GENESIS 2-3: THE HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY

Daryl L. Docterman

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May, 2016

ABSTRACT

Using primarily Yairah Amit's work on hidden polemics as a template, plus Ancient Near Eastern literature, this work argues for a hidden polemic in Genesis 2-3 against certain excesses in royal ideology and practice. The key themes of knowledge and life—as well as other terms and motifs that are related to knowledge and life—are examined in Genesis 2-3 in connection with those same themes in other parts of the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East. It is demonstrated that knowledge and life are common themes of royal ideology in the rest of the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East in general. This ideology is often treated in a way that is favorable to kings and their ideology. However, there are other views that are not so favorable. Such views often involve hidden polemics that seek to protect the authors as well as the readers and/or hearers of the polemics. These polemics also, by their hidden nature, tend to draw the reader/hearer into the stories.

With much gratitude to my longsuffering and encouraging wife, Sharon,

To the acceptance and kindness of my first adviser, Doctor Doug Ingram,

and

To the patience, kindness, humor, and practical suggestions of all kinds from

Doctor David G. Firth, my Doctor Father

"ויהרנא פי־שנים ברוחך אלי"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

The thesis that is here argued is that Genesis 2-3, the Eden Narrative, is a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology. It will be critical to present evidence for such a hidden polemic, and to propose motivations for such hiding.

It is assumed here that the Eden Narrative does indeed make use of other materials,[1] though the argument made here is not dependent for its validity upon the identification of these sources. This thesis deals primarily with something like the "final form" of Genesis 2-3. Some brief discussion concerning possible sources and their possible interrelationship will take place, nevertheless. This will occur primarily in the discussion of prior scholarship.

The expression "something like the final form" that was used in the prior paragraph requires explanation. Some Old Testament scholars have pointed out that the expression "final form" is itself problematic.[2] The writings that

---

[1] In view of the Eden Narrative's use of the *Gilgamesh Epic*, this approach appears to be plausible. Cf. Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1982) and Jeffrey H. Tigay, editor, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985). This provides a helpful and appropriate analogy for what may be the background for Genesis 2-3. However, the *Gilgamesh Epic* is extant. Putative biblical sources for Genesis 2-3 are not. Therefore, while not denying the possibility of various sources within the Eden Narrative, this thesis will focus on the text of Genesis as we now have it. The thesis presented here is, thus, intentionally synchronic.

[2] Cf. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 140. Fishbane writes, concerning the fluidity of the Hebrew Bible,
"The dominant trope of instruction in aggadic exegesis thus suggests that every teaching which somehow transforms the received traditions in the process of their representation has its place within the immense structure of inner-biblical *aggadah* . . . . For it requires one to recognize, with the final tradent-teachers, that the Hebrew Bible is a variety of teachings and responses which each generation has added to its *traditum*, and that each successive layering of *traditio is, inevitably, a reordering of the* relative authority of the received traditions. In this sense, the received canon of Scripture, as a form of instruction, is quintessentially an aggadic trope."
Cf. also John Barton, *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature, and Theology: Collected Essays of John Barton* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 185-191, for a discussion of some of the problems with the term "final form."

comprise the Old Testament were always subject to at least three tendencies: careful preservation, updating, and revision.[3] Thus, the term "final form" is something of a misnomer. Therefore, it may be nearly as problematic to speak of the "final form" of a document or story, as it is to speak of the "sources" for a document or story.

However, it is difficult to discuss any ancient document, unless some sort of more or less final form is posited. Furthermore, the portions of Genesis 2-3 that are contained in the DSS are very similar to the corresponding portions of Genesis 2-3 that are found in Codex Leningradensis and other more "modern" Hebrew texts.[4] There are also very few significant variants in the *LXX* translation of Genesis 2-3.[5] Therefore, while recognizing the validity of concerns for (and the inadequacy of) the term "final form," this term will be used, bearing in mind that it here means "something like the final form."

---

[3] Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 11, detects two dynamics operating in the case of the scribes at Qumran. "First, they often simply copied the individual books of the Scriptures as exactly as humanly possible. But secondly, sometimes the scribes intentionally inserted new material that helped interpret or highlight for their contemporary congregation in a new situation the relevance of the traditional text." Updating and revision may be regarded as shading off into one another. The common saying, "Every translation of a text is also an interpretation" could, perhaps, be revised to "Every updating of a text is also a revision." In a similar vein, cf. the discussion of the treatment of tradition in Kenton L. Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 2005), 20.

[4] Cf. James Vanderkam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: Harper, 2002), 104-105. The authors comment that ". . . the twenty-four Genesis scrolls are mostly fragmentary, with only thirty-four of the fifty chapters of Genesis represented (1-6, 8, 10, 12, 17-19, 22-24, 26-27, 32-37, 39-43, 45-50). It appears that the text of Genesis had become generally stable by the Qumran period, since these manuscripts reveal a text generally close to the traditional Masoretic Text and the Samaritan Pentateuch . . . . Beyond minor variations or differences in spelling, only eleven Genesis scrolls contain any variants worth noting (a possible exception being the book's chronological system) and may be classified as *mixed* or *non-aligned*. Other manuscripts, notably the two (or possibly three) from Wadi Murabba'ṯ, copied at the beginning of the second century CE, are virtually identical to the Masoretic Text."
Perhaps another alternative should be proposed. At times, scribes may have preserved the basic meaning of the texts, while updating the language somewhat for (then) "modern" readers.

[5] Cf. John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar's Press, 1993), 22-50.

The Structure of the Argument of this Thesis

The thesis will be organized as follows. Chapter 1 will set forth a methodology for grounding this enquiry into the proposed hidden polemic in Genesis 2-3. Criteria that have been proposed by scholars (particularly by Yairah Amit) will be used to examine the Eden Narrative, as well as some other Old Testament texts that seem to contain polemics against certain aspects of royal ideology, or against certain kings.[6] In addition to these helpful criteria, one more criterion—a fifth—is here proposed: the presence of polemic concerning royal ideology in other ANE[7] literature. If polemic is, in fact, found in other ANE literature, this might help to establish it in the Old Testament as well, since royal ideology seems to have been relatively consistent across the ANE.

