was born to a large, established Croat family in 1950 in the central Bosnian town of Susanj near Zenica. He had always been interested in spiritual matters, even at an early age, and the influence of his family had a profound impact on his worldview and moral development. The memories of his family's influence is based in an awareness that his grandfather "took a strong stance against" the Croatian Ustaša regime in the late 1930s and 1940s and that his father and grandfather were then persecuted after the war for "refusing to participate in the rising Communist regime."¹⁵⁵ Marković stated that in his family "we had our own internal ideas, and kept alive a sort of resistance."¹⁵⁶ As a result, Marković believed that is what drew him to the Franciscans, who provided his education and further influenced his thoughts and attitude toward humility, service, love and resistance. He began his focused study of theology at the Franciscan School of Theology in Sarajevo and was ordained in 1976, going on to serve as parish priest in a small village near Travnik, Bosnia and later pursuing a master's degree in pastoral theology at the Zagreb Catholic Seminary. He then returned to Sarajevo to join the Franciscan Seminary in the 1980s, teaching religion, pastoral theology and music.

Marković was still living in Sarajevo in the years leading up to and at the outbreak of the war. Like many in Sarajevo, he was shocked when the siege began, noting that "we theologians are fairly naïve: it's hard for us to

¹⁵⁴ The narrative of Friar Ivo Marković is comprised of two main biographical sources found in Keziah Conrad, "Peacebuilder Profiles: Ivo Marković," March 2007, M.A. in Peace Studies essay for Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, Available at http://www.beyondintractability.org/reflections/peacebuilder_profiles/Ivo_Markovic.jsp, accessed on 26 August 2011 and in David Little, ed., "'Would you Shoot Me, You Idiot?': Friar Ivo Marković, Bosnia and Herzegovina," in *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*, Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 106-117. In these texts, the accented latinic letters (such as č or š) used in Bosnian are not present, so quoted texts where the accent is missing or anglicized are left as they were printed. Elsewhere, the proper spelling in Bosnian is used.

¹⁵⁵ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

¹⁵⁶ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

believe that people can be evil.”¹⁵⁷ The Franciscan School of Theology in Sarajevo was immediately overrun by Serb forces and all of the priests in the school were taken into custody. Marković remembered hearing their stories of Muslims they had killed and noted that was his “first encounter with actual murderers, with people who had already killed tens of people.”¹⁵⁸ The Franciscans were later released and expelled from the school’s buildings, allowing Marković to return to his family home in central Bosnia.

He had observed the changes in political attitudes and the manipulation of religion and religious establishment to justify a rise of nationalism in the wake of Tito’s death. He noticed that “religious leaders at the local level were instrumental in mobilizing for war...[as m]any imams were military leaders, while a number of priests in the Catholic and Orthodox churches blessed weapons” and that “religious figures were ‘there to give strength to the armies, moral strength for soldiers to be strong enough to kill.’”¹⁵⁹ Therefore, Marković understood that many within religious leadership had become colluders and accomplices in the war and so he sought to respond by trying “to ‘revive positive relationships among religious communities that...[existed] before the war, to use the power of religion to stop the war and move toward reconciliation.’”¹⁶⁰

The actions and method utilized by Marković were centered in his belief “in the power of religion for ‘purification, healing, awareness, reconciliation and peace.’”¹⁶¹ He was also motivated “to act without compromise” by the suffering of others, whereby he became “deeply, personally involved in the happenings of war” and was changed “spiritually, psychologically and physically” as a result.¹⁶² Case in point, while at home in central Bosnia with the war raging around him, Marković often went out to the front lines of armies of all sides, where he “literally chased people out of

¹⁵⁷ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

¹⁵⁸ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

¹⁵⁹ *Peacemakers in Action*, 107-108.

¹⁶⁰ Marković, interview with the Tanenbaum Center, 1 April 2000 in *Peacemakers in Action*, 108.

¹⁶¹ *Peacemakers in Action*, 108.

¹⁶² Marković, email, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 108.

the trenches to talk with each other, to prevent them from fighting.”¹⁶³

David Little’s profile of Marković in his book *Peacemakers in Action* includes a story from this period of Marković’s work where he and another Franciscan mediated between Croat and Bošnjak commanders near Travnik in the summer of 1992 working to “prevent their troops from joining in the local battle.”¹⁶⁴ After unsuccessfully appealing to political leaders to try to dampen the fierce fighting and ethnic cleansing taking place in the area, Marković and his partner walked through the front lines of Croat and Bošnjak armies, who were “facing each other across a field”, in order to “go from a Croat village, Guca Gora, to a Muslim one, Maljina...to ask the imam to help” them.¹⁶⁵

Marković tells the story:

Soldiers on both sides challenged us. When approaching the Muslim side, dressed in Franciscan habit, I was told to stop or they would shoot. I became angry and ran toward them saying, “What, shoot? Would you shoot me, you idiot?” It seemed that the soldiers, though, were actually afraid of us Franciscans. Some of them followed us into the village where we found everyone in a panic. Bullets were falling on the roofs of houses and we had to go inside to escape. Some of them were threatening to return the fire. However, we found the imam and proposed that we bring together the two local commanders to see if they could prevent the violence from escalating among their troops. One of us Franciscans volunteered to remain in the Muslim village as a guarantee of good will. However, the imam insisted that there would be no hostages. We then met with both the Croat and Muslim commanders in a local café where we negotiated an agreement that the two armies would not fight. Although the region was later overrun by other troops, these commanders and their soldiers did not take part in the hostilities.¹⁶⁶

Marković noted that he went into these situations “without any fear, simply believing” that no one would kill him as they had no reason to do so.¹⁶⁷

However, this belief would be shaken when, in 1993, his father whom

¹⁶³ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

¹⁶⁴ *Peacemakers in Action*, 109.

¹⁶⁵ *Peacemakers in Action*, 109.

¹⁶⁶ Marković, email, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 109.

¹⁶⁷ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

Marković had recruited into his peacemaking and mediation efforts and who was a well-respected person in the area, was killed.

The Bošnjak Army had undertaken an offensive attack against the Croatian Defense Council in the areas around Zenica, including the area in which Marković's family lived. In that attack, not only was Marković's father killed, but nine other family members when his home village of Susanj was destroyed, and fifty-five parishioners and neighbors in the surrounding area were killed as well.¹⁶⁸ Such an experience was a test of faith for Marković, who observed:

It was an unbelievable shock for me...I had not expected anything like that. Everything that I later learned, researched, discovered about the process of reconciliation — I first experienced it firsthand. I experienced shock, deep shock, pain, everything that people do feel in those moments: questions, protest, even before God. Why did this happen to him, to me, to us — why has such an innocent person been killed?¹⁶⁹

At the time of his father's death, Marković was living in Zagreb, Croatia working with the Christian Information Service (CIS). CIS' work provided reliable news and information about the conflict in Bosnia and Croatia to international audiences and press and support humanitarian, peacemaking, and reconciliatory efforts during and after the war.¹⁷⁰ Upon hearing the news of his father's death, he contemplated returning to the heart of Bosnia's conflict in order "to protect these unprotected people,"¹⁷¹ and if necessary, take up arms.¹⁷² Marković stated this inner struggle as follows:

I doubted in my work. Everything I had done, maybe I had done it wrong, maybe I should have helped people prepare to

¹⁶⁸ Marković, email, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 109-110. As of June 2011, no investigation or indictments have taken place specifically for the death of twenty civilians (including Marković's family) in village of Susanj in June 1993. See news media service Balkan Insight, "TV Justice Magazine: Episode 17: Crimes in Susanj Village, Near Zenica, Go Uninvestigated," 15 June 2011, available at <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/video-clip-template/crimes-in-susanj-village-near-zenica-go-uninvestigated>, accessed 29 August 2011.

¹⁶⁹ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

¹⁷⁰ *Peacemakers in Action*, 110 and Conrad, "Ivo Markovic"

¹⁷¹ Marković, email, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 110.

¹⁷² *Peacemakers in Action*, 110 and Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

defend themselves, to fight. Could I perhaps be responsible for the death of these people, because I naively believed in peace — and now people are lost: my father, my family members, everybody, everything that we had, that we were, everything has been broken, destroyed, ruined. I even thought that maybe I should, like Che Guevara or priests who took up arms, maybe I should go to Bosnia and somehow, whether with weapons or some other way, join in and defend the people, be with them.¹⁷³

However, in the end, Marković came to understand his father “was killed because of the strong movement of evil that [his father] had tried to stop”¹⁷⁴ and so Marković “had to continue [his] fight against [that same] evil.”¹⁷⁵ He believed this was what his father would have expected, rather than allowing himself to get caught in the cycle of victimization and revenge and forgetting that “the killers, our enemies, are also victims.”¹⁷⁶ So, he continued to work for peace throughout the war, trying to create safe spaces where dialogue could take place and life could be affirmed.

After the war, Marković returned to Sarajevo, joining St. Anthony’s Monastery and continuing his peace-related efforts by becoming the first Bosnian Franciscan to actively initiate and promote reconciliation efforts. He did this by visiting different communities, setting up mutual cross-community aid, and helping to create shared spaces where individuals could meet and begin dialogue. He was also one of the first from Sarajevo to visit Pale, a town outside of Sarajevo that had served as the hub of the Bosnian Serb army. Marković’s approach in Pale reflected the values placed upon the rituals of hospitality:

Early in 1996, when no one dared to go to the Bosnian Serb Republic, I decided to go to Pale. When I arrived, policemen took me to prison to interrogate me. They wanted to know what I was doing and who sent me. I asked to call some Serbian friends who could answer these questions for them. My friends came and the police let me go... I continued to go to Pale two to three times a week...visiting whole neighborhoods

¹⁷³ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

¹⁷⁴ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 110.

¹⁷⁵ Conrad, “Ivo Markovic.”

¹⁷⁶ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 110.

in people's homes. Slowly, I became Ivo to them and they asked about their acquaintances in Sarajevo and sent them letters and messages... Gradually I began to see the whole situation change. The brainwashing performed by the media could be countered by meaningful personal interaction...¹⁷⁷

Marković's post-conflict work in Bosnia continues today, primarily as director of Sarajevo-based organization Oči u Oči (translated to English as "Face to Face") Inter-religious Service, whose purpose is to build up and support the vision of a pluralistic Bosnia. Within the work of Oči u Oči is Pontanima, a multiethnic interfaith choir that performs sacred music of the Muslim, Orthodox, Catholic and Jewish traditions found in Bosnia.¹⁷⁸

Marković remembers how difficult it was in the early days for members of the choir to perform "the music of the enemy,"¹⁷⁹ but he was determined in his goal "to create a symphony of religions, to bring together through song the three springs of monotheistic religion: Judaism, Christianity and Islam."¹⁸⁰ While the choir started after the war with about a dozen members, in 2007 it now has over sixty and has won several prestigious awards for their performances and work.¹⁸¹

Yet, Marković's work has not been without censure or difficulty. Within the religious establishment of Bosnia, he is infamous for his views of welcome and inclusivity. In 1998 he risked severe punishment within his own Catholic Church by stating publicly that the traditional religions of Bosnia have no capacity to "reconcile people...because they are too nationalistic and they coordinate their actions according to national interests."¹⁸² With such opinions, Marković has always differentiated himself from the religious leadership which contributed to the conflict, and in comparison, has been "ready to place his life in danger and to risk being branded a traitor" to assist the threatened other.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁷ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 111.

¹⁷⁸ *Peacemakers in Action*, 111.

¹⁷⁹ *Peacemakers in Action*, 112.

¹⁸⁰ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

¹⁸¹ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

¹⁸² *Peacemakers in Action*, 114.

¹⁸³ *Peacemakers in Action*, 114.

On a personal level, Marković's convictions about the other became all the more real when he was finally able to return to his birthplace after the war, only to find that a Muslim family was now living in his family's house. Marković's embodiment of hospitality and its rituals once again came to the fore:

...when I said that I had grown up in that house, the children were terrified and ran away, crying 'an Ustashe is here!' I called them back; everybody was in shock, everybody was pale — it was a while since they'd seen anybody from the other side. After those first few minutes we discovered each other's humanity, sat down for a cup of coffee. Afterwards I always used to go visit them. And then there was the old woman who was in my brother's house. She brought out a shotgun to kill me — a grandma with a gun! — so that I wouldn't come into the house. But I said very gently, 'Grandma, you're not going to kill me.' We drank coffee together. Later on she used to tell me she was happier when I would come to visit than if it were her own son, who had disappeared in the course of the war. I haven't investigated it much in myself, to what extent that turning point was an impulse for me in my later work for peace, but I certainly found it easier than others to enter into that other side that many people perceive as opposing, enemy. I simply stopped acknowledging the boundaries that divide people and create phobias, and I felt called to cross those boundaries and to invite others to do so.¹⁸⁴

Marković understands his work is radical to many, but he notes that it "must be radical, provocative, eye opening, and without fear...[and it] must destroy the status quo and break open closed social groups that are filled with fear, hate, and egoism."¹⁸⁵ He argues the conflict in Former Yugoslavia "stemmed from replacement of personal faith with the passions of belonging to the group,"¹⁸⁶ and believes embodying a personal and vibrant faith that "motivates [one] to...activism"¹⁸⁷ in the interest of the threatened other is where the answer to the problem of sectarian division lies. Marković remembers acts of inter-religious solidarity during the war, where "believers

¹⁸⁴ Conrad, "Ivo Markovic."

¹⁸⁵ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 114.

¹⁸⁶ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 116.

¹⁸⁷ *Peacemakers in Action*, 116.

from different religions organized actions inspired with faith,” and he remarks it was always “excellent.”¹⁸⁸ Marković recounts particular activities in 1994 where “Christians and Muslims organized open roads for humanitarian help,” accomplished by “Catholics [who] led convoys through Croat roadblocks and Muslims [who] did the same at Muslim roadblocks.”¹⁸⁹

For Marković, his action on behalf of a threatened other arises from “a sign of the experience of grace” and a deep commitment to the understanding that “[f]aith is a personal experience...not the passion that comes from belonging to a group.”¹⁹⁰ His life-affirming, hospitable approach to ministry, peacemaking, and reconciliation is captured in his affirmation that “life, activity [for others], truth and spirituality are to be lived.”¹⁹¹

b. Analysis

The examples given throughout this dissertation have been communal action, as seen in the community of Le Chambon, the Sanctuary Movement, the Jewish Community of Sarajevo and the village of Baljvine. In this case study, however, the role of an individual - Friar Ivo Marković - in providing protective hospitality is examined. Yet, Marković never refers to his actions as practices of hospitality, and in the published accounts of his work there is no consideration of hospitality at all. Nevertheless, its absence in name does not negate its presence throughout Marković’s peacemaking work. As identified in previous chapters, some markers of protective hospitality within the preceding narrative are visible in Marković’s actions: a willingness to consider as well as cross over boundaries in efforts to provide safety, a lack of concern for communal and ideological purity in light of the needs of a threatened other, a readiness to endure serious physical and non-physical risk to protect others, an affirmation of theology and action that supports life, and a common use of the rituals of table fellowship with the other as a means

¹⁸⁸ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 115.

¹⁸⁹ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 115.

¹⁹⁰ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 116.

¹⁹¹ Marković, interview, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 116.

of humanization and reconciliation.

Marković stands in a long line of individuals across the world who, at great risk to themselves, work to provide safe spaces and protective hospitality for the threatened other. These individuals are often cited in discussions related to actions taken to support peacemaking, conflict transformation or reconciliation. Luke Bretherton and David Little's *Peacemakers in Action* both consider the work of Father Sava Janjić and the Dečani Serbian Orthodox Monastery who "welcomed refugees...without regard to their ethnicity or religion" during the ethnic cleansing campaigns in nearby Kosovo in 1999.¹⁹² Serbian paramilitary forces "threatened to slaughter all the monks in the monastery if [they] did not turn over" the Albanians who had found refuge within its walls, but the monks succeeded in ensuring at least seventy Albanians made it to safety.¹⁹³ Janjić clearly stated his actions were determined by "religious duty" and "moral obligation to protect all people at risk" which "superceded all nationalist politics."¹⁹⁴

Similarly, Presbyterian minister Reverend Roy Magee grew up in the Protestant, working class, Shankill Road area of Belfast, Northern Ireland, and became proactive during the conflict when fears of sectarian attack exacerbated violence in his neighborhood. In order to reduce anxiety and neutralize the situation, somehow Magee convinced the men of the community who had been patrolling each night to stay in, and he did so "by promising to personally walk the streets every night and assure their protection."¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² David Little, ed., "The Cybermonk: Father Sava Janjic, Kosovo," in *Peacemakers in Action*, 132; Bretherton, *Hospitality as Holiness*, 1, 141.

¹⁹³ Lidija Kujundzic, "Return to the Monastery," 14 December 2000, currently available at <http://www.ex-yupress.com/nin/nin66.html>, accessed on 29 August 2011, in *Peacemakers in Action*, 132-133; Mark Urban, "Saved by the Monks of Decani," BBC News, 17 June 1999, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/371687.stm>, accessed 29 August 2011. See also Scott Canon, "Decani Monks' Courage Saved the Lives of Many Kosovars," *Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service*, 23 June 1999; Associated Press, "Serb Monastery Protects all Peoples," 17 June 1999, all available on the Serbian Orthodox Diocese of Raska and Prizren webpage at http://www.kosovo.net/decani_peace.html, accessed 29 August 2011. Varying reports say the number of Albanians who found refuge there was between 70-150 individuals.

¹⁹⁴ *Peacemakers in Action*, 133.

¹⁹⁵ *Peacemakers in Action*, "Men Who Walked the Street," 62 from Reverend Dr. Roy

But such actions are not just for those who find themselves surrounded by a conflict not of their own making. Individuals who were once combatants and violent actors can also provide protective hospitality. Such is the case of the Violence Interrupters, group comprised of individuals who were once gang members but are now mediators actually interrupting violence on the streets of Chicago.¹⁹⁶ One of those individuals is a woman named Ameena Matthews, a Muslim convert who used to be a drug enforcer for a local gang and now works to protect life in her neighborhood, creating safe zones for people seeking refuge from gang violence.¹⁹⁷

Another distinguishing factor to Marković's actions in relation to the other case studies is his overt links to religion as motivation for his actions in providing protective hospitality. Marković's personal faith, which had been influenced by his exposure to and adoption of Franciscan theological ideals, informed his commitment to peace and social justice. As Marković's witness within the Bosnian context illustrates, Little notes that "proper religion exhibits a preference for pursuing peace by peaceful means (nonviolence over violence) and for combining the promotion of peace with the promotion of justice."¹⁹⁸ He also argues that religion which is "dedicated to promoting justice and peace by peaceful means often prompts a hostile...response,"¹⁹⁹ as was evidenced by the censure Marković endured from religious leadership regarding his views. Yet, Little notes that such hostility is "best overcome, morally, and most likely practically, by favoring the promotion of justice and peace...and by willingly bearing risks and costs associated with such activity."²⁰⁰

Those risks and costs to providing safe spaces are found throughout

Magee, interview by the Tanenbaum Center, 5 May 1999, Belfast, Northern Ireland.

¹⁹⁶ A documentary film entitled *The Interrupters* made by Steve James and Alex Kotlowitz with Kartemquin Films was just released in the summer of 2011 about the work of the Violence Interrupters. See <http://interrupters.kartemquin.com/> for information.

¹⁹⁷ See Madhvi Pankhania, "Ameena Matthews is a real life screen heroine," *The Guardian*, 26 August 2011, Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/lifeandstyle/the-womens-blog-with-jane-martinson/2011/aug/26/ameena-matthews-interrupters-chicago>, accessed on 27 August 2011.

¹⁹⁸ *Peacemakers in Action*, 437.

¹⁹⁹ *Peacemakers in Action*, 437.

²⁰⁰ *Peacemakers in Action*, 437.

Marković's narrative, but one of particular interest was an offer made by one of the Franciscans during the mediation between the Croat and Bošnjak frontlines. The offer was for a volunteer to remain in the Muslim village "as a guarantee of good will" and the village imam rejected the idea, as it appeared to him a hostage scenario. One cannot help but be reminded of Morschauser's interpretation of the Genesis 19 and Judges 19 texts where he argued the practice of taking a hostage was, in ideal scenarios, precisely "a guarantee of good will." Yet, in a contemporary context informed by memory of extremists taking hostages as an act of unveiled threat, one can imagine how a hostage scenario envisioned by Morschauser could be misinterpreted and go horribly wrong in this tiny village on the frontlines of Bosnia's war.

Nevertheless, the actions of placing one's self in the way of harm as a gesture of good will and as a means of providing protective hospitality is still practiced in contexts of conflict throughout the world today. Interventionist tactics in active peacemaking, sometimes colloquially referred to working as "human shields" or "getting in the way," are utilized by individuals and communities who put themselves in the midst of a conflict, on the frontlines, and at risk of physical harm or death to provide safety or sanctuary for the other.

Such actions became headline news in January 2011 when, after a series of violent sectarian attacks on Coptic Christians in Egypt, thousands of Muslims protectively encircled churches in order to ensure that their Coptic sisters and brothers could celebrate mass without threat to their lives. "We either live together, or we die together," stated one person who stood guard.²⁰¹ Similarly, theologian Robert Schreiter writes of a group of Croatian women called Wall of Peace who, during the 1990s war in Croatia, "went ahead of the [Croatian] troops and moved into the homes of women in the Serbian villages."²⁰² Their purpose was to place themselves as shields and

²⁰¹ Yasmine El-Rashidi, "Egypt's Muslims attend Coptic Christmas Mass, serving as 'human shields'," *Ahram Online*, 7 January 2011, available at <http://english.ahram.org.eg/News/3365.aspx>, accessed on 11 January 2011.

²⁰² Robert J. Schreiter, *The Ministry of Reconciliation: Spirituality and Strategies*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999), 28.

observers in order to protect Serbian women from being raped “in revenge for what had been done to Croatian women” by Serbian troops previously.²⁰³ A final example can be seen in the direct action of organizations such as Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT)²⁰⁴ and The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHN)²⁰⁵ who are famous for placing themselves between soldiers and civilians or bulldozers and homes, in order to bear witness to violence and injustice, and to provide safe spaces for the threatened other. It is in actions such as these that the clear connections between protective hospitality and nonviolent direct action, peacemaking tactics and principles of conflict transformation and reconciliation are visible.

5. Implications of Case Studies for Research

This research as argued throughout the previous chapters that the practice of protective hospitality has faith-based foundations present in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam that encourage further exploration. It has also argued that there is positive potential for protective hospitality to contribute substantially to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, reconciliation, and the formation of an Abrahamic “cooperative theology”. The arguments have been both illustrated and problematized by the case studies presented here in this chapter.

For example, Marković’s narrative illustrated “faith is a personal experience” that motivates the practice of protective hospitality. While that certainly may be true for many, the narrative of Baljvine and possibly even the Jewish Community considering their mostly secular orientation shows that overt religious adherence is not always a primary motivator. If a community or individual bases its identity and value upon the reality of living

²⁰³ Schreiter, *The Ministry of Reconciliation*, 28. Schreiter is not clear in depicting if the Croatian women who made up the Wall of Peace had been raped by Serbian troops themselves or were simply aware that such actions happened and wanted to prevent Croatian troops from doing the same. The actions of these women are reminiscent of the actions of Le Chambon, who acted not only to protect the Jews but to also protect the perpetrators from their own violence.

²⁰⁴ See their website at <http://cpt.org/> for more information.

²⁰⁵ See their website at <http://icahd.org/> for more information.

together with the other, then motivation to welcome and protect that other is paramount. Therefore, a challenge to one of the arguments of this research is that perhaps religious faith is not always the motivator for protective hospitality, but instead it may coincide with faith in the humanity of one's neighbors.

Yet, such clear distinctions are difficult to formulate in the context of Bosnia. While the Abrahamic traditions have the capacity and theological language to address the issue of protective hospitality as has been noted in previous chapters, these case studies illustrate that even the religious practitioners do not yet articulate it as such. Such a reality is why this research sought to identify and highlight the *potential* for the development of an Abrahamic theology and practice of protective hospitality, but in light of these case studies it also recognizes that the language within public discourse is simply not present at this time to develop anything conclusively.

Additionally, the case studies presented here do not serve to show the practice of protective hospitality as being something specific to Bosnia, but they are included to redeem, at least on some level, the memories of the conflict in Bosnia, which is often portrayed as completely bleak and without any significant acts of courage or hospitality in the midst of the violence. The potential for protective hospitality to contribute to a culture of peacebuilding, conflict transformation, reconciliation, and cooperative theology and action are seen most strongly in the development and dissemination of positive communal memory in Bosnia's post-war context. These case studies have shown that the witness of the Jewish Community and Baljvine to the power of positive memory in informing future action is strong. One could speculate that if the Jewish Community had remained insular, only remembering the deportation and extermination of its members and choosing not to recover and revive the stories of those who provided protective hospitality during the Holocaust, its actions in the 1990s might have been very different. The same could be said for Baljvine; if the residents had allowed the national story of their respective ethnic groups to override their own collective memory of solidarity and protection, the narrative of the village of Baljvine might be read

just like that of any other village in Bosnia today.

In 1997, the various religious leaders of Bosnia and Hercegovina drafted a “Statement of Shared Moral Commitment,” which marked the birth of the Inter-Religious Council of Bosnia and Hercegovina.²⁰⁶ While there are issues about the council’s effectiveness,²⁰⁷ the statement and formation of the council was a foundation to build reconciliatory relationships in order to prevent future conflict. Since religious leadership are often the bearers of communal memory, their participation in making sure the positive stories are told and given time and attention within public discourse can serve to shape the historical memory of the conflict into a more nuanced narrative and hopefully bringing an end to the “repetition of returning violence for violence.”²⁰⁸

As evidenced by these case studies, the context of Bosnia holds the potential for profound cooperation between the religious communities for the threatened other. While relationships do exist and there is valuable work being done, it is obvious that within its post-conflict context there is still a great deal to be accomplished to create a society that provides protective hospitality to all. The emergence and adoption of the positive stories of protective hospitality as a means to foster this has been argued here. Yet, the credibility of the religious institutions in Bosnia is in shambles, and their emphasis upon the positive stories that came out of the conflict will be marginalized if there is no recognition of the responsibility religious leadership had toward the crimes that were committed on a widespread scale during the conflict. Therefore, religious leaders must also confess and be willing to discuss the stories of “atrocities committed by their ‘flock’,” and use both the positive and negative narratives “to stimulate theological

²⁰⁶ The Statement of Shared Moral Commitment is available on IRC’s website, <http://www.mrv.ba/images/stories/documents/Statement.pdf>, accessed 30 August 2011.

²⁰⁷ See U.S. Institute for Peace, “USIPeace Briefing: The Current Status Of Religious Coexistence And Education In Bosnia And Herzegovina,” November 2009, http://www.usip.org/files/resources/religion_education_bosnia_herzegovina_pb.pdf, accessed 30 August 2011.

²⁰⁸ Johnston and Eastvold, “History Unrequited,” 231.

reflection about the implications of that information.”²⁰⁹ Only then could a truly cooperative theology and practice of protective hospitality between the Abrahamic traditions in Bosnia be formed and implemented.

Additionally, since conversion can be considered apostasy and treason in the current ethno-religious context of Bosnia, cooperative efforts between the religious institutions must take seriously the differences between the traditions, rather than pretend each of the traditions are inherently the same. Croatian journalist Slavenka Drakulić wrote that “[o]nce the concept of ‘otherness’ takes root, the unimaginable becomes possible,”²¹⁰ and on one level, she is right. A concept of otherness taken to the extreme allows for dehumanization and objectification, and ultimately enables the ethnic cleansing and genocide that occurred in Bosnia. However, the answer is not to homogenize and eradicate difference, but to understand and value that difference through hospitality, which, in turn, helps to form relationships of solidarity. Inter-religious cooperative theology and practice in any context can only maintain credibility if each group “tangibly demonstrate[s] solidarity” as the other, rather than as the same.²¹¹ Protective hospitality’s power lies in welcoming or being welcomed by an other; protection given by the same is not hospitality but filial or communal obligation.