Using other ANE literature is, to be sure, problematic. Scholarly approaches to ANE literature outside of the Old Testament has gone through various stages, in terms of its relation (or lack thereof) to the Old Testament.[8] It is indeed important to be wary of the dangers of "parallelomania."[9] Even

---

[6] Cf., for example, Brian P. Irwin, "Not Just Any King: Abimelech, the Northern Monarchy, and the final form of Judges," *JBL* 131/3 (2012): 443-454. Irwin argues that it is not monarchy as such, which the Abimelech story in Judges inveighs against, but rather non-Davidic kings, particularly during the period of return from the exile.

[7] The abbreviation "ANE" for "the ancient Near East," (as well as for "ancient Near Eastern") will be used for the most part in this thesis.

[8] Cf. Richard S. Hess, "One Hundred Fifty Years of Comparative Studies on Genesis 1-11: An Overview," in *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, 362-382 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 3-26, for a helpful survey of scholarship, up to the early 1990s.
Cf. also William W. Hallo, "Compare and Contrast: The Contextual Approach to Biblical Literature," in *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature*, Scripture in Context III, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies, edited by William W. Hallo, Bruce William Jones, and Gerald L. Mattingly (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 1-30, who advocates a careful approach, which takes seriously both similarities and differences of ANE and biblical literature.

[9] Cf. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1-13, who warns against the danger of comparing too closely, and so, not taking seriously the uniqueness of different works.

when two texts use the same terminology, the two may be understood in radically different ways in two different cultures. Even within the same culture, two texts may use the same or similar language, but have very different meanings.

However, the use of similar words, roots, symbols, and concepts might be helpful in establishing a general royal ethos in the region, without attempting to establish precise relationships, or to argue for "influence."[10] While Hallo acknowledges that the questions ". . . as to where, when and even in what direction it [i.e., "any alleged cultural interchange"] might have occurred" are important, he also writes,

> The fact that we cannot always be sure of the place, the date, or the direction of the borrowing does not invalidate either the comparative or the contextual approach: modern literary criticism properly investigates literary parallels without necessarily or invariably finding the exact route by which a given idea passed from one author to another. And given the fragmentary nature of the ancient record, the answers cannot always be forthcoming.[11]

In a similar vein, Walton warns against ". . . the tendency to create uniform views where none exist. To speak of 'Mesopotamian thinking' or 'Egyptian theology' or 'Israelite worldview' is unquestionably presumptuous. It is like speaking of 'European culture' today."[12] Furthermore, Walton warns against the danger of assuming continuity over time within the same area or ethnic group,[13] or even within the same group at the same time.[14]

---

[10] Cf. John Bright, *A History of Israel*, 3rd edition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 226. While Bright is skeptical as to whether Israel took over the royal ideology of its surrounding nations *in toto*, he does acknowledge, "It is, of course, likely that features of Israel's royal ideology were borrowed. The Israelite monarchy was, after all, an innovation for which no native precedents existed. A state that absorbed thousands of Canaanites, that patterned much of its bureaucracy on foreign models, and whose national shrine was constructed on a Canaanite pattern, doubtless borrowed features of its cult—and of its ideal of kingship—as well."

[11] Hallo, "Compare and Contrast," 6.

[12] John H. Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 15-16.

[13] Ibid., 16.

Walton sets forth ten important principles must be kept in mind when doing comparative studies. This thesis attempts to keep these principles in mind.

1. Both similarities and differences must be considered.
2. Similarities may suggest a common cultural heritage or cognitive environment rather than borrowing.
3. It is not uncommon to find similarities at the surface but differences at the conceptual level and vice versa.
4. All elements must be understood in their own context as accurately as possible before cross-cultural comparisons are made (i.e., careful background study must precede comparative study).
5. Proximity in time, geography, and spheres of cultural contact all increase the possibility of interaction leading to influence.
6. A case for literary borrowing requires identification of likely channels of transmission.
7. The significance of differences between two pieces of literature is minimized if the works are not the same genre.
8. Similar functions may be performed by different genres in different cultures.
9. When literary or cultural elements are borrowed they may in turn be transformed into something quite different by those who borrowed them.
10. A single culture will rarely be monolithic, either in a contemporary cross-section or in consideration of a passage of time.[15]

Since allusion is crucial to the detection (as well as to the hiding) of hidden polemic, it will be important to discuss allusion in some detail. The meaning and nature of polemic and the meaning and functions of royal ideology will also be treated in the chapter on methodology.

Chapter 2 will discuss previous scholarship, pointing out some of the strengths and weaknesses of various broad categories of approaches. It will be demonstrated that political interpretations of Genesis 2-3 are not lacking, including approaches that propose that the Eden Narrative is calling into

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 26-27.

question certain aspects of royal ideology. However, such interpretations often seem to lack a clear methodology. A somewhat more reflective approach to hidden polemic—plus the fifth criterion that I am proposing (other ANE literature that is concerned with kingship)—may place these political approaches on a firmer methodological footing. This survey of scholarship will reveal the presence of scholarly approaches that suggest a hidden polemic against royal ideology and practice.

In chapters 3 and 4, an analysis of two of the most crucial elements of ancient royal ideology —knowledge and life—will be presented. These chapters will fulfill Amit's second criteria: clues in other biblical texts that a polemic is occurring.

Chapter 3 will examine the theme of royal knowledge in the Old Testament outside of Genesis 2-3, primarily by examining the portrayals of two of the early kings of Israel, David and Solomon. Both of these kings are described as having wisdom, yet in the case of both kings, wisdom and knowledge are problematic—at least in the larger context of the stories of Samuel and Kings. Other Old Testament texts that seem to point toward a problematic connection and possible polemic debate concerning royal knowing will be noted briefly. These other texts would provide fruitful ways of further exploring the possibility of polemics against certain excesses in royal ideology in other, less obvious texts, such as Genesis 2-3.

Chapter 4 will examine the theme of royal reception and mediation of life in the Old Testament outside of Genesis 2-3. The primary focus will be an

examination of Psalm 72. Other psalms,[16] proverbs,[17] and narrative biblical texts such as 2 Samuel 21:1-14, 1 Kings 17-18 that seem to connect the king directly with the theme of life also will be briefly discussed. As with knowledge, other Old Testament texts and other ANE materials will be noted that may suggest a variety of very different approaches to life in connection with royal ideology. Thus, the possibility that an Old Testament polemic of some kind is going on in connection with royal ideology and life will be argued.

Chapter 5 will examine Genesis 2-3, especially with a view to two of its themes: knowledge and life. It will be argued that these themes are critical for understanding the Eden Narrative, at least in its final form. Such themes also suggest a hidden polemic against the use of these themes in royal ideology. Other words and motifs in Genesis 2-3 that also may point toward a political setting for the story will be listed, and some will be discussed briefly. Genesis

---

[16] Norman K. Gottwald, "Kingship in the Book of Psalms," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, edited by William P. Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 437, notes the following psalms ". . . as testimony to the attitude toward kingship: Psalms 2, 18, 20-21, 45, 72, 89, 110, 144, and 146."

[17] Scholars have tended to downplay the connections between the book of Proverbs and the Eden Narrative. There may be several possible reasons for this.
First, there has been a tendency—which has prevailed since the dawn of the enlightenment—to regard the Old Testament as a fragmented miscellany. When such a mindset prevails, scholars have an understandable reaction against looking for any unity (or even connections) in diverse texts of the Old Testament.
Second, Genesis 2-3—and the work of the Yahwist as a whole—has been regarded as widely separated in time from the book of Proverbs. Even if this were true, it would not automatically make a connection impossible, or even unlikely. After all, those same stories may refer (whether with approval or disapproval) to scholars who lived hundreds or even thousands of years ago. The assumption that later Hebrew writers would not have (whether intentionally or unintentionally) linked their own writings with earlier Hebrew writings needs to be seriously questioned. The precise nature of those linkages may not be recovered or recoverable, but the linkage itself makes a great deal of sense.
Third, scholars have tended to become embroiled in discussions over the referentiality (or otherwise) of the Solomonic references in the wisdom literature. While such discussions may be helpful, they may also mask the simpler and more general point: Such references to one of the greatest of Israel's kings would have invoked an echo of both the greatness and the pitfalls of Solomon's reputation in the literature.

2-3 will be situated within its larger ANE context of the themes of knowledge and life, as these are connected with kings.

A brief conclusion will round off the thesis. This conclusion will include possible avenues for further investigation.

When reference is made to "Genesis 2-3," this is shorthand for Genesis 2:4[a], 2:4[b], or even 2:5 through 3:24. While it no doubt matters for some approaches to the Eden Narrative, for the argument that is presented here, it matters little where precisely the unit begins. However, the assumption here is that 2:4 serves as a bridge between the Creation Narrative of Genesis 1:1-2:3, and the Eden Narrative of 2:5-3:24.[18] However, for the sake of brevity, the text of Genesis 2:4-3:24 (or 2:4[a]-3:24, or 2:4[b]-3:24, or 2:5-3:24) will generally be referred to as "Genesis 2-3." Alternatively, the term "Eden Narrative" will be used.

In the interest of breaking up the monotony, the argument will employ certain synonyms for some words and phrases. The terms "explicit" and "implicit" polemic will follow Amit's usage throughout. However, due to the frequency with which hidden polemic is mentioned, the term "cryptic critique" and other terms will be used occasionally for "hidden polemic."

As much as possible, the formatting that is original to quotes has been preserved. In particular, all italics in quotes belong to the sources quoted. Italics are used in the body of the thesis only for foreign words and expressions, and for sub-section titles within the chapters of this thesis. Square brackets are used to enclose the first letter of a quote, in order to indicate when a different case (lower or upper) was originally used in the quote.

---

[18] Cf. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), 149. While Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3*," (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 13, thinks that the relevant text is 2:5-3:24, he also thinks of v. 4 as "a bridge" between 1:1-3 and 2:5-3:24.

Spelling in quotes has been preserved. American (rather than English) spelling in non-quotes in the text and footnotes is followed throughout.

Citations of primary and secondary sources involving subscripts, superscripts, etc. have been preserved.

All quotes from the Hebrew Bible are from the Codex Leningradensis Hebrew Text Westminster Morphology and Lemma Database of BibleWorks 8, unless otherwise indicated. Quotes from the Greek translation of the Old Testament are from BibleWorks 8, BGT database, unless otherwise stated.

In cases where the versification of the Hebrew *WTT* diverges from the English Bible, the Hebrew appears first, with the English Bible versification following, enclosed in square brackets. The abbreviation EB is used in these cases.

CHAPTER 1: METHODOLOGY: ALLUSION, POLEMIC, AND ROYAL IDEOLOGY

Introduction

Because this thesis involves allusion, polemic, and royal ideology, it will be necessary to briefly discuss these three separate (yet interlocking) aspects. It will be essential to set forth what each of these is, how to recognize it, and what purpose (or purposes) each might serve. Thus, there will be a three-part subdivision of each of the three components. After each of these crucial terms has been discussed in turn, there will be a brief summary and conclusion as to how they may relate to one another, and how they relate to the argument presented here.

Additionally, since the thesis here presented concerning hidden polemic in Genesis 2-3 makes extensive use of the work of Yairah Amit as a template, it will be necessary to discuss her work in some detail. In particular, two of her works are crucial to the present work: *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, and "Epoch and Genre: The Sixth Century and the Growth of Hidden Polemics."[19] Amit's work will be related to the work of others on allusion, polemic, and royal ideology.