In a context of conflict, the case studies and the research as a whole has shown the potential for protective hospitality for the threatened other to provide a foundation upon which a framework of peacemaking, conflict transformation and reconciliation can be built. Protective hospitality enables this framework because of three reasons. First, it can foster a healthier and more cohesive communal narrative that is built upon the dangerous memories of protection given in the past. Second, it establishes relationships of reciprocity and mutual aid, which forms a stronger bond than mere

²⁰⁹ Johnston and Eastvold, “History Unrequited,” 236-237. Johnston and Eastvold argue for this particular action on the part of the religious communities and call for it to be a process “characterized by deference, not condescension; exhortation, not coercion; and dialogue, not intimidation.”

²¹⁰ Slavenka Drakulić, *The Balkan Express: Fragments from the Other Side of War*, (New York: HarperPerennial, 1994), 3.

²¹¹ Johnston and Eastvold, “History Unrequited,” 232.

diplomacy on a secular, discrete level.²¹² Thirdly, protective hospitality allows for development of communal identity and diversity, recognizing the value of the contributions and sheer presence of an other. In the spirit of Hans Küng's global ethic,²¹³ a theology and ethic of protective hospitality is not just for the religious or the non-religious, and it seeks to build up a culture of honor and dignity that provides space for people to act morally and peacefully on behalf of others.

Conclusion

The selection of Bosnia as the context for these case studies allowed for investigation into each of the Abrahamic traditions present in the region and its historical and political climate with regards to conflict, memory and the realities faced by a threatened other. The complicated role religion plays within Bosnian society mirrors many of the same issues noted elsewhere in its close relationship to political and national identity and ideology, cultural values and practices, and communal memory. Moreover, the absence of substantive religious discourse within Bosnia's multi-religious, post-conflict society provided a realistic test for the applicability and difficulties faced in relation to the positive potential for an inter-religious cooperative theology and ethic of protective hospitality.

This chapter supports the analysis of an Abrahamic theology and ethic of protective hospitality by noting several themes that have arisen throughout the research. First, through the case studies, the power of protective hospitality has been situated in a real context, highlighting the risks and practicalities involved and the role religion and the accompanying

²¹² See Douglas Johnston, *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) and *Faith-based Diplomacy: Trumping Realpolitik* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) for discussion of religion's role in diplomatic work.

²¹³ See Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions, *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions*, with commentaries by Hans Küng and Karl-Josef Kuschel, (New York: Continuum, 2006); Hans Küng, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*, (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004).

concepts related to honor plays in its articulation and practice. Second, the importance of an ethno-religious collective and its corresponding resurgence of communal memory as influenced by nationalism highlights the values and practice of protective hospitality as its antithesis. Third, the case studies of the Jewish Community and Baljvine have emphasized the important role inclusive memory plays both in self-identification and in defining one's relationship to an other, informing actions based upon dangerous memory as a higher authority against abusive power and negative narratives.

Fourth, it is clear that protective hospitality, at this time, is often to be found on the margins of society. Protective hospitality often works to challenge or subvert the powers that be, and it is practiced most effectively by those groups and individuals who have value diversity and whose concerns about the safety and well-being of the other are greater than fears related to risk or purity. Fifth, the memories of protective hospitality practiced in a community's past appear to help formulate a communal ethic of reciprocity, fueling a cycle of protective hospitality that makes decisions regarding its practice easier as time goes on. Sixth, the narrative of the village of Baljvine has illustrated the necessity for a culture of protective hospitality to be built, sustained and carefully guarded as a value that binds a community together. Finally, the case study of Friar Ivo Marković has articulated an understanding that protective hospitality provides a foundation upon which structures of peacemaking, conflict transformation, and reconciliation can be built and maintained.

CONCLUSION TO RESEARCH

*God welcomes us to
the table, laden and full,
Her apron dirty.¹*

This dissertation sought to answer the following research question:

What are the resources and teachings in the Abrahamic traditions that take hospitality, and more specifically, its call to provide protective hospitality seriously enough to inform shared action and belief on behalf of the threatened other in contexts of conflict?

To answer the above question, the research argument presented in the previous six chapters has been as follows:

Protective hospitality and its faith-based foundations, specifically in the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, merit greater theological attention. More specifically, the practice of protective hospitality in Christianity can be enhanced by better understandings of Judaism and Islam's practice of hospitality, namely their codes and etiquettes related to honor. Additionally, the positive potential for protective hospitality's contribution to peacebuilding, conflict transformation, and reconciliation and the possibility for development of a "cooperative theology" among the Abrahamic traditions are particularly valuable.

Accordingly, this dissertation sought to investigate the Christian theology and ethic of protective hospitality by looking to fellow Abrahamic traditions of Judaism and Islam and by addressing real issues, real contexts, real belief, and real dangers that face the threatened other and the individuals and communities who seek to provide sanctuary for them. It accomplished this task by situating the research in a variety of contexts: first, in the initial Chapter One case studies of Le Chambon and the Sanctuary Movement which provided a reference point for discussion of protective

¹ Composed by author. It is a haiku, in the Japanese style, comprised of seventeen syllables in three lines of five, seven, and five syllables respectively. Published in "Conference Response," *Being the Other: Theological Students' Conference 2011*, Experiential Learning Paper, no. 6, Irish Peace Centres, (September 2011): 81.

hospitality in subsequent chapters, and second, in the three case studies in Chapter Six which focused on the provision of protective hospitality during the 1992-1995 war in Bosnia. The presentation of the Bosnian case studies completed a circular journey from lived experience to analysis and back to lived experience.

Investigating the theology and ethics of the practice of protective hospitality provided a means to bring together the two currents in contemporary Christian theologies used in this research. The first current was a contextual and political approach informed by liberation and feminist theology. The second current was a complementary and cooperative approach informed by inter-religious, Abrahamic, and hospitable principles that spoke to the reality that Christian theology exists in a pluralist world. Through these two currents, this research illustrated that hospitality is not polite accommodation but is an openness to engage with and learn from the other with compassion, dignity, honor, generosity, and risk.

The second chapter of this research highlighted the various contributions that have given meaning to hospitality as a cultural practice, looking specifically at the linguistic roots of hospitality, three central practices of hospitality, and the tensions that are inherent in its provision. These tensions, and hospitality's relationships to political power, tolerance, solidarity, and honor all give complex meaning to and confine its practice.

The third chapter focused specifically upon hospitality as found in the theology and ethics of the Abrahamic traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. By briefly examining the shared origins of each tradition, both in terms of Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultural heritages and in the patriarch of Abraham, certain common aspects and models were identified that provided a foundation for further exploration. Each religious tradition was then examined in turn, identifying and considering resources that inform hospitality as well as factors that impede its contemporary practice. By identifying aspects that are unique in each of the Abrahamic traditions' practice of hospitality, the absence of the role of honor in contemporary Western Christian scholarship related to hospitality was highlighted, allowing

for further consideration of the importance of honor and its recovery in the Christian tradition to enhance and give additional meaning to the practice of hospitality.

The fourth chapter of this research introduced the second part of this dissertation, which sought to investigate the specific practice of protective hospitality. This chapter's structure was based on questions that arose in the informal conversations conducted during the course of this research in Northern Ireland and Bosnia with religious leadership and laity in the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions. As a result, a foundation for an understanding of protective hospitality was established through an examination of the mechanics of protective hospitality, considering specifically the stages of its provision, the meanings and limitations inherent in protection, and the variety of motivations available to the Abrahamic traditions that inspire individuals and communities to act on behalf of the threatened other. Then particular aspects that often impede the practice of protective hospitality were analyzed: namely, concerns related to risk, the formation and enforcement of healthy boundaries, threats to spiritual, communal, or moral purity, and protective hospitality's relationship to violence, cruelty, and nonviolent action. Throughout this chapter, the reality that positive outcomes of the practice of protective hospitality are not guaranteed were highlighted, emphasizing the tremendous potential for the Abrahamic traditions to further evaluate and develop a cooperative theology and ethic of risk to address the needs of a threatened other in contexts of conflict. The overall emphasis articulated in this chapter was that by allowing oneself to be exposed to the other, and ultimately, being willing to put oneself at risk for the safety of the other is an effective means whereby dignity can be affirmed, transformation can take place, and relationships of solidarity for the greater good may be formed.

The fifth chapter surveyed samples from the Tanakh/Hebrew Bible and the Qur'an and extra-textual sources of Islam to consider the theology and ethics of protective hospitality in the sacred texts. Through this examination, the role of honor codes as discussed in earlier chapters came to

the fore as interpretations of these texts emphasized the overall values of protection of one's guests and affirmation of life as an expression of honor, even in the face of serious threat. In addition, the Abrahamic textual sanctions related to the Cities of Refuge and Constitution of Medina assert the social and legal constructs that can enforce the provision refuge and protection for endangered others. As a result, the analysis suggested three points. First, there is direct relationship between protective hospitality and justice. Second, the selected texts continue to inspire belief and action related to protective hospitality in the present day, centuries after their composition and canonization. Because of this, the third point emphasizes the positive potential that exists for protective hospitality to inform and support a cooperative theology and ethic among the Abrahamic traditions of solidarity with individuals, groups, and communities who are in the midst of conflict and threatened by injustice and violence.

The final chapter in this dissertation was situated in the particular context of Bosnia and its 1991-1995 sectarian conflict. By locating the application of this research in Bosnia, certain aspects came to light. First, an analysis of protective hospitality in a conflicted context makes real the risks and practicalities involved in its provision. Second, religion and its accompanying concepts related to honor play an important role in the articulation and practice of protective hospitality. Thirdly, the role of an inclusive communal memory can help develop healthy self-identification and relationships with the other, can be a strong motivator for the provision protective hospitality, and has the power to fuel an ethic of reciprocity whereby a cycle of protective hospitality develops, becoming a communal value. Fourthly, protective hospitality appears to be most effectively practiced by groups and individuals who value diversity and whose concerns about the safety and well-being of others supercede their concerns about risk or purity. Fifth, a culture of protective hospitality needs to be built, sustained, and carefully guarded if it is to become a value that binds a community together. Finally, these case studies have shown that protective

hospitality provides a foundation upon which structures of peacemaking, conflict transformation, and reconciliation can be built and sustained.

Word Count: 88,388

Bibliography

- Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. *Nonviolence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003.
- Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence: Theory and Practice*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2001.
- Admirand, Peter. "Healing the Distorted Face: Doctrinal Reinterpretation(s) and the Christian Response to the Other." *One in Christ*. 42/2 (2008): 302-317.
- Ahmed, Akbar S. *Discovering Islam: Making Sense of Muslim History and Society*. Revised ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Moris Albahari. Interview with author. Sarajevo, Bosnia. 18 January 2004 .
- Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century BCE*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Alexander, Elizabeth. "Ars Poetica #100: I Believe." In *Crave Radiance: New and Selected Poems 1990-2010*. Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2010.
- Alexander, Jocelyn and Jo Ann McGregor. "Hunger, violence and war in Zimbabwe." In *Violence and Belonging: The quest for identity in post-colonial Africa*. Vigdis Broch-Due, ed. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Alexander, T. Desmond. "Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness." *Journal for Biblical Literature*, 104:2 (1985): 289-291.
- Ali, Kecia. *Sexual Ethics and Islam: Feminist Reflections on Qur'an, Hadith, and Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2006.
- Al-Kaysi, Marwan Ibrahim. *Morals and Manners in Islam: A Guide to Islamic Adab*. Leicester: The Islamic Foundation, 1986
- al-Kisa'i, Muhammad ibn 'Abd Allah. *Tales of the Prophets*. Wheeler M. Thackston, Jr., trans. Chicago: Great Books of the Islamic World/Kazi Publications, 1997.
- Almond, Gabriel A., R. Scott Appleby, and Emmanuel Sivan. *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms Around the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003.
- Althaus-Reid, Marcella. *The Queer God*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.
- Anastasios, Archbishop Yannoulatos. *Facing the World: Orthodox Christian Essays on Global Concerns*. Pavlos Gottfried, trans. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- Anderson, Pamela Sue. "A Feminist Ethics of Forgiveness." In *Forgiveness and Truth: Explorations in Contemporary Theology*, Alistair McFadyen and Marcel Sarot, eds. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001. 145-156.
- Andijar, Gil. "Introduction: 'Once More, Once More:' Derrida, the Arab, the Jew." In *Acts of Religion* by Jacques Derrida. Gil Andijar, ed. New York: Routledge, 2002. 1-39.
- Andijar, Gil. "A Note on 'Hostipitality.'" In *Acts of Religion* by Jacques Derrida. Gil Andijar, ed. New York: Routledge, 2002. 356-357.

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Sidling up to Difference," part of the "Civil Conversations Project." *Krista Tippett: On Being*, American Public Radio. Podcast. Transcript available online at <http://being.publicradio.org/programs/2011/ccp-appiah/transcript.shtml>. Accessed 19 September 2011.
- Appleby, R. Scott. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.
- ApRoberts, Ruth. *The Ancient Dialect: Thomas Carlyle and Comparative Religion*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988.
- Aquino, Maria Pilar, Daisy L. Machado, Jeanette Rodriguez. *A Reader in Latina Feminist Theology: Religion and Justice*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Armstrong, Karen. *Muhammad: A Biography of the Prophet*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Armstrong, Karen. "Balancing the Prophet." *Financial Times*. Arts and Weekend Section. 27 April 2007. 1-3.
- Arnautović, Marija. "Bosnia: The Village Where Hate Never Triumphed." Institute of War and Peace Reporting (IWPR). TRI issue 642, 10 April 2010. Available at <http://iwpr.net/report-news/bosnia-village-where-hate-never-triumphed>. Accessed on 3 Sept 2010
- Arterbury, Andrew. *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in its Mediterranean Setting*. New Testament Monographs, 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- Arterbury, Andrew. "Entertaining Angels: Hospitality in Luke and Acts 20." *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2007. 20-26.
- Auckelman, D. "City of Refuge." *Sojourners*. 13 (January 1984): 22-26.
- Avrahami, Yael. "בְּרוּשׁ in the Psalms — Shame or Disappointment?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 34/3 (March 2010): 295-313.
- Ayoub, Mahmoud M. "Abraham and His Children: Reply." In *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*. Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005.
- Bader, Mary Anna. *Sexual Violation in the Hebrew Bible: A Multi-Methodological Study of Genesis 34 and 2 Samuel 13*. Studies in Biblical Literature, no. 87. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Bailey, Clinton. *A Culture of Desert Survival: Bedouin Proverbs from Sinai and the Negev*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Bailey, Clinton. *Bedouin Law from Sinai and the Negev: Justice without Government*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Baker, D. L. *Tight Fists or Open Hands: Wealth and Poverty in the Old Testament Law*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press, 2009.