---

[19] Yairah Amit, *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*, BIS 25, translated by Jonathan Chipman (Leiden: Brill, 2000), and Yairah Amit, "Epoch and Genre: The Sixth Century and the Growth of Hidden Polemics," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*," edited by Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 135-151.
Other works by Amit have also been consulted. These include the following: Yairah Amit, "'The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive or Change His Mind': On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative," *Proof* 12/3 (1992): 201-212; Yairah Amit, "Biblical Utopianism: A Mapmakers Guide to Eden," *USQR* 44/1 (1990): 11-17; Yairah Amit, *History and Ideology: An Introduction to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible*, translated by Yael Lotan (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Yairah Amit, "Hidden Polemics in the Story of Judah and Tamar," in *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum*, edited by David J.A. Clines and Ellen van Wolde (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011), 1-20.

Some of the relevant ANE materials will be discussed during this chapter as well. This will address the fifth criterion that supplements Amit's four criteria for recognizing polemic in the Old Testament. In particular, ANE materials that speak of kings in ways that are similar to Genesis 2-3 will be discussed. Once again, allusion, polemic, and ideology will be important for understanding the impact of other ANE materials upon the argument that is presented here.

I. ALLUSION

A. Defining Allusion

What is allusion? An often quoted definition is provided by Miner: "Tacit reference to another literary work, to another art, to history, to contemporary figures, or the like."[20] In a later edition of the same reference work, Miner gives a slightly different definition of allusion. Here, Miner defines allusion as "a poet's deliberate incorporation of identifiable elements from other sources, preceding or contemporaneous, textual or extratextual."[21]

"Although poetic a. [i.e., allusion] is necessarily manifested in words, what it draws on in another work need not be verbal. The words of the

---

Many other scholars have written helpful works on Old Testament polemics in particular texts—including in Genesis 2-3. These scholars and their works have contributed greatly to the argument here presented. Amit's work has been especially helpful in providing a helpful distillation of many of the theoretical principles for detecting a hidden polemic, and also by giving practical examples from the Old Testament of such hidden polemics.
Also helpful have been James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). While he has not been quoted in this thesis, Barrington Moore, *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt* (White Plains, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1978), has provided helpful background.

[20] Earl Miner, "Allusion," *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, edited by Alex Preminger (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 18.

[21] Earl Miner, "Allusion," *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993): 38-39.

alluding passage may establish a conceptual rather than a verbal connection with the passage or work alluded to."[22]

Allusion demands "an echo of sufficiently familiar yet distinctive and meaningful elements" and "an audience sharing the tradition with the poet." Without these two elements, the interrelationship between two texts (or any non-textual phenomena) will not be recognized.[23]

Ben-Porat describes literary allusion in a more narrowly textual manner.

> The literary allusion is a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts. The activation is achieved through the manipulation of a special signal: a sign (simple or complex) in a given text characterized by an additional larger "referent." This referent is always an independent text. The simultaneous activation of the two texts thus connected results in the formation of intertextual patterns whose nature cannot be predetermined.[24]

It is important that Ben-Porat notes that the "nature" of the intertextual relationship of two texts "cannot be predetermined." Intertextual relations, even when they can be firmly established, can function in a number of different ways. This will be discussed below.

It may be somewhat helpful to distinguish "allusion" from other terms such as "inner-biblical exegesis" or "echo." However, it may also be helpful to regard allusions as falling on a continuum with these other related literary phenomena, thus highlighting the fluid nature of allusions.[25]

Recognizing Allusion

---

[22] Ibid., 39.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ben-Porat, "The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *PTL* 1 (1976): 107-108.

[25] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 23. Hays claims not to distinguish consistently between "allusion" and "echo," but then says, "In general, throughout the following pages, *allusion* is used of obvious intertextual references, *echo* of subtler ones." In a sense, this demonstrates the very point which Hays is making: Intertextual references fall on a continuum, with points on the continuum shading off into one another.

By definition, recognizing allusion is difficult. If a "tacit reference"[26] is indeed tacit, such difficulty would be unavoidable. Allusion will be easy to miss, at least for some readers. As Miner notes, "The test for a. is that it is a phenomenon that some reader or readers may fail to observe."[27] In a similar vein, Hays proposes a continuum for intertextual connections, ranging from explicit quotations to very faint echoes, with the degree of confidence that something is an allusion diminishing as one moves away from explicit quotations.

> Quotation, allusion, and echo may be seen as points along a spectrum of intertextual reference, moving from the explicit to the subliminal. As we move farther away from overt citation, . . . the intertextual relations become less determinate, and the demand placed on the reader's listening powers grows greater. As we near the vanishing point of the echo, it inevitably becomes difficult to decide whether we are really hearing an echo at all, or whether we are only conjuring things out of the murmurings of our own imaginations.[28]

While recognizing the difficulty of detecting the presence and meaning of allusion,[29] Hays proposes seven ". . . criteria for testing claims about the presence and meaning of scriptural echoes in Paul."[30] However, Hays acknowledges that the meaning of texts cannot be contained by his criteria "hedges".[31]

> (1) *Availability*. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers?[32] . . .

---

[26] Miner, "Allusion," *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 18.

[27] Miner, "Allusion," *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*: 39.

[28] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 23.

[29] Ibid., 32-33.

[30] Ibid., 29.

[31] Ibid., 32-33. In other words, although Hays thinks of the criteria he proposes as helpful, he admits that such criteria cannot be considered foolproof "rules" for establishing echoes or allusions.

[32] Ibid., 29.

(2) *Volume.* The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant: how distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture, and how much rhetorical stress does the echo received in Paul's discourse?[33] . . .

(3) *Recurrence.* How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?[34] . . .