- Balkan Insight. "TV Justice Magazine: Episode 17: Crimes in Susanj Village, Near Zenica, Go Uninvestigated." 15 June 2011. Available at <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/video-clip-template/crimes-in-susanj-village-near-zenica-go-uninvestigated>. Accessed 29 August 2011
- Barnes, Michael. *Theology and the Dialogue of Religions*. Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Barr, James. "Migraš in the Old Testament." *Journal of Semitic Studies*. 29/1 (March 1, 1984): 15-31.
- Bass, Dorothy, ed. *Practicing Our Faith: A Way of Life for a Searching People*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1997.
- Battle, Michael. *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2009.
- Bau, Ignatius. *This Ground is Holy: Church Sanctuary and Central American Refugees*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.
- BBC News. "Libya interim leaders give ultimatum to Gaddafi forces." 30 August 2011. Available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14715518>. Accessed on 30 August 2011.
- Beck, Richard. *Unclean: Meditations on Purity, Hospitality, and Mortality*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011.
- Benedict, Ruth. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. First published 1946. Boston: Mariner Books, 2006.
- Benhabib, Seyla. "The Generalized and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory." In *Feminism as Critique: On the Politics of Gender*, Seyla Benhabib and Drucilla Cornell, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. Quoted in Sharon Welch. *A Feminist Ethic of Risk*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Bennett, John B. *Academic Life: Hospitality, Ethics, and Spirituality*. San Francisco: Anker Publishing, 2003.
- Benveniste, Emile. "L'hospitaite'." *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-europeennes*, vol.1. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1969. 87-101. Quoted in Tracy McNulty. *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Bergmann, Michael, Michael J. Murray, and Michael C. Rea, eds. *Divine Evil?: The Moral Character of the God of Abraham*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Berquist, Jon L. *Controlling Corporeality: The Body and the Household in Ancient Israel*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002.
- Bideleux, Robert and Ian Jeffries. *A History of Eastern Europe: Crisis and Change*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Blok, Anton. *Honour and Violence*. New York: Polity, 2000.
- Blumethal, David R. *Facing the Abusing God: A Theology of Protest*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

- Boardman, Elizabeth F. *Taking a Stand: A Guide to Peace Teams and Accompaniment Projects*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 2005.
- Bober, M. M. *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History*. Second Revised edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1965.
- Boersma, Hans. "Liturgical Hospitality: Theological Reflections on Sharing in Grace." *Journal for Christian Theological Research* 8 (2003): 67-77.
- Boersma, Hans. *Violence, Hospitality and the Cross: Reappropriating the Atonement Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Boff, Leonardo. *Virtues: For Another Possible World*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011.
- Bolchazy, Ladislaus. *Hospitality in Antiquity: Livy's Concept of its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1977. Quoted in Andrew Arterbury. *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in its Mediterranean Setting*. New Testament Monographs, 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- Bohmbach, Karla G. "Conventions/Contraventions: The Meanings of Public and Private for the Judges 19 Concubine." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 83 (1999): 83-98.
- Bolin, Thomas M. "'A Stranger and an Alien Among You' (Genesis 23:4): The Old Testament in Early Jewish and Christian Self-Identity." In *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*, Julian V. Hills, ed. (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 57-76.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Ethics*. New York: Touchstone, 1995.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Updated and expanded edition. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
- Borgen, Peder. 'Philo of Alexandria.' In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Michael E. Stone, ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984. 233-282.
- Bormans, Maurice. *Guidelines for Dialogue Between Christians and Muslims*. Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990.
- Bougarel, Xavier, Elissa Helms, and Ger Duizings, eds. *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.
- Brajovic, Zoran. "The Potential of Inter-Religious Dialogue." In *Peacebuilding and Civil Society in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ten Years After Dayton*. Martina Fischer, ed. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007. 185-214.
- Bretherton, Luke. *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness Amid Moral Diversity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Briggs, Emilie Grace. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906. Reprint 1976.
- Brimlow, Robert W. *What About Hitler?: Wrestling with Jesus' Call to Nonviolence in an Evil World*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2006.
- Bringa, Tone. *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way: Identity and Community in a Central Bosnian Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1995.

- Brock, Rita Nakashima and Rebecca Ann Parker. *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering and the Search for What Saves Us*. Boston: Beacon, 2001.
- Brown, Daniel W. *A New Introduction to Islam*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2009.
- Brown, David. *God and Enchantment of Place: Reclaiming Human Experience*. New York: Oxford, 2006.
- Brown, Joanne Carlson and Carole R. Bohn, eds. *Christianity, Patriarchy and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1989.
- Brown, Tricia Gates, ed. *Getting in the Way: Stories from Christian Peacemaker Teams*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 2005.
- Broz, Svetlana, ed. *Good People in an Evil Time*. Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans. Sarajevo: Grafičar promet, 2002.
- Broz, Svetlana. "Moral Courage and Civil Society: Lessons from Yugoslavia." Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans. Sarajevo: Gariwo, 2003. Available online at <http://www.gariwo.org/gariwosa/www/UserFiles/File/Moral%20Courage%20and%20Civil%20Society.pdf>. Accessed on 20 August 2010.
- Broz, Svetlana. "Beacons of Humanity," *Spirit of Bosnia: An International, Interdisciplinary, Bilingual Online Journal*. 1/4 (October 2006). Available online at <http://www.spiritofbosnia.org/volume-1-no-4-2006-october/beacons-of-humanity/?output=pdf>. Accessed on 20 August 2010.
- Broz, Svetlana, ed. "Moving Forward: Essays on Civil Courage." *Spirit of Bosnia: An International, Interdisciplinary, Bilingual Online Journal*. 2/4 (October 2007). Available online at <http://www.spiritofbosnia.org/volume-2-no-4-2007-october/moving-forward-essays-on-civil-courage/>. Accessed on 20 August 2010.
- Broz, Svetlana. "Civil Courage: Good People in an Evil Time, Building and Promoting Resilience." *African Health Sciences*. Special Issue: Resilience. 8 (December 2008). 36-38.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise and Challenge in Biblical Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*, Interpretation Biblical Commentary Series, (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1982
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40-66: Westminster Bible Companion Series*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *The Covenanted Self: Explorations in Law and Covenant*. Patrick Miller, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Deep Memory, Exuberant Hope*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Peace*. Understanding Biblical Themes series. St. Louis: Chalice, 2001.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Divine Presence Amid Violence: Contextualizing the Book of Joshua*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. New York: Scribners, 1970.
- Burrell, David B. *Knowing the Unknowable God: Ibn-Sina, Maimonides, Aquinas*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.

- Byrne, Brendan. *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel*.
Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Byrne, Máire. *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: A Basis for
Interfaith Dialogue*. London: Continuum, 2011.
- Cairns, Douglas. *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in
Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Caputo, John D. *More Radical Hermeneutics: On Not Knowing Who We Are*.
Studies in Continental Thought series. Bloomington, IN: Indiana
University Press, 2000.
- Caputo, John D. *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?* Grand Rapids: Baker
Academic, 2007.
- Carothers, Thomas. *In the Name of Democracy: U.S. Policy toward Latin
America in the Reagan Years*. Berkeley, CA: University of California
Press, 1993.
- Carroll, Seforosa. "Reimagining Home: A Diasporic Perspective on Encounters
with the Religious Other in Australia." In *Asian and Oceanic
Christianities in Conversation: Exploring Theological Identities at Home
and in Diaspora*. Heup Young Kim, Fumitaka Matsuoka, and Anri
Morimoto, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi Editions, 2011. 169-184.
- Cavanaugh, William T. and Peter Scott, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to
Political Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Cavanaugh, William T. *Torture and Eucharist: Theology, Politics, and the Body
of Christ*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Čerić, Mustafa. "Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Hope or Fear of our Times."
In *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in
Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. James L. Heft, ed. New York:
Fordham University Press, 2004.
- Chamberlain, J. Edward. *If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories?:
Reimagining Home and Sacred Space*. Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2003.
- CBS News. "The Righteous." 8 November 2009. Available at
[http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/11/08/sunday/main5574960.
shtm](http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/11/08/sunday/main5574960.shtm)l. Accessed on 15 October 2010.
- Chayes, Antonia and Martha L. Minow, eds. *Imagine Coexistence: Restoring
Humanity After Violent Ethnic Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,
2003.
- Chesterton, G.K. *The Collected Works of G.K Chesterton*. vol. 29. London:
Ignatius Press, 1988.
- Chia, Edmund Kee-Fook. "Is Interfaith Theology Possible?" *Studies in
Interreligious Dialogue*. 18/1 (2008): 112-117.
- Chittister, Joan. "Hospitality: The Unboundaried Heart." In *Wisdom Distilled
from the Daily: Living the Rule of St. Benedict Today*. San Francisco:
HarperSanFrancisco, 1990.
- Chittister, Joan, Murshid Saadi Shakur Chishti, and Rabbi Arthur Waskow. *The
Tent of Abraham: Stories of Hope and Peace for Jews, Christians and
Muslims*. Boston: Beacon, 2006.
- Chopp, Rebecca. *The Praxis of Suffering: An Interpretation of Liberation and
Political Theologies*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990.

- Christensen, Michael J. "Practicing Hospitality in the City: Making the Stranger into a Friend." In *City Streets, City People*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1988.
- City of Sanctuary (UK). <http://www.cityofsanctuary.org>. Accessed on 10 September 2011.
- Clark, Howard, ed. *People Power: Unarmed Resistance and Global Solidarity*. New York: Pluto Press, 2009.
- Clark, Ian D. and David A. Cahir. "The comfort of strangers': Hospitality on the Victorian Goldfields, 1850-1860." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 15 (2008): 2-7.
- Clooney, Francis X. *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Cole, Darrell. "Good Wars." *First Things*. 116 (October 2001): 27-31.
- Coleman, Will. "Being Christian in a World of Fear: The Challenge of Doing Theology within a Violent Society." In *Many Voices, One God: Being Faithful in a Pluralistic World*. Walter Brueggemann and George W. Stroup, eds. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Community Relations Council. *Towards Sustainable Security; Interface Barriers and the Legacy of Segregation in Belfast*. Belfast: Community Relations Council, 2008.
- Cone, James. *For My People: Black Theology and the Black Church*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984.
- Cone, James H. *God of the Oppressed*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997.
- Cone, James. *Speaking the Truth: Ecumenism, Liberation and Black Theology*. Second ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999.
- Conner, Philip. *Huguenot Heartland: Montauban and Southern French Calvinism During The Wars of Religion*. St Andrews Studies in Reformation History series. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2002.
- Conrad, Keziah. "Peacebuilder Profiles: Ivo Marković." March 2007. M.A. in Peace Studies essay for Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Available online at http://www.beyondintractability.org/reflections/peacebuilder_profile_s/Ivo_Markovic.jsp. Accessed on 26 August 2011.
- Courville, Mathieu. *Edward Said's Rhetoric of the Secular*. London: Continuum, 2010.
- Cornille, Catherine. "Introduction: On Hermeneutics in Dialogue." In *Interreligious Hermeneutics*. Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010.
- Cornille, Catherine and Christopher Conway, eds. *Interreligious Hermeneutics*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010.
- Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions. *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions*. New York: Continuum, 2006.
- Counihan, Carole and Penny Van Esterick, eds. *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Crittenden, Ann. *Sanctuary: A Story of American Conscience and the Law in Collision*. New York: Grove Press, 1988.

- Cunningham, David S. *These Three are One: The Practice of Trinitarian Theology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Cunningham, Hilary. *God and Caesar at the Rio Grande: Sanctuary and the Politics of Religion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Curta, Florin. *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500-1250*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Cvitković, Ivan. "Religions in War: The Example of Bosnia and Herzegovina." Paul Mojzes, trans. *Religion in Eastern Europe*. 21/6 (2001): 32-45.
- D'Arcy May, John, ed. *Pluralism and the Religions: The Theological and Political Dimensions*. London: Cassell, 1998.
- D'Arcy May, John. *After Pluralism: Towards an Interreligious Ethic*. Münster: LIT, 2000.
- Dabashi, Hamid. *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2008.
- Daly, Mary. *The Church and the Second Sex*. Boston: Beacon, 1968, reissue 1985.
- Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father*. Boston: Beacon, 1973, reissue 1985.
- Davidson, Miriam. *Convictions of the Heart: Jim Corbett and the Sanctuary Movement*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1988.
- Day, Dorothy. *House of Hospitality*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1939.
- Dawes, Gregory W. "The Sense of the Past in the New Testament and the Qur'an." In *Islamic and Christian Cultures: Conflict or Dialogue*, Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, III, Plamen Makariev, ed. Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2001. 9-31
- De Gruchy, John W. *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Delić Salih. "Can You Count on Your Neighbors." In *Good People in an Evil Time*, Sveltana Broz, ed., Ellen Elias-Bursać, trans. Sarajevo: Grafičar promet, 2002. 15-20.
- Denny, Frederick Mathewson. "The meaning of *ummah* in the Qur'an." *History of Religions*. 15 (1975): 34-69.
- Denny, Frederick M. "Islam and Peacebuilding." In *Religion and Peacebuilding*, Harold Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004. 129-146.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Violence and Metaphysics." In *Writing and Difference*. Alan Bass, trans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 79-153.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Hospitality and Hostility." Seminar at University of California, Irvine. 3 April 1996. Quoted in Tracy McNulty, *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Hospitality." In *Deconstruction in a nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*. Commentary by John D. Caputo, ed. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 1997. 109-112.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, trans. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

- Derrida, Jacques and Anne Dufourmantelle. *Of Hospitality: Cultural Memory in the Present*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Derrida, Jacques. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Thinking in Action series. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Acts of Religion*. Gil Anidjar, ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Politics of Friendship*. New York: Verso, 2006.
- deSilva, David A. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Diamant, Anita. *Living a Jewish Life: Jewish Traditions, Customs and Values for Today's Families*. New York: Collins, 1996.
- Dietler, Michael and Brian Hayden. *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010.
- Docker, John. *The Origins of Violence: Religion, History and Genocide*. New York: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Dodson, Jualynne E., and Cheryl Townsend Gilkes. "There's Nothing Like Church Food': Food and the U.S. Afro-Christian Tradition: Remembering Community and Feeding the Embodied S/spirit(s)." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 63/3 (Fall 1995): 519-538.
- Donia, Robert J. *Sarajevo: A Biography*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006.
- Donne, John. "Meditation XVII." *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, 1624.
- Doorly, William J. *The Laws of Yahweh: A Handbook of Biblical Law*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2002.
- Douglas, Mary. *Risk Acceptability According to the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Douglas, Mary. *In The Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series* 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. vol. 2. *Mary Douglas Collected Works*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. "Numbers." *New Interpreter's Bible*. vol. 2. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Drakulić, Slavenka. *The Balkan Express: Fragments from the Other Side of War*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1994.
- Duran, Khalid. "Homosexuality in Islam." In *Homosexuality and World Religions*. Arlene Swidler, ed. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1993. 181-197
- Đurić, Danijela. Bosnian Serb protective hospitality practitioner. Interview with author. Sarajevo, Bosnia. 2 August 2010
- Earl, Douglas S. *The Joshua Delusion: Rethinking Genocide in the Bible*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2011.
- Earl, Riggins R., Jr. "Under Their Own Vine and Fig Tree: The Ethics of Social and Spiritual Hospitality in Black Church Worship." *Journal of the*

- Interdenominational Theological Center* 14/1 and 2 (Fall 1986-Spring 1987): 181-93.
- Eiesland, N.L. *The Disabled God: Toward a Liberatory Theology of Disability*. Nashville: Abington Press, 1994.
- Ekklesia. "WCC chief welcomes Muslim letter on dialogue." 15 October 2007. <http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/5920>.
- Ekklesia. "American inter-church body says Muslim-Christian exchange 'a sign of hope'." 16 October 2007. <http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/5923>.
- Ekklesia. "Muslim statement on peace among religions 'historic', says academic." 11 October 2007. <http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/5899>.
- Ekklesia. "Anglican chief echoes call for faiths to renounce all violence." 22 October 2007. <http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/5979>.
- Eisenstadt, Oona. "The Problem of the Promise: Derrida on Levinas on the Cities of Refuge." *Crosscurrents*. Winter (2000): 474-482.
- El Fadl, Khaled M. Abou. *And God Knows the Soldiers: The Authoritative and Authoritarian in Islamic Discourses*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2001.
- Ellis, Marc. *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.
- Ellis, Marc. *Reading the Torah Out Loud*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- El-Rashidi, Yasmine. "Egypt's Muslims attend Coptic Christmas Mass, serving as 'human shields'." 7 January 2011. *Ahram Online*. Available at <http://english.ahram.org.eg/News/3365.aspx>. Accessed on 11 January 2011.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "VI: Worship." *The Conduct of Life*. 1860 (revised 1876). Available at <http://www.emersoncentral.com/worship.htm>. Accessed on 8 October 2010
- Engell, Helene. "Dialogue for Life: Feminist Approaches to Interfaith Dialogue." *Theology and the Religions: A Dialogue*, Viggo Mortenson, ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. 249-256.
- Engineer, Ashgar Ali. *Islam and Liberation Theology*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1990.
- Esack, Farid. *Qur'an, Liberation and Pluralism*, Oxford: Oneworld Press, 1997.
- Eusebius. *The History of the Church: From Christ to Constantine*. Penguin Classics. Andrew Louth, ed. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- Eynikel, Erik. "Judges 19-21, An 'Appendix: Rape, Murder, War and Abduction." *Communio Viatorum*. 47:2 (2005): 101-115.
- Fast, Howard. *The Jews: Story of a People*. New York: Dell Press, 1992.
- Fine, John V.A. Jr., *The Bosnian Church: A New Interpretation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston: Beacon, 1993.
- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. *The Power of the Word*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

- Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. "Theological and religious studies: the contest of the faculties." In *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education*. Barbara G. Wheeler and Edward Farley, eds. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991. 119-150.
- Firestone, Reuven. "Judaism as a Force for Reconciliation: An Examination of Key Sources." In *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. James L. Heft, ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004. 74-87.
- Fitzgerald, Michael L. "Relations among the Abrahamic Religions: A Catholic Point of View." In *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*. Bradford E. Hinze and Irfan A. Omar, eds. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005. 55-78.
- Fleischner, Eva. "Can Few Become the Many? Some Catholics in France Who Saved Jews during the Holocaust." In *Remembering for the Future, A*. Roy Eckardt and Alice Eckardt, eds. vol. 1. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989. 233-47.
- Fletcher, Jeannine Hill. *Monopoly on Salvation?: A Feminist Approach to Religious Pluralism*. New York: Continuum, 2005.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. *Islamic Societies in Practice*. Second ed. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2004.
- Fogelman, Eva. *Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of the Jews During the Holocaust*. New York: Anchor, 1995.
- Fox, Marvin. *Interpreting Maimonides: Studies in Methodology, Metaphysics, and Moral Philosophy*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Frankel, Jonathan and Steven J. Zipperstein, eds. *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Frantzen, Allen J. *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice, and the Great War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Frederick, Kevin. "Clinging to the Threshold of Hope: A Sermon." *Family Matters*. 17:1 (Spring 2003): 55-71.
- Freedman, David Noel, Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, Michael M. Homan, and Astrid B. Beck. *The Nine Commandments: Uncovering a Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *Abraham: trials of family and faith*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2007.
- Friedmann, Yohanan. *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Friedrich, Paul. "Sanity and the Myth of Honor: The Problem of Achilles." *Ethos*. 5 (1977): 281-305.
- "Friendship." *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*. No. 27. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.

- García, María Cristina. *Seeking Refuge: Central American Migration to Mexico, the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006.
- Gathje, Peter R. *Sharing the Bread of Life: Hospitality and Resistance at the Open Door Community*. 25th Anniversary of the Open Door Community. Atlanta: Open Door Community, 2006.
- Gathogo, Julius Mutugi. "African philosophy as expressed in the concepts of hospitality and ubuntu." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*. 130 (March 2008): 39-53.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Gershman, Norman. *Besa: A Code of Honor: Muslim Albanians who Rescued Jews During the Holocaust*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008.
- Giannakis, E. "The Concept of the Ummah." *Graeco-Arabica*. 2 (1983), 99-111.
- Gil, Moshe. "The Constitution of Medina: a reconsideration." *Israel Oriental Studies*. 4 (1974): 44-66.
- Gil, Moshe. *Jews in Islamic Countries in the Middle Ages*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Gilmore, David, ed. *Honour and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987.
- Golden, Penny and Michael McConnell. *Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986.
- Goldstein, Niles Elliot. "The New Schul - Kol Nidre 5767." Available online at: <http://www.newshul.org/pdfs/sermon06yk.pdf>. Last accessed on 21 October 2009.
- Goodman, Martin, Geurt Hendrik van Kooten, and J van Ruiten. *Abraham, the nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic perspectives on kinship with Abraham*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Gopin, Marc. *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gopin, Marc. "Judaism and Peacebuilding." In *Religion and Peacebuilding*. Harold G. Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004. 111-127.
- Gopin, Marc. "The Heart of the Stranger." In *Explorations of Reconciliation*. David Tombs and Joseph Liechty, eds. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006. 3-21.
- Gottlieb, Lynn. *She Who Dwells Within: A Feminist Vision of a Renewed Judaism*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995.
- Graham, Elaine, Heather Walton, and Frances Ward, eds. *Theological Reflection: Methods*. vol. 1. London: SCM, 2005.
- Grayze, Susan R. *Women's Identities at War: Gender, Motherhood and Politics in Britain and France During the First World War*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Greenberg, Irving. "Religion as a Force for Reconciliation and Peace: A Jewish Analysis." In *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. James L. Heft, ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004. 88-112.

- Gregorios, Paulos Mar. "Not a Question of Hospitality." *Ecumenical Review* 44 (1992): 46.
- Grey, Mary. *To Rwanda and Back: Liberation Spirituality and Reconciliation*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2007.
- Griffiths, Leslie. "Hospitality." *One in Christ*. Vol. 42, no. 2. 229-245.
- Gross, Michael L. *Ethics and Activism: The Theory and Practice of Political Morality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Gross, Selwyn. "Religious Pluralism in Struggles for Justice." *New Blackfriars* 71 (841): 2. Quoted in Farid Esack. *Qur'an, Liberation and Pluralism: An Islamic Perspective of Interreligious Solidarity Against Oppression*. Oxford: Oneworld, 1997.
- Guder, Darrell J. et al. *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Gundry-Volf, Judith M. and Miroslav Volf. *A Spacious Heart: Essays on Identity and Belonging*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Gushee, David P. *Righteous Gentiles of the Holocaust: Genocide and Moral Obligation*. Second ed. New York: Paragon, 2003.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. C. Inda and J. Eagleson, trans. and ed. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1973.
- Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck and John L. Esposito, eds. *Daughters of Abraham: Feminist Thought in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2002.
- Hallie, Philip. *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed: The Story of Le Chambon and How Goodness Happened There*. New York: Harper, 1979.
- Hallie, Philip. "From Cruelty to Goodness." *The Hastings Center Report*. 11/3 (June 1981): 23-28.
- Hallie, Philip. *In the Eye of the Hurricane: Tales of Good and Evil, Help and Harm*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1997.
- Hamilton, Janet, Bernard Hamilton and Yuri Stoyanov. *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650-c. 1450*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Hamilton, Jennifer, John Bell and Ulf Hansson. "Sectarianism and Segregation: Impact on Everyday Life." *Shared Space*. No 6 (June 2008): 35-50.
- Hand, Seán. "Working out interiority: locations and locutions of ipseity." *Literature and Theology*. 17/4 (2003): 422-434.
- Harder, Gary. "Competing visions: Can we keep Isaiah and Ezra in the same Bible, and you and me in the same church?" *Vision* (Spring 2002): 25-33.
- Hassan, Riaz. *Faithlines: Muslim Conceptions of Islam and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Hassan, Riffat. "Challenging the Stereotypes of Fundamentalism: An Islamic Feminist Perspective." *The Muslim World*. 91/1-2 (2001): 55-69.
- Hassan, Riffat. "Islamic Hagar and Her Family." In *Hagar, Sarah, and Their Children*. Phyllis Trible and Letty M. Russell, eds. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006. 149-167.

- Hauerwas, Stanley and Samuel Wells. *The Blackwell Companion to Christian Ethics*. Blackwell Companions to Religion series. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. "Bonhoeffer on Truth and Politics," The Project on Lived Theology, University of Virginia. Available at <http://livedtheology.org/pdfs/hauerwas.pdf>. 5 April 2007.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1983.
- Hauerwas, Stanley and William H. Willimon. *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1989.
- Hawkins, Thomas. *Sharing the Search: A Theology of Christian Hospitality*. Nashville: The Upper Room, 1987.
- Hayka, Muhammad Husayn. *The Life of Muhammad*. Isma'il Ragi al Faruqi, trans. American Trust Publications, first print 1976, fourth print 2005.
- Heck, P.L. "Jihad Revised." *Journal of Religious Ethics*. 32/1 (2004): 95-128.
- Heft, James L., ed. *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. New York: Fordham, 2004.
- Heft, James L. "Introduction: Resources for Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity and Islam." In *Beyond Violence: Religious Sources of Social Transformation in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. James L. Heft, ed. New York: Fordham, 2004. 1-14.
- Heim, S. Mark. *Saved from Sacrifice: A Theology of the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Hellman, Peter. *When Courage Was Stronger Than Fear: Remarkable Stories of Christians and Muslims Who Saved Jews from the Holocaust*. New York: Marlowe and Company, 2004.
- Helminski, Kabir. "Adab: The Courtesy of the Path." <http://www.sufism.org/books/sacred/adab.html>. Accessed on 4 March 2007.
- Herbert, David. "Religion and European Identities." In *Exploring European Identities*. Christina Chimento, ed. Milton Keynes: The Open University, 2003. 183-226
- Herbert, David. *Religion and Civil Society: Rethinking Public Religion in the Contemporary World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003. 229-264
- Herman, Judith Lewis. *Trauma and Recovery*. London: Pandora, 1997.
- Hershberger, Michelle. *A Christian View of Hospitality: Expecting Surprises*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999.
- Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976.
- Herzfeld, Michael. "Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems." *Man*. Royal Anthropological Institute 15 (1980); 339-351.
- Herzfeld, Michael. "'As in Your Own House': Hospitality, Ethnography, and the Stereotype of Mediterranean Society." In *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, David Gilmore, ed. Washington: American Anthropological Association, 1987. 75-78.