(4) *Thematic Coherence.* How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing?[35]

(5) *Historical Plausibility.* Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could his readers have understood it? (We should always bear in mind, of course, that Paul might have written things that were not readily intelligible to his actual readers.) This test, historical in character, necessarily requires hypothetical constructs of what might have been intended and grasped by particular first-century figures.[36] . . .

(6) *History of Interpretation.* Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes? . . . While this test is a possible restraint against arbitrariness, it is also one of the least reliable guides for interpretation . . . . Thus, this criterion should rarely be used as a negative test to exclude proposed echoes that commend themselves on other grounds.[37]

(7) *Satisfaction.* With or without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? . . . This criterion is difficult to articulate precisely without falling into the affective fallacy, but it is finally the most important test: it is in fact another way of asking whether the proposed reading offers a good account of the experience of a contemporary community of competent readers. . . . [T]he final test of the present study of Paul will come only in the reading, and the case is necessarily cumulative.[38]

There are always only shades of certainty when these criteria are applied to particular texts. The more of them that fall clearly into place, the more confident we can be in rendering an interpretation of the echo effect in a given passage.[39]

Berger has also articulated principles for determining allusion, applying them to the case of Ruth and 1 Samuel 25. Berger acknowledges that,

---

[33] Ibid., 30.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid., 31.
[38] Ibid., 31-32.
[39] Ibid., 32.

although recognizing an allusion is never a foregone conclusion, elements within a text may signal allusion.

> As many have noted, the probability that one text alludes to another will generally depend on the distinctiveness and frequency of their common features. Thus, if the features in question are unexceptional, or if we observe just a handful of similarities distributed over large expanses of text, an argument in favor of allusion will most often fall short. At the same time, a particularly striking parallel might suggest allusion all by itself. More important, an especially dense cluster of similarities might prove decisive even where each of them, taken individually, could otherwise have been seen as coincidental; the larger the number of moderately suggestive parallels, the more compelling they become when considered together.[40]

It is also possible to approach the matter of allusion in terms of stages in the recognition of allusions. For example, in his more reader-centric approach, Ben-Porat identifies four stages that the reader goes through in order to recognize an allusion.

1. The reader recognizes ". . . the marking element(s) as belonging or closely related to an independent referent text . . . ."[41]
2. The text to which the allusion refers is identified.[42]
3. "*Modification of the Initial Local Interpretation . . .*" of the alluding text.[43]
4. "*Activation of the Evoked Text . . . as a Whole, in an Attempt to Form Maximum Intertextual Patterns.*"[44]

Leonard seeks to test certain methodological principles for determining intertextual allusions by a close examination of Psalm 78.[45] He begins with

---

[40] Yitzhak Berger, "Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Case of 1 Samuel 25," *JBL* 128 (2009): 254.
[41] Ibid., 110.
[42] Ben-Porat, "Poetics of Literary Allusion," 110.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid., 111.

two criteria that would certainly constitute criteria for an allusion: ". . . a paragraph-long quotation, complete with a citation . . . ."[46] In less clear cases, Leonard proposes ". . . eight principles as methodological guidelines."[47] These eight are as follows.

> (1) Shared language is the single most important factor in establishing a textual connection. (2) Shared language is more important than nonshared language. (3) Shared language that is rare or distinctive suggests a stronger connection than does language that is widely used. (4) Shared phrases suggest a stronger connection than do individual shared terms. (5) The accumulation of shared language suggests a stronger connection than does a single shared term or phrases. (6) Shared language in similar contexts suggests a stronger connection than does shared language alone. (7) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared ideology to establish a connection. (8) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared form to establish a connection.[48]

Leonard holds that "themes" is too broad a resemblance to be used to argue persuasively for allusion.[49] This seems to be a fair criticism. The argument has often been proposed that, because the Eden Narrative shares certain themes with other stories, this means that the Eden Narrative alludes to other stories that treat similar (or the same themes).[50] However, while such themes are of interest, they likely should not be used as evidence for allusion to particular texts. On the other hand, they may corroborate such evidence, provided that evidence itself exists.

---

[45] Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127/2 (2008): 244-245.

[46] Ibid., 246. If "allusion" is understood as an indirect or passing reference, a direct quote should be distinguished from allusion.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 246-247.

[50] Jonathan Magonet, "The Themes of Genesis 2-3," in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, ed. Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 39-46; Alan Jon Hauser, "Genesis 2-3: The Theme of Intimacy and Alienation," in *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, JSOTSup 19 edited by David J. A. Clines, David M. Gunn, and Alan J. Hauser, 20-36 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982).

Leonard points out that "[t]he description of the plagues in Psalm 78 is filled with language that corresponds to the plague narratives in the Torah."[51] In particular, Leonard draws attention to the lexical linkages between Psalm 78:51 and Exodus 12:12, 29.[52] Indeed, Leonard cites a number of verbal parallels between Psalm 78 and the JE account of the plagues.[53]

In the second criterion ("shared language"), Leonard points out that, even when two texts have much language that is not shared, this in no way invalidates lexical evidence for allusion to another biblical text.[54] In other words, the fact that some words are changed in an allusion does not affect the fact of allusion.[55] According to Leonard, different wording, ignoring certain material present in the plagues, and even changes in the order of the plagues does not touch the essential point of the allusiveness of Psalm 78 to the JE account.[56] "To demonstrate that two texts are not connected requires more than highlighting the differences between those texts. After all, an author certainly has the ability to borrow from a given text and then subtly or even radically to reshape the borrowed material for his or her own purposes."[57]

Concerning the importance of shared language that is rare or distinctive, Leonard makes two excellent points. Common shared language does not automatically preclude the idea that one text is alluding to another. However, rare or distinctive language that is shared is a stronger indicator of the

---

[51] Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions," 247.
[52] Ibid., 247-248.
[53] Ibid., 248.
[54] Ibid., 249.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid., 250.
[57] Ibid.

presence of allusion.[58] As an example of rare, shared language, Leonard cites the expression כְּמוֹ־נֵד. This phrase is used in both Psalm 78:13 and Exodus 15:8.[59]

Commenting on the accumulation of shared language, Leonard writes, "An implication flowing from the principle outlined here is the notion that strong evidence for allusions in some cases can lend support to less certain allusions elsewhere. Each additional connection found in a text provides supporting evidence for affirming less obvious allusions."[60]

Shared contexts, even when the language shared is common, strengthen the possibility of allusion.[61] However, shared ideology is not required for allusion.

> A writer who depends on a particular text or tradition will often draw on the language of that underlying tradition. There is no reason to expect, though, that a later writer would understand or feel compelled to duplicate the ideological concerns of the earlier tradent.[62] . . . [Commenting on later Christian and rabbinic authors who used Old Testament texts] . . . The fact that these later writers advanced ideologies different from those of the original authors *has no bearing* on the question of whether they allude to their writings.[63]

This observation would also hold true for allusions within the Old Testament. In fact, if one text completely agreed with the ideology of another to which it may allude, why would the more recent text even exist?

Leonard argues that a similar form (or *gattung*) is not required in order to establish allusion.[64] To generalize Leonard's observations about the link between Psalm 78 and the "murmuring tradition" of the Pentateuch, there is no

---

[58] Ibid., 251.
[59] Ibid., 251-252.
[60] Ibid., 253.
[61] Ibid., 255.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid., 256.
[64] Ibid., 256-257.

reason to expect that the allusions of any text to another text would have been constrained by the fact that the form of one text is different from the text that is being alluded to. The commonplace that "form follows function" may hold true at times, but in many cases, form and function are quite fluid in their relationship to one another. Allusions—whether or not they express similar ideologies—can be expressed by widely differing genres. For example, a joke, a poem, and an essay could all make reference to any of these (or other) genres, and could either agree, modify, or oppose the point of the text to which allusion is made.

In the second main section of his article, Leonard acknowledges the even greater difficulty

> . . . of determining the direction of these allusions. When one text is obviously later than another, as, for example, in NT allusions to passages in the Hebrew Scriptures, the direction of allusion is easily ascertained. When dealing with passages in the Tanak, however, it is rarely possible to establish so definitively the priority of texts, especially since demonstrably early texts often contain later, secondary elements.[65]

However, Leonard proposes the following criteria for determining the direction of influence. He seems to proceed from the stronger criteria to those that may be less compelling. These criteria are as follows:

1. The reader recognizes ". . . the marking element(s) as belonging or closely related to an independent referent text . . . ."[66]
2. The text to which the allusion refers is identified.[67]
3. "*Modification of the Initial Local Interpretation* . . ." of the alluding text.[68]

---

[65] Ibid., 257.
[66] Ben-Porat, "Poetics of Literary Allusion," 110.
[67] Ibid.

4. "*Activation of the Evoked Text . . . as a Whole, in an Attempt to Form Maximum Intertextual Patterns.*"[69]

The first criterion is clear enough. The second involves ". . . orthography, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, content, and so on . . . ."[70] However, as Leonard immediately concedes, "Naturally, each of these features is subject to debate, as evidenced by the fact that reputable scholars manage to settle on divergent dates for nearly every biblical text."[71]

Concerning the third criterion (whether one text is capable of producing the other), Leonard writes, "When comparing texts that appear to be connected, it is important to consider whether one text has sufficient breadth and depth to generate the other."[72] However, Leonard may be overestimating the value of this criterion for determining the direction of allusion. He gives as an example Genesis 12:10-20. This seems to be the story of the exodus. "The question is which story has left its mark on the other. The answer seems obvious."[73] Leonard asserts that the more developed story (that of the exodus) gave rise to the story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt. "It is nearly impossible . . . to understand how an isolated pericope in Abram's story could have given birth to the great complex of traditions that make up the exodus story."[74]

However, it is not really so "nearly impossible." After all, while it is certainly possible to model a shorter story on a longer one, it is equally possible for shorter stories to be the impetus for a larger story or complex of

---

[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 111.
[70] Ibid., 258.
[71] Ibid., 258-259.
[72] Ibid., 260.
[73] Ibid., 260.
[74] Ibid.

stories. Indeed, this particular direction of allusion seems to have been the case with Gilgamesh Epic. Shorter, simpler Sumerian stories seem to have been adapted and woven together to form the Gilgamesh Epic.[75]

The fourth criterion (one text assuming the other) involves a text referring to only part of another text. Such a reference would only make sense if the rest of the text was assumed.[76] The fifth criterion means that, if a text has shown a general tendency to borrow from other texts, the likelihood is increased of that text to borrow from yet another text.[77] The sixth criterion is that of a text using another text in a particular, stylistic and exegetical manner.[78] In particular, determining the direction of an allusion is a matter of imagining how the direction of the allusion could have gone in the opposite direction.[79]

Leonard begins his conclusion by acknowledging that, "[a]lthough the principles outlined here guide the process of identifying and determining the direction of allusions, the process is often more art than science."[80] This is an appropriately tentative conclusion. The possibility of dating certain biblical texts, and of discussing the direction of influence may be helpful in some cases. Leonard is probably correct in faulting Eslinger for being too skeptical on this point of determining the diachronic direction of allusions in texts.[81]

However, while Leonard's criteria for determining the direction of allusion are helpful for some texts, for the purpose of the argument that is here

---

[75] Cf. J. D. Bing, "On the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh," *JANES* 7 (1975): 1-10.
[76] Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions," 261.
[77] Ibid., 262.
[78] Ibid., 262-264.
[79] Ibid., 264.
[80] Ibid., 264.
[81] Ibid., 243.

presented, diachronic considerations will play little part. There are five reasons for this neglect of diachronic matters.

First, there are already many diachronic treatments that deal with the dating of Genesis 2-3, and its possible development through time. This is a well-worked field that can be accessed by anyone who is interested in the issue.[82]

Second, dates for Genesis 2-3 range from the time of Moses, to the Hellenistic period.[83] The lack of anything like a scholarly consensus suggests that attempts at dating are, at the very least, problematic.