- Hinze, Bradford E. and Irfan A. Omar, eds. *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish and Christian Relations*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005.
- Hoare, Marko Attila. "What do the figures for the Bosnian war-dead tell us?" 5 January 2008. *Bosnian Institute*. Available at: http://www.bosnia.org.uk/news/news_body.cfm?newsid=2336. Accessed on 20 September 2011.
- Hobbs, T. R. "Reflections on Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations." *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 116/3 (Autumn, 1997): 501-503.
- The Holy Rule of St. Benedict*. Boniface Verheyen, trans. 1949, chap. 53. Available at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/benedict/rule2/files/rule2.html>. Accessed on 1 June 2011.
- Homan, Daniel, and Lonni Collins Pratt. *Radical Hospitality: Benedict's Way of Love*. Orleans, MA: Paraclete Press, 2005.
- hooks, bell. *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press, 1981.
- hooks, bell. *Remembered Rapture: The Writer at Work*. London: Holt, 1999. 120-121. Quoted in Pamela Sue Anderson, "A Feminist Ethics of Forgiveness." *Forgiveness and Truth: Explorations in Contemporary Theology*. Alistair McFadyen and Marcel Sarot, eds. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Religion and Empire: People, Power and the Life of the Spirit*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- "Hospitality." *Parabola: the Magazine of Myth and Tradition*. 15/4 (November 1990). Entire issue.
- "Hospitality." *Weavings*. 9/1 (January-February 1994). Entire issue.
- Hostetter, Doug, Rachel Davis, Benjamin Majekodunmi, and Judy Smith Höhn. "Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities and the Responsibility to Protect: Challenges for the UN and the International Community in the 21st Century." *The Responsibility to Protect Occasional Paper Series*, International Peace Institute, June 2008. Unpublished paper.
- Hughes, Edward J. *Wilfred Cantwell Smith: A Theology for the World*. London: SCM, 1986.
- Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2008 - Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 31 January 2008, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/47a87bf91d.html>, accessed 29 August 2011
- Hurley, Michael. *Reconciliation in Religion and Society*. Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1994.
- Hussain, Amir. "Muslims, Pluralism, and Interfaith Dialogue." In *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*. Omid Safi, ed. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003. 251-269.
- Hütter, Reinhold. "Hospitality and Truth: The Disclosure of Practices in Worship and Doctrine." In *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life*. Miroslav Volf and Dorothy C. Bass, eds. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Ibn Isahq. *Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sirat Rasul Allah*. A. Guillame, trans and ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Ignatieff, Michael. *The Needs of Strangers*. London: Chatto and Windus, The Hogarth Press, 1984.
- Inge, John. *A Christian Theology of Place*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Institute of War and Peace Reporting. *The Village the War Forgot*. Tales of Transition Conference. 29 September 2010. Available at: <http://iwpr.net/report-news/village-war-forgot>. Accessed on 24 August 2011.
- International Court of Justice, The Hague. CR 2006/22. *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)*. 17 March 2006. Verbatim Record. Available at <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/91/10628.pdf>. Accessed on 3 September 2010.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council. *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Sectarian divide continues to hamper residual return and reintegration of the displaced*. 25 October 2006. Available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/560E20B7FCCB0555C1257212003CA532/\\$file/Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina%20-%20October%202006.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/560E20B7FCCB0555C1257212003CA532/$file/Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina%20-%20October%202006.pdf). Accessed 29 August 2011
- International Cities of Refuge Network. <http://www.icorn.org/>. Accessed on 10 September 2011.
- Inter-Religious Council of Bosnia-Herzegovina. "The Statement of Shared Moral Commitment." Available at: <http://www.mrv.ba/images/stories/documents/Statement.pdf>. Accessed 30 August 2011.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique and Barbara Rosenwein. *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism and Islam (1000-1150)*. Graham Robert Edwards, trans. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2003.
- Irani, George E. and Nathan C. Funk. "Rituals of Reconciliation: Arab-Islamic Perspectives." In *Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam*, Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. Lanham: University Press of America, 2001. 169-192.
- Islam Times*. "BESA...When Muslims Saved Jews." 31 August 2009. Available at: <http://www.islamtimes.org/vdgc379q.ak9zz4j5ra.html>. Accessed on 19 September 2011.
- Israeli Committee Against Housing Demolition. <http://icahd.org/>. Accessed 10 September 2011.
- Jacobs, Janet Liebman. *Hidden Heritage: The Legacy of the Crypto-Jews*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Jafri, Amir H. *Honour Killing: Dilemma, Ritual, Understanding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Jamal, Amreen. "The Story of Lot and the Qur'an's Perception of the Morality of Same-Sex Sexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality*. 41/1 (2001): 1-88.
- Jarman, Neil. "Security and Segregation: Interface Barriers in Belfast." *Shared Space*. No 6 (June 2008): 21-34.
- Jasam, Saima. *Honour, shame and resistance*. Lahore : ASR Publications, 2001.

- Jeanrond, Werner G. "Toward an Interreligious Hermeneutics of Love." *Interreligious Hermeneutics*. Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010. 44-60.
- Johnson, Elizabeth A. *Friends of God and Prophets*. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- Johnson, Rubellite. "Religion." *Native Hawaiians Study Commission Report*. Honolulu: Office of Hawaiian Affairs, February 1983.
- Johnson, William Stacy ed. *Crisis, Call and Leadership in the Abrahamic Traditions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Johnston, Douglas. *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Johnston, Douglas. *Faith-based Diplomacy: Trumping Realpolitik*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Johnston, Douglas M. and Jonathon Eastvold. "History Unrequited: Religion as a Provocateur and Peacemaker in the Bosnian Conflict." In *Religion and Peacebuilding*, Harold Coward and Gordon S. Smith, eds. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Jones, L. Gregory. "Eucharistic Hospitality: Welcoming the Stranger into the Household of God." *Reformed Journal*. 39 (May 1989): 13.
- Jones, L. Gregory. *Embodying Forgiveness: A Theological Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Jones, L. Gregory, Reinhard Hütter, and C. Rosalee Velloso Ewell, eds. *God, Truth, and Witness: Engaging Stanley Hauerwas*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005.
- Jones, Martin. *Feast: Why Humans Share Food*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Jones-Warsaw, Koala. "Toward a Womanist Hermeneutic: A Reading of Judges 19-21." In *A Feminist Companion to Judges*. A. Brenner, ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993. 172-86.
- Kang, Namsoon. "Re-constructing Asian feminist theology: toward a glocal feminist theology in an era of neo-Empire(s)." In *Christian Theology in Asia*. Sebastian C.H. Kim, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 205-226.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Ted Humphrey, trans. Indianapolis: Hackett and Company, 2003. Article 3: 15-18.
- Karabell, Zachary. *Peace Be Upon You: Fourteen Centuries of Muslim, Christian and Jewish Conflict and Cooperation*. New York: Vintage, 2007.
- Katz, Claire Elise. *Levinas, Judaism, and the Feminine: The Silent Footsteps of Rebecca*. Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Religion. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- Kearney, Richard and Mark Dooley, eds. *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Keefe Alice. "Rapes of Women/Wars of Men." *Semeia*. 61 (1993): 79-98.
- Keen, Ralph. *Exile and Restoration in Jewish Thought: An Essay In Interpretation*. Continuum Studies In Jewish Thought series. New York: Continuum, 2009.

- Kellenberger, J., ed. *Inter-Religious Models and Criteria*. New York: St Martin's, 1993.
- Keller, Nuh Ha Mim Keller. "Adab of Islam." 2001. http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/nuh/adab_of_islam.htm. Accessed on 4 March 2007.
- Kelsay, John. *Arguing the Just War in Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2007.
- Kenyon, Kathleen. *Digging Up Jericho*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957.
- Kern, Kathleen. *In Harm's Way: A History of Christian Peacemaker Teams*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2009.
- Kern, Kathleen. *As Resident Aliens: Christian Peacemaker Teams in the West Bank 1995-2005*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2010.
- Keshkegian, Flora A. *Redeeming Memories: A Theology of Healing and Transformation*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000.
- Khan, Ali. "Commentary on the Constitution of Medina." in *Understanding Islamic Law: From Classical to Contemporary*. Hisham M. Ramadan, ed. Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2006.
- Khan, Mohammed Muqtedar. "Islam as an Ethical Tradition of International Relations." In *Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam*, Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. Lanham: University Press of America, 2001.
- Kiefert, Patrick R. *Welcoming the Stranger: A Public Theology of Worship and Evangelism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Kimball, Charles. *When Religion Becomes Evil*. San Francisco: Harper, 2002.
- Kimball, Charles. *When Religion Becomes Lethal: The Explosive Mix of Politics and Religion in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 2011.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham City Jail, April 16, 1963." In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* James Melvin Washington, ed. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1986. 289-302.
- Ursula King, "Feminism: The Missing Dimension in the Dialogue of Religions." In *Pluralism and the Religions: The Theological and Political Dimensions*. John D'Arcy May, ed. London: Cassell, 1998. 40-57.
- Kirk, David. "Hospitality: The Essence of Eastern Christian Lifestyle." *Diakonia* 16/2 (1981): 104-17.
- Klassen, William. *Love of Enemies: The Way to Peace*. Overtures to Biblical Theology series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Knitter, Paul F. *No Other Name?* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985.
- Knitter, Paul F. "Toward a Liberation Theology of Religions." *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*. John Hick and P.F. Knitter, eds. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.
- Knitter, Paul F. Foreword to *An Asian Theology of Liberation* by Aloysius Pieris. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.
- Knitter, Paul F. "Pluralism and Oppression: Dialogue between the Many Religions and the Many Poor." *The Community of Religions: Voices and*

- Images of the Parliament of the World's Religions*. Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns, eds. New York: Continuum, 1996.
- Knitter, Paul F. "Responsibilities for the Future: Toward an Interfaith Ethic." *Pluralism and the Religions: The Theological and Political Dimensions*. John D'Arcy May, ed. London: Cassell, 1998. 75-89.
- Knitter, Paul F. "The Vocation of an Interreligious Theologian: My Retrospective on Forty Years in Dialogue." *Horizons*. 31/1 (2004): 135-149.
- Knoppers, Gary N. and J. Gordon McConville, eds. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on Deuteronomistic History*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study. vol. 8. Warsaw, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Koenig, John. *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Koyama, Kosuke. "'Extend Hospitality to Strangers': A Missiology of *Theologia Crucis*." *Currents in Theology and Mission*. 20/3 (June 1993): 165-176.
- Kugle, Scott Siraj Al-Haqq. "Sexuality, Diversity and Ethics in the Agenda of Progressive Muslims." In *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*. Omid Safi, ed. Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2003. 190-234.
- Kugle, Scott Siraj al-Haqq. *Homosexuality in Islam: Critical Reflection on Gay, Lesbian and Transgender Muslims*. Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2010.
- Kujundzic, Lidija. "Return to the Monastery." 14 December 2000. Available at <http://www.ex-yupress.com/nin/nin66.html>. Accessed on 29 August 2011
- Kuschel, Karl-Josef. *Abraham: A Symbol of Hope for Jews, Christians and Muslims*. John Bowden, trans. London: SCM, 1995.
- Küng, Hans and Karl-Josef Kuschel, eds. *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions*. London: SCM Press, 1993.
- Küng, Hans. *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998
- Küng, Hans. *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004.
- Kyung, Chung Hyun. *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990.
- LaCocque, André. *The Feminine Unconventional: Four Subversive Figures in Israel's Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- LaFeber, Walter. *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America*. Second ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- Lawrence, Louise Joy. *An ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew: a critical assessment of the use of the honour and shame model in New Testament studies*. Doctoral thesis. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Lasine, Stuart. "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World." *Journal for the Society of the Old Testament*. 29 (1984): 37-59.
- Le Bon, Gustave. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, first published in 1895. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2002. Available at: <http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/BonCrow.html>. Accessed 18 August 2011

- Lee, Jung Young. *Marginality: The Key to Multicultural Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995.
- LeoGrande, William M. *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other*. Richard A. Cohen, trans. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Beyond the Verse: Talmudic Readings and Lectures*. Gary D. Mole, trans. London: Athlone Press, 1994.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Difficult Freedom: Essays on Judaism*. Johns Hopkins Jewish Studies series. Sean Hand, trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Humanism of the Other*. Nidra Poller, trans. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2005.
- Lewis, Berrisford. "Forging an understanding of black humanity through relationship: an ubuntu perspective." *Black Theology* 8/1 (1 April 2010): 69-85.
- Liechty, Joseph and Cecelia Clegg. *Moving Beyond Sectarianism*. Dublin: Columba Press, 2001.
- David Little, "Cosmopolitan Compassion and Condemnation," *Religion and Values in Public Life*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Divinity School, 2000).
- Little, David, ed., "'Would you Shoot Me, You Idiot?': Friar Ivo Marković, Bosnia and Herzegovina." In *Peacemakers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*. Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 106-117.
- Lorentzen, Robin. *Women in the Sanctuary Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1991.
- Lottes, John D. "Toward a Christian Theology of Hospitality to Other Religions on Campus." *Currents in Theology and Mission*. Lutheran School of Theology and Mission. 32/1 (2005): 26-39.
- Love, Maryann Cusimano. "The Ethics of Risk." *America: The National Catholic Weekly*. 11 September 2006. Available at: http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=4943. Accessed on 7 July 2011.
- Maahs, Charles. "Hospitality, Power, and Mission: A Review of the Writings and Leadership of Roger W. Fjeld." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 30/3 (June 2003): 168-172.
- MacDonald, David B. "From Jasenovac to Srebrenica: Subaltern Genocide and the Serbs." In *Genocides by the Oppressed: Subaltern Genocide in Theory and Practice*. Nicholas A. Robins and Adam Jones, eds. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009. 103-121.
- MacDonald, David B. *Balkan Holocausts: Serbian and Croatian Victim-Centered Propaganda and the War in Yugoslavia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1984.

- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*. London: Duckworth, 1999.
- Maček, Ivana. *Sarajevo Under Siege*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Magnusson, Kjell. "Bosnia and Herzegovina." In *Islam Outside the Arab World*. David Westerlund and Ingvar Svanberg, eds. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999. 295-314.
- Mahmutćehajić, Rusmir. *Bosnia the Good: Tolerance and Tradition*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2000.
- Mahmutćehajić, Rusmir. *On Love: In the Muslim Tradition*. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 2007.
- Marshall, Bruce D. *Trinity and Truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Marshall, Ellen Ott. *Christians in the Public Square: Faith that Transforms Politics*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008.
- Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Markowitz, Fran. *Sarajevo: A Bosnian Kaleidoscope*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010.
- Marranci, Gabriele. *Jihad Beyond Islam*. Oxford: Berg, 2006.
- Marty, Martin. *When Faiths Collide*. Blackwell Manifestos. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Massignon, Louis. "The Three Prayers of Abraham Father of all Believers." In *Testimonies and Reflections: Essays of Louis Massignon*. Herbert Mason, ed. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Matthews, V. "Hospitality and Hostility in Genesis 19 and Judges 19." *Biblical Theology Bulletin*. 22:1 (1992): 3-11.
- Matthews, V. and D. Benjamin, eds. *Social World of Ancient Israel: 1250-587 BCE*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Mavroudi, Elizabeth. "Nationalism, the Nation and Migration: Searching for Purity and Diversity." In *Space and Polity*. 14/3 (December 2010): 219-233.
- McAliskey, Bernadette Devlin. Northern Ireland civil rights leader. Phone interview with author. 16 September 2011.
- McCarthy, Gerry. "A Climate of Suspicion." May 2007. *The Social Edge*. Available at: <http://thesocialedge.com/commentary/gerrymccarthy/index1.shtml>. Accessed on 18 May 2007.
- McFadyen, Alistair and Marcel Sarot. *Forgiveness and Truth: Explorations in Contemporary Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.
- McNulty, Tracy. *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Meneley, Anne. "Living Hierarchy in Yemen." *Anthropologica*. XLII (2000): 61-74
- Menocal, Maria Rosa. *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2002.

- Metz, Johann Baptist. *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Society*. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.
- Metz, Johann Baptist. *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Meyer, Danny. *Setting the Table: The Transforming Power of Hospitality in Business*. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.
- Miller, William Ian. *Humiliation: and other essays on honor, social discomfort, and violence*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *On Human Dignity: Political Theology and Ethics*. London: SCM Press, 1984.
- Morrison, R.J., Paul Geraghty, Linda Crowl, *Science of Pacific Island Peoples: Land Use and Agriculture*. vol. 2. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1994.
- Morschauer, Scott. "'Hospitality', Hostiles and Hostages: On the Legal Background to Genesis 19.1-9." *Journal of the Society of the Old Testament*. 21A (2003): 461-485.
- Mortenson, Greg and David Oliver Relin. *Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Promote Peace One School at a Time*. New York: Penguin, 2006.
- Mortenson, Viggo, ed. *Theology an the Religions: A Dialogue*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Moss, Michael and Souad Mekhennet. "The Guidebook for Taking a Life." *New York Times*. 10 June 2007. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/10/weekinreview/10moss.html>. Accessed on 21 July 2011.
- Moussalli, Ahmad S. "Islamic Democracy and Pluralism." In *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*, Omid Safi, ed. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003. 286-305.
- Moyaert, Marianne. "The (Un-)translatability of Religions? Ricoeur's Linguistic Hospitality as a Model for Inter-Religious Dialogue." *Exchange*. 37 (2008): 337-364.
- Moyaert, Marianne. "Absorption or Hospitality: Two Approaches to the Tension between Identity and Alterity." In *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010. 61-88.
- Moyn, Samuel. *Origins of the Other: Emmanuel Levinas Between Revelation and Ethics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 2005.
- Mudge, Lewis S. *The Gift of Responsibility: The Promise of Dialogue Among Christians, Jews, and Muslims*. New York: Continuum, 2008.
- Munasinghe, Viranjini. "Nationalism in Hybrid Spaces: The Production of Impurity out of Purity." In *American Ethnologist*, 29/3 (August 2002), 663-692.
- Murica-Lennox, Samira. Resident of Baljvine, Bosnia. Skype interview with author. 3 October 2010.
- Murk-Jansen, Saskia. *Brides in thee Desert: The Spirituality of the Beguine*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998.

- Musser, Donald W. and D. Dixon Sutherland, eds. *War or Words? Interreligious Dialogue as an Instrument of Peace*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2005.
- Müller, Barbara. *The Balkan Peace Team: 1994-2001*. Paul Foster, trans. Stuttgart: Ibidem, 2007.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.
- Mzamane, Mbulelo. "Building a new society using the building blocks of ubuntu/botho/vhuthu." In *Religion and Spirituality in South Africa*. Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2009. 236-248.
- Nasr, Seyyed Hossein, ed. *Islamic Spirituality: Foundations*. World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest, vol. 19. New York: Crossroad, 1987.
- Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. *Convictions of the Soul: Religion, Culture, and Agency in the Central America Solidarity Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Neuffer, Elizabeth. *The Key to My Neighbor's House: Seeking Justice in Bosnia and Rwanda*. New York: Picador, 2001.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972-1973*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1973.
- Newlands, George and Allen Smith. *Hospitable god: The Transformative Dream*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010.
- Newman, Elizabeth. "Accepting Our Lives as Gift: Hospitality and Post-Critical Ethics." *Tradition and Discovery*. 39/1 (2002-2003): 60-72.
- Newman, Elizabeth. "Hospitality and the Priesthood of all Believers." Presented at "The Schooled Heart." Pruit Memorial Symposium. Waco, TX: Baylor University. Manuscript. October 31, 2003.
- Newman, Elizabeth. "Flannery O'Connor and the Practice of Hospitality." *Perspectives in Religious Studies*. 32/2 (Summer 2005): 135-147.
- Newman, Elizabeth. *Untamed Hospitality: Welcoming God and Other Strangers*. The Christian Practice of Everyday Life series. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007.
- Nichols, Francis W., ed. *Christianity and the Stranger: Historical Essays*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Nienhuis, Nancy E. "Taming 'Wild Ass-Colts': An Analysis of Theology as a Kyriarchal Weapon of Spiritual and Physical Violence." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. 25/1 (2009): 43-64.
- Nisbett, Richard E. and Dov Cohen, *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. Westview Press, 1996.
- Noor, Farish A. "What is the Victory of Islam: Towards a Different Understanding of the *Ummah* and Political Success in the Contemporary World?" In *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender, and Pluralism*. Omid Safi, ed. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003. 320-332.
- Noort, Edward, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18-19 and its interpretation*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.

- Norris, H.T. *Islam in the Balkans: Religion and Society Between Europe and the Arab World*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1993.
- Noth, Martin. *Numbers*. The Old Testament Library series. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1968.
- Nouwen, Henri. "Hospitality." *Monastic Studies*. 10 (1974). 1-28.
- Nouwen, Henri. *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Nouwen, Henri. *Peacework: Prayer, Resistance and Community*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005.
- Nussbaum, Martha. *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- O'Connor, Kathleen M. *Lamentations and the Tears of the World*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2002.
- O'Donnell, James G. "The Influence of Freud's Hermeneutic of Suspicion on the Writings of Juan Segundo." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 10 (1982): 28-34.
- O'Leary, Joseph Stephen. *Religious Pluralism and Christian Truth*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. *Byzantium and the Slavs*. Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994.
- Ochs, Peter. "Abrahamic Hauerwas: Theological Conditions for Justifying Inter-Abrahamic Study." *God, Truth and Witness: Engaging Stanley Hauerwas*. L. Gregory Jones, Reinhold Hütter and C. Rosalee Velloso Ewell, eds. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005.
- Oden, Amy G. *And You Welcomed Me: A Sourcebook on Hospitality in Early Christianity*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- Odenheimer, Micha. "Honor or Death." *Jerusalem Report* IX:22 (1 March 1999), 25.
- Ofer, Yosef. "A diagram of the open land of the Levite cities in Nahmanides' Commentary on the Torah." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 99/2 (1 March 2009): 271-283.
- Ogletree, Thomas W. *Hospitality to the Stranger: Dimension of Moral Understanding*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Oh, Irene. *The Rights of God: Islam, Human Rights, and Comparative Ethics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Olyan, Saul M. "Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment." *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 115/2 (Summer 1996): 201-218.
- Ortner, S. "The virgin and the state." *Feminist Studies*. 4 (1978): 19-35.
- Oršolić, Marko. Franciscan priest and Director of Zajedno (International Multicultural and Inter-Religious Cooperation). Interview by author. 22 May 2003. Sarajevo, Bosnia

- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1997.
- Palmer, Parker. *Company of Strangers: Christians and the Renewal of America's Public Life*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- Pandžo, Amra. Bošnjak community leader and Islamic theologian. Interview with author. 30 July 2010. Sarajevo, Bosnia.
- Pankhania, Madhvi. "Ameena Matthews is a real life screen heroine." *The Guardian*. 26 August 2011. Available online <http://www.guardian.co.uk/lifeandstyle/the-womens-blog-with-jane-martinson/2011/aug/26/ameena-matthews-interrupters-chicago>. Accessed on 27 August 2011.
- Park, Andrew Sung. *From Hurt to Healing: A Theology of the Wounded*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2004.
- Park, Joon-Sik. "Hospitality as Context for Evangelism." *Missiology*. 30/3 (July 2002): 385-395.
- Parker, Simon B. "The Hebrew Bible and Homosexuality." *Quarterly Review* 11/3 (Fall 1991): 4-19.
- Patel, Eboo. "When Muslims Saved Jews." Part of The Faith Divide series. *The Washington Post*. 25 June 2009. Available online at http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/eboo_patel/2009/06/besa_world_war_ii_re-told.html. Accessed on 15 October 2010.
- Paul, Samuel A. *The Ubuntu God: Deconstructing a South African Narrative of Oppression*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton, University Press, 2009.
- Pears, Angie. *Doing Contextual Theology*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Pejic, Nenad. "The Suicide of Multiethnic Sarajevo?" 25 April 2010. *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. Available online at <http://www.rferl.org/articleprintview/2023847.html>. Accessed on 6 September 2010.
- Pellegrino, Marge. *Journey of Dreams*. London: Frances Lincoln Children's Books, 2009.
- Penchansky, David. "Up for Grabs: A Tentative Proposal for Doing Ideological Criticism." *Semeia*. 59 (1992): 35-41.
- Peristiany, J.G., ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Peristiany, J.G. and Julian Pitt-Rivers, eds., *Honor and Grace in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Peters, F.E. *Children of Abraham: Judaism, Islam, and Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Pew Forum on Religion and the Public Life. "The Religious Dimensions of Torture Debate." 7 May 2009. Available at <http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=156>. Accessed on 12 May 2009
- Phan, Peter C. *Being Religious Interreligiously: Asian Perspectives on Interfaith Dialogue*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2004.
- Phan, Peter C. "Living for the Reign of God: Liberation, Cultures, Religions: A Theology of Liberation for the Asian Churches." Paper from *Liberation*

- Theology: Movement or Moment* Conference. Dublin, Ireland: Milltown Institute. 3-4 October 2008.
- Pieris, Aloysius. *An Asian Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in Anthropology of the Mediterranean." *Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology*. 19 (1977): 94-112.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. *The Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Plaskow, Judith. *Standing Against Sinai: Judaism from a Feminist Perspective*. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.
- Pohl, Christine D. *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1999.
- Pohl, Christine D. "Hospitality, a Practice And a Way of Life." *Vision* (Spring 2002): 34-43.
- Pohl, Christine D. "Building a Place for Hospitality." *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics*. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2007. 27-36.
- Powell, Elinor D. U. *The Heart of Conflict: A Spirituality of Transformation*. Kelowna, BC: Northstone, 2003.
- Rabbis for Human Rights. <http://rhr.org.il/eng/>. Accessed on 10 September 2011.
- Rahman, F. "The Principles of Shura and the Role of the Umma in Islam." *American Journal of Islamic Studies*. 1:1 (1984): 1-9.
- Ramadan, Tariq. *In the Footsteps of the Prophet: Lessons Learned from the Life of Muhammad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Reaves, Jayme. "Room at the Table: The Role of Hospitality in Inter-Religious Life from an Open-Minded Baptist Perspective." *The Place for Others in Our Faith and Life: Foundations for Inter-Religious Peace Education. Building Bridges Towards Peace and Reconciliation in South-East Europe in partnership with the Conference of European Churches (CEC) and World Council of Churches' South-East European Ecumenical Partnership (SEEEP)*. Sarajevo: Abraham: Association for Inter-Religious Peace Work, 2004.
- Reaves, Jayme and David Tombs. "Redemption, Resistance and Liberation: A Christian Response to Modern Slavery." European Slave Trade Conference. Dublin, Ireland. July 2007.
- Reaves, Jayme. "Everyone Has a Name": *A Theological and Moral Discussion of the Inclusion of Perpetrators in the Status of Victimhood*. Master of Philosophy in Reconciliation Studies. Unpublished dissertation. Belfast: Irish School of Ecumenics, Trinity College Dublin, 2007.
- Reaves, Jayme. "The Holy Rite of Disagreement." *Studying Faith, Practicing Peace*. Experiential Learning Paper, no. 4. Irish Peace Centres. (September 2010): 77-83.
- Reaves, Jayme. "Clergy and Their Response to Trauma: A Literature Review." Co-authored with Fred Vincent, Gerald Leavy and Colleen Brown. Northern Ireland Association for Mental Health. January 2011. Awaiting publication.

- Reaves, Jayme. "Conference Response." *Being the Other: Theological Students' Conference 2011*. Experiential Learning Paper, no. 6. Irish Peace Centres. (September 2011): 78-81.
- Renard, John, ed. *Windows on the House of Islam: Muslim Sources on Spirituality and Religious Life*. Berkley: University of California, 1998.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Mary, the Feminine Face of the Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- Reynolds, Jack. *Merleau-Ponty and Derrida: Intertwining Embodiment and Alterity*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2004.
- Reynolds, Thomas E. "Improvising together: Christian solidarity and hospitality as jazz performance." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 43/1 (1 December 2008): 45-66.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Denis Savage, trans. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and The Human Sciences*. John B. Thompson, ed. and trans. Reprint of 1981 Paris edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Kathleen Blamey, trans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Reflections on a New Ethos for Europe." In *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action*. Richard Kearney, ed. Philosophy and Social Criticism series. London: Sage, 1996.
- Ricoeur, Paul, ed. *Tolerance Between the Intolerance and the Intolerable*. Diogenes (176). Providence, RI: Bergham, 1997.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *On Translation*. Eileen Brennan, trans. Thinking in Action series. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Course of Recognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Rigby, Cynthia L. "Is There Joy Before Mourning? 'Dangerous Memory,' in the work of Sharon Welch and Johann Baptist Metz." *Koinonia*. 5 (Spring 1993): 1-30.
- Robeson, Angela. "Weapons of War." *New Internationalist*. 244 (June 1993). Available at <http://www.newint.org/features/1993/06/05/rape/>. Accessed on 21 July 2011.
- Rollins, Peter. *The Orthodox Heretic: And Other Impossible Tales*. Brewster, MA: Paraclete, 2009.
- Romero, Oscar. *Voice of the Voiceless: The Four Pastoral Letters and Other Statements*. Michael J. Walsh, trans. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985.
- Roth, Norman. *Conversos, Inquisition, and the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 2002.
- Russell, Letty M. *Household of Freedom: Authority in Feminist Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Russell, Letty M. "Practicing Hospitality in a Time of Backlash." *Theology Today*. 52/4 (January 1996): 476-484.
- Russell, Letty M. "Hot-House Ecclesiology: A Feminist Interpretation of the Church." *Ecumenical Review*. 53/1 (January 2001): 48-56.