Third, this thesis does not argue for a close literary connection between any two texts. Rather, the argument is that Genesis 2-3 references a general ANE world view concerning royal ideology. While texts have an evidentiary part to play in this argument, the main concern here it is the royal ideology that they appear to reflect. Thus, the relative dating of texts that reveal such a general world view is somewhat less important than it would be if the

---

[82] Cf., for example, Avi Hurvitz, "The Recent Debate on Late biblical Hebrew: Solid Data, Experts' Opinions, and Inconclusive Arguments," *HS* 47 (2006): 191-210, Terje Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000), 206-213; David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996).

[83] For the very conservative view that Moses wrote Genesis 2-3, cf. John E. Hartley, *Genesis*, NIBC (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2000), 15-17. For a similar approach, see also Paul J. Kissling, *Genesis*, The College Press NIV Commentary (Joplin, Missouri: College Press, 2004), 42-49.
For the older scholarly consensus that Genesis 2-3 was written during the United Monarchy (with or without the use of older materials), cf. Otto Kaiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*, trans. John Sturdy (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg, 1975), 78-91 (especially, pp. 82-84). Cf. also Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1986), 107-108.
Somewhat more cautiously, John Day, *From Creation to Babel: Genesis 1-11*, LHB/OTS 592 (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 47-49, argues for a pre-exilic date, although not necessarily a date during the United Monarchy.
Increasingly, scholars seem to favor a very late date. Cf. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden,* 206-213. Stordalen opts, however tentatively, for a Persian dating for the Eden Narrative (p. 213).
An even more radically late date is exemplified by Russell Gmirkin, *Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006).

argument of this thesis were concerned with the development of this world view through time, or if the relationship between specific texts were in view.

Fourth, while Leonard's seems to be correct in pointing out specific (and numerous) connections between Psalm 78 and the Pentateuch, the same cannot easily be done in connection with Genesis 2-3. There do seem to be some connections between Genesis 2-3 and other biblical texts. However, these connections are not close enough to enable a firm diachronic determination about the direction the allusion would logically go. Thus, although Leonard's criteria for detecting allusion are helpful to the argument of this thesis, his criteria for determining the direction of allusions are less so.

Fifth, the argument here is for a hidden polemic against certain common assumptions and assertions of royal ideology in the ANE. Because of the hiddenness of this polemic, it is argued that clues about the ancient time in which the Eden Narrative is set are likely a crucial aspect of that hiddenness, rather than clues to the date of its composition. In other words, setting the story "long ago and far away," allows those who crafted and preserved the story to disguise the real target of their polemic.

A. The Purposes of Allusion

Many possible purposes and functions have been identified for allusions. According to Miner, "A. may be used merely to display knowledge . . .; to appeal to those sharing experience or knowledge with the poet; or to enrich a poem by incorporating further meaning."[84] According to Sommer,[85] some

---

[84] Miner, "Allusion," The New Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, 39.

[85] Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*, CJOD (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 18-20.

purposes for allusion are "culturally conservative," and some are "culturally innovative."[86] Allusion may, indeed, be used to give pleasure to the author of the newer work, by showing off his knowledge, and/or to the audience who read the newer work.[87] Thus, allusion shares some of the DNA of jokes, since the familiar and the unfamiliar give pleasure in both allusions and jokes.[88]

Scholars often argue for very different—even contradictory—purposes for allusion within the same texts, even when there is agreement as to a text and its allusive source. For example, Berger[89] and Fisch[90] agree that Ruth is to be connected with the story of David and Bath-Sheba. However, Fisch argues for a positive role for Ruth *vis-à-vis* David—i.e., a purpose that serves to portray David in a positive manner. Berger, on the other hand, argues for Ruth's negative role in assessing David. This exemplifies the very different—indeed, opposite—functions that can be predicated of two texts, even when there is agreement between competent scholars concerning the texts' connectedness with one another.

Summary of Scholarly Approaches to Allusion

The authors discussed in the above sections on allusion seem to agree that allusion is difficult to recognize. However, they all recognize that more or less objective criteria are needed, if the attempt to argue for allusion is to have any cogency. While the ways in which these criteria are described varies from scholar to scholar, there appears to be general agreement that words and phrases are indicators of allusion. Miner argues that, while verb al clues are

---

[86] Ibid., 18-19.
[87] Ibid., 19.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Berger, "Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion": 253-272.
[90] Harold Fisch, "Ruth and the Structure of Covenant History," *VT* 32 (1982): 425-437.

crucial in establishing the presence of allusion, the allusion may to be "concepts" as well as to texts.[91] Also, there is agreement that rarer words and phrases in two texts are more likely to demonstrate allusion than if common words and phrases are used.

Some of the scholars discussed here—at least, based on the writings cited here— think of allusion as primarily a textual phenomenon. Others recognize the cross-fertilization between various media.[92]

A few scholars have argued that there is evidence that can help establish the temporal direction of the allusion. Many others remain silent on this matter, content with establishing criteria for allusion, rather than dealing with the time and direction of the allusion.

I. POLEMICS

A. Defining Polemics

Articles and books that contain the word "polemic" and its cognates rarely seem to define what they mean by the term. Yet the definition of the term matters greatly.

Merriam-Webster's on-line definition seems fairly typical. ". . . an aggressive attack on or refutation of the opinions or principles of another

b **:** the art or practice of disputation or controversy —usually used in plural but singular or plural in construction . . . ."[93] The Oxford English

---

[91] Miner, "Allusion," *New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics,* 39.