- Russell, Letty M. "Children of Struggle." In *Hagar, Sarah, and Their Children*. Phyllis Trible and Letty M. Russell, eds. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006. 185-197.
- Russell, Letty M. *Just Hospitality: God's Welcome in a World of Difference*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Ryan, William C. "The Historical Case for the Right of Sanctuary?" *Journal of Church and State*. 29 (Spring 1987): 209-32.
- Sachar, Howard Morley. *Farewell España: the world of the Sephardim remembered*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *The Islamic Roots of Democratic Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Sacks, Jonathan. *To Heal a Fractured World: The Ethics of Responsibility*. London: Continuum Press, 2005.
- Safi, Omid. "Introduction: *The Times They Are A Changin'* – A Muslim Quest for Justice, Gender Equality, and Pluralism." In *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003. 1-29.
- Safi, Omid, ed. *Progressive Muslims: On Justice, Gender, and Pluralism*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003.
- Said, Abdul Aziz, Nathan C. Funk and Ayse S. Kadayifci, eds. *Peace and Conflict Resolution In Islam: Precept and Practice*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2001.
- Said, Edward. *Edward Said: A Critical Reader*. Michael Sprinker, ed. Oxford: Basil Blackball, 1992.
- Salmon, Marilyn J. *Preaching Without Contempt: Overcoming Unintended Anti-Judaism*. Fortress Resources for Preaching series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Sarna, N.M. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis; The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989.
- Sarajevo Haggadah*. Text by Cecil Roth. Beograd: Jugoslavia, 1975.
- Satloff, Robert. *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories from the Holocaust's Long Reach Into Arab Lands*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2006.
- Schneider, J. "Of vigilance and virgins: Honor, shame, and access to resources in Mediterranean societies." *Ethnology*. 10 (1971): 1-24.
- Schreier, Robert J. *The Ministry of Reconciliation: Spirituality and Strategies*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999.
- Schulman, Miriam and Amal Barkouki-Winter. "The Extra Mile: The Ancient Virtue of Hospitality Imposes Duties on Host and Guest." Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, *Issues in Ethics*. 11/1 (Winter 2000). <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v11n1/hospitality.html>. Accessed on 10 March 2007.
- Schweid, Eliezar. *The Philosophy of the Bible as Foundation of Jewish Culture*. Vol. 2. Leonard Levin, trans. Brighton, MA: Academic Press, 2008.
- Scott, Jamie and Paul Simpson-Housley, eds. *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Segundo, Juan Lois. *The Liberation of Theology*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1978.

- Seow, C. L. "A Heterotextual Perspective." In *Homosexuality and Christian Community*. C.L. Seow, ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996.
- Serotta, Edward. *Survival in Sarajevo: How a Jewish Community Came to the Aid of its City*. Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 1994.
- Schuster, Ekkehard. *Hope against Hope: Johann Baptist Metz and Elie Wiesel Speak Out on the Holocaust*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Schwartz, Regina M. *The Curse of Cain: The Violent Legacy of Monotheism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1997.
- Scott, James M. ed. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Vol. 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Scoville, Warren C. *The Persecution of Huguenots and French Economic Development, 1680-1720*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1960.
- Shah-Kazemi, Reza. "Light upon Light? The Qur'an and the Gospel of St. John." *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, eds. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010. 116-148.
- Shanks, Hershel, ed. *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*. Washington, D.C.: Prentice Hall and Biblical Archeological Society, 1999.
- Sherwood, Yvonne and Kevin Hart, eds. *Derrida and Religion: Other Testaments*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Shriver, Donald W., Jr. and Peggy L. Shriver, "Open Wounds," *Christian Century*, 6-13 June 2001, 4-5.
- Shurden, Walter. *Not a Silent People: Controversies that Have Shaped Southern Baptists*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys Publishing, 2000.
- Simons, Walter. *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200-1565*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2001.
- Skainos Project. Belfast, Northern Ireland.
<http://www.skainos.org/2009/07/09/the-skainos-name/>. Accessed on 10 September 2011.
- Sobrinho, Jon. *The Principle of Mercy: Taking the Crucified People from the Cross*. Various trans. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994.
- Smith, Archie, Jr. "Hospitality: A Spiritual Resource for Building Community." *Journal for the Interdenominational Theological Center*. 25/3 (Spring 1998): 139-151.
- Smith, Christian. *Resisting Reagan: The U.S. Central America Peace Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Smootha, Sammy. *Israel: pluralism and conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.
- Smyth, Geraldine. "A Habitable Grief: Forgiveness and Reconciliation for a People Divided." *Milltown Studies* 53 (Summer 2004). 94-130.
- Sölle, Dorothee. *Political Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971.
- Sölle, Dorothee. *Suffering*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

- Sölle, Dorothee. *Celebrating Resistance: The Way of the Cross in Latin America*. London: Mowbray, 1993.
- Sölle, Dorothee. *The Silent Cry: Mysticism and Resistance*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001.
- Spahić-Šiljak, Zilka. Feminist Islamic scholar and coordinator of the Master of Arts in Religious Studies at the University of Sarajevo. Interview with author. 2 August 2010. Sarajevo, Bosnia.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. *The Woman's Bible*. 1895. Dover Publications, 2003.
- Stiebert, Johanna. *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible: The Prophetic Contribution*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 346. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Stone, Ken. *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History: A Narratological and Anthropological Analysis*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 234. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stover, Eric and Harvey M. Weinstein, eds. *My Neighbor, My Enemy: Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Strom, Yale. *The Expulsion of the Jews: Five Hundred Years of Exodus*. New York: SP Books, 1992.
- Strhan, Anna. "And who is my neighbour? Levinas and the commandment to love re-examined." *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue*. 19/2 (2009): 145-166.
- Sunshine, Glenn S. *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003.
- Sussman, Anna. "A Lebanese chef's vision: Make falafel, not war." *International Herald Tribune*. 16 August 2007. Available at (<http://www.ihf.com/articles/2007/08/16/news/souk.php>). Accessed on 19 August 2007.
- Sutherland, Arthur. *I Was a Stranger: A Christian Theology of Hospitality*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006.
- Swidler, Leonard. "Dialogue: out of the shadows into blazing "desert" sun." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*. 45/3 (1 June 2010): 493-509.
- Šeperić, Entoni. Bosnian Croat Roman Catholic theologian. Interview with author. 27 July 2010. Sarajevo, Bosnia.
- Tabeau, Eqa and Jakub Bijak. "War-related Deaths in the 1992-1995 Armed Conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Critique of Previous Estimates and Recent Results." *European Journal of Population*. 21/2-3. 187-215. Available at <http://www.springerlink.com/content/w288118j50758360/>. Accessed on 20 September 2011.
- Tauber, Eli. Leader in Jewish Community of Sarajevo. Interview with author. 23 July 2010. Sarajevo, Bosnia.

- Tauber, Eli. *When Neighbors Were Real Human Beings*. Sarajevo: University of Sarajevo, Institute for the Research of Crimes Against Humanity and International Law, 2010.
- Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Amy Gutmann, ed. Princeton: Princeton University, 1994.
- Taylor, Mildred. *Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry*. New York: Bantam Press, 1984.
- Tec, Nechama. *When Light Pierced the Darkness: Christian Rescue of Jews in Nazi-Occupied Poland*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1986.
- Thambu, Valson. "Building communities of peace for all." *Ecumenical Review* (April 2005): 1-8.
- Tombs, David. "'Shame' as a Neglected Value in Schooling." *The Journal of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*. 29/1 (1995): 23-32.
- Tombs, David. *Latin American Liberation Theology*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002.
- Tombs, David and Joseph Liechty, eds. *Explorations in Reconciliation*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006.
- Torres, Sergio and John Eagleson, eds. *The Challenge of Basic Christian Communities: Papers from the International Ecumenical Congress of Theology, February 29-March 2, 1980, Sao Paulo, Brasil*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1981. Quoted in Penny Golden and Michael McConnell. *Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986.
- Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. Overtures to Biblical Theology series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1984.
- Trible, Phyllis and Letty M. Russell, eds. *Hagar, Sarah, and Their Children: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Perspectives*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Truth, Sojourner. "Ain't I a Woman?" Speech. 1851. Available at <http://www.feminist.com/resources/artspeech/genwom/sojour.html>. Accessed 25 September 2011.
- Tutu, Desmond. *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York: Image Doubleday, 1999.
- Tutu, Desmond. *God Has a Dream: A Vision of Hope for Our Time*. New York: Image Doubleday, 2004.
- Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn*, Penguin Classics, 1884 original publish date. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- UNESCO. "The Art of Hospitality." *Courier*. February 1990. Entire issue.
- Urban, Mark. "Saved by the Monks of Decani." BBC News. 17 June 1999. Available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/371687.stm>. Accessed 29 August 2011
- United States Institute of Peace (USIP). "Can Religion Heal Bosnia?" *PeaceWatch*. October 1996. Available at <http://www.usip.org/pubs/PW/1096/bosnia.html>. Accessed on 14 January 2003.
- United States Institute of Peace (USIP). "USIPeace Briefing: The Current Status Of Religious Coexistence And Education In Bosnia And Herzegovina."

- November 2009. Available at http://www.usip.org/files/resources/religion_education_bosnia_herzegovina_pb.pdf. Accessed 30 August 2011.
- Van Den Hengel, John W. "Paul Ricoeur's Oneself as Another and Practical Theology." *Theological Studies*. 55/3 (1 September 1994): 458-480.
- van Houten, Christiana. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 107. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- van Nieuwenhuijze, C.A.O. "The *ummah* - an analytic approach." *Studia Islamica*. 10 (1959): 5-22.
- van Wijk-Bos, Johanna W. H. *Reimagining God: The Case for Scriptural Diversity*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Velikonja, Mitja. *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Rang'ichi Ng'inja, trans. Eastern European Studies Series. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2003.
- Villa, Martin. "Opaque Hospitality: The experience of Hospitality-Hostility beyond the Human Factors approach." Available at http://www.martinavila.com/upload/avila_m_opaque_hospitality.pdf. Accessed on 18 July 2011.
- Volf, Miroslav. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Volf, Miroslav. "A Cup of Coffee." *Christian Century*. 15 October 1997. 917.
- Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1998.
- Volf, Miroslav and Dorothy Bass, eds. *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 2002.
- Volf, Miroslav. "Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Justice: A Christian Contribution to a More Peaceful Social Environment." The Project on Lived Theology, University of Virginia. Available at <http://livedtheology.org/pdfs/Volf.pdf>. Accessed on 5 April 2007.
- Volf, Miroslav. "How safe can we be?" *Christian Century*. 19 October 2010. 66.
- Von Denffer, Ahmad. *Ulum Al-Qur'an: An Introduction to the Sciences of the Qur'an*. London: The Islamic Foundation, 1989.
- Von Grunebaum, G.E. *Modern Islam: The Search for Cultural Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1962.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*, from the Old Testament Library Series. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1972.
- Vosloo, Robert. "Identity, Otherness and the Triune God: Theological Groundwork for a Christian Ethic of Hospitality." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*. 119/119 (July 2004): 69-89.
- Vroom, Hendrik M. "Right Conduct as a Criterion for True Religion." *Inter-Religious Models and Criteria*, J. Kellenberger, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993. 106-134.
- Wadell, Paul. *Friendship and the Moral Life*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989.

- Wadud, Amina. *Qur'an and Woman: Rereading the Sacred Text from a Woman's Perspective*. New York: Oxford, 1999.
- Wadud, Amina. *Inside the Gender Jihad: Women's Reform in Islam*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2006.
- Watson, James L. and Melissa L. Caldwell, eds. *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- Weaver, J. Denny. *The Nonviolent Atonement*. Second ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Weeks, Theodore. *From Assimilation to Antisemitism: The Jewish Question In Poland, 1850-1914*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2005.
- Welch, Sharon. *A Feminist Ethic of Risk*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Welch, Sharon. *After Empire: The Art and Ethos of Enduring Peace*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Westerhoff, Caroline. *Good Fences: The Boundaries of Hospitality*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 2004.
- Wettstein, Howard, ed., *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Wheatley, Paul. *The Places Where Men Pray Together: Cities in Islamic Lands, Seventh Through the Tenth Centuries*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Wiesel, Elie. *The Stranger in the Bible*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981.
- Wiesel, Elie. "The Refugee." *Cross Currents*. 34/4 (Winter 1984-5): 385-390.
- Wikler, Meir. *Aishel: Stories of Contemporary Jewish Hospitality*. Nanuet, NY: Feldheim, 1995.
- Wilde, Oscar. "The Soul of Man Under Socialism." Section 24, 1891. Available at the Molinari Institute's online library, <http://praxeology.net/OW-SMS.htm>. Accessed 7 July 2010.
- Wilkins, Steve. *Face to Face: Meditations on Friendship and Hospitality*. Moscow, ID: Canon, 2002.
- Will, James E. *The Universal God: Justice, Love and Peace in the Global Village*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Williams, Bernard. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1993.
- Williams, Delores. *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995.
- Williams, Robert R. *Hegel's Ethics of Recognition*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.
- Williams, Rowan. "The Suspicion of Suspicion: Wittgenstein and Bonhoeffer." In *The Grammar of the Heart: New Essays in Moral Philosophy and Theology*. R. H. Bell, ed. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988. 36-53.
- Wimberly, Edward P. "Methods of Cross-Cultural Pastoral Care: Hospitality and Incarnation." *Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Center*. 25/3 (Spring 1998): 188-202.
- Women in Black. <http://www.womeninblack.org/en/history>. Accessed on 10 September 2011.

- Woodward, Richard. "A Lost World Made by Women." *New York Times*. 13 July 2008. Travel Section. Available at <http://travel.nytimes.com/2008/07/13/travel/13journeys.html>. Accessed on 1 June 2011
- Wyatt, N. "The Story of Dinah and Shechem." *Ugarit-Forschungen*. 22 (1990): 433-58.
- Yee, Gale. 'Ideological criticism: Judges 17–21 and the dismembered body.' In *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Gale Yee, ed. Minneapolis: Fortress; 1995. 146–170.
- Yong, Amos. *Hospitality and the Other: Pentecost, Christian Practices, and the Neighbor*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008.
- Young, Kathleen. "The Former Yugoslavians." In *Endangered peoples of Europe: Struggles to Survive and Thrive*. Jean S. Forward, ed. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Youngs, Samuel. "The frontier of comparative theology." *Journal of Comparative Theology*. March (2010): 1-10.
- Yoo, Yani. "Han-Laden Women: Korean 'Comfort Women' and Women in Judges 19-21." *Semeia*. 78 (1997): 37-46.
- Zeid, A. M. Abou. "Honour and Shame Among Bedouins of Egypt." In *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. J. G. Peristiany, ed. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965. 245-259.
- Zohar, Zion. *Sephardic and Mizrahi Jewry: From the Golden Age of Spain to Modern Times*. New York: NYU Press, 2005.