[92] While this thesis deals almost exclusively with texts, the fruitful and less well-worked field of iconography might reward further exploration. The difficulties of relating texts to iconography has often been noted in the scholarly literature. (Cf., e.g., Izak Cornelius, "Paradise Motifs in the 'Eschatology' of the Minor Prophets and the Iconography of the Ancient Near East. The Concepts of Fertility, Water, Trees and 'Tierfrieden' and Gen 2-3," *JNSL* 14 (1988): 41-83.) However, despite the real and serious difficulties, it would be of interest to cautiously explore this area as well. (See, e.g., Othmar Keel, *Goddesses and Trees, New Moon and Yahweh: Ancient Near Eastern Art and the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 261, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 16-17.)

Dictionary has a similar definition. "A strong verbal or written attack on someone or something . . . ."[94]

It may well be that the historical use of the word (stemming from the Greek word that often refers to literal warfare) has colored the modern understanding of the term "polemics."[95] However, the question should be raised as to whether more subdued attacks might also be considered "polemical" in nature as well.[96]

For the purpose of the argument here presented, polemic is any protest—no matter how muted or strong—against another position, institution, ideology, or person. This definition does not prejudge the intensity with which, or the methodology by which, polemic is used to oppose a particular view. Neither does it specify whether the polemic is verbal, written, or action-related. This definition does, however, retain the essentially oppositional nature of polemic.

---

[93] http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/polemic. accessed 12- 31-2105.

[94] http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/polemic. accessed 12-31-2015.

[95] Cf. Jonathan Crewe, "Can a Polemic be Ethical? A Response to Michel Foucault," in *Polemic: Critical or Uncritical*, edited by Jane Gallop (New York: Routledge, 2004), 136-137.

[96] To press the literal, obsolete meaning of polemics as "warfare," it is worth pointing out that the act of tunneling under a city's walls in order to conquer it is just as truly warfare, as is a direct assault on the city gates. Similarly, ideological polemic may consist of indirect, as well as direct, assaults upon another position.

B. Recognizing Polemics[97]

As with recognizing explicit allusions (or better, "quotations"), recognizing open polemics is not difficult. 1 Samuel 8 is a textbook example. Kaplan contends that the expression "the manner of the king" in 1 Sam 8:11-18 ". . . should be viewed as part of the *Fürstenspiegel* genre of discourse, a mode of critiquing and restraining royal power in the ancient Near East by raising a mirror to its excesses."[98]

C. The Purposes of Polemics

What is the purpose of polemic? It might be better to ask about the purposes of polemic, for there are (at least in some cases) multiple polemical battles going on within the same text. Thus, for example, Strine argues cogently that Ezekiel is conducting a two-pronged attack: one against an intra-Judahite group,[99] and one against the Babylonians.[100]

If Strine is correct, a significant underlying purpose of Ezekiel's polemics is "identity formation."[101] If there is one purpose for polemic in general, this may well be that purpose: identity formation. Arguments about important

---

[97] Many of the criteria for recognizing hidden polemic are similar—if not identical—to the criteria for recognizing that one text is alluding to another. Thus, much of the discussion on recognizing allusion is applicable to recognizing hidden polemic.
Also, there will be more discussion concerning recognizing hidden polemic in the section dealing with the work of Amit.

[98] Jonathan Kaplan, "Samuel 8:11-18 as 'A Mirror for Princes'," *JBL* 181/4 (2012): 626. Cf. also Lyle Eslinger, "Viewpoints and Points of View in 1 Samuel 8-12." *JSOT* 26 (1983): 61-76.

[99] C. A. Strine, Sworn Enemies: The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile, BZAW 436 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 177-227.

[100] Ibid., 228-268.

[101] Ibid., 276-279.

issues often may boil down to the establishment and/or maintenance of boundaries between "us" and "them."[102]

While Scott does not appear to use the word "polemic," the idea seems to permeate his work. Scott distinguishes between "public transcripts" and "private transcripts." "Public transcripts" reflect the ideology of a dominant group, while "hidden transcripts" reflect the ideology of a subordinate group.

Public transcripts embody the ideology of the dominant elite. Scott writes,

> *Public* here refers to action that is openly avowed to the other party in the power relationship, and *transcript* is used almost in its juridical sense (*procès verbal*) of a complete record of what was said. This complete record, however, would also include nonspeech acts such as gestures and expressions.[103]

While Scott, does appear to define what he means by "the hidden transcript," he appears to use the term to describe what goes on within the dominated group, out of sight of the dominant elite. Such a hidden transcript ". . . is produced for a different audience and under different constraints of power than the public transcript."[104]

The zone between these two different ideologies, public and hidden, ". . . is a zone of constant struggle between dominant and subordinate—not a solid wall. . . . The unremitting struggle over such boundaries is perhaps the most vital arena for ordinary conflict, for everyday forms of class struggle."[105] When Scott speaks of "constant struggle" and "unremitting struggle," his approach clearly involves polemical discourse. Both Strine's and Scott's

---

[102] Ibid., 277-278. Strine points out that Ezekiel is attempting to establish the "us" as "those of us who are in exile, but who are faithful." The "them" involves two polemic targets: the Judahites who are still in Judah, and the Babylonians.

[103] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 2, fn. 1.

[104] Ibid., 5.

[105] Ibid., 14.

approach suggest that the purpose of both public and hidden transcripts is not only to contest the other transcript. These transcripts also serve an internal function for each group: to keep the members of both the dominant and subordinate groups on the same message.

In dialog with Clines, who holds that the Bible is inherently ideological and essentially conflictual,[106] Barr has raised a serious question as to whether or not ideology is a matter of conflict or of consensus. "The idea that ideology is to be traced back to social conflict seems to me to be mistaken. All that has been said in our discussion of the definition of ideology seems to point in the opposite direction: ideology points towards a consensus, not a consensus with no exceptions at all, but a substantial general consensus."[107]

However, there are two weaknesses with Barr's analysis. Barr may be correct in pointing out that Clines' example of the Ten Commandments as "ideological" is not the best example for Cline's argument.[108] But even if this is granted, it does not touch portions of the Old Testament in which conflict between different groups and ideologies is too obvious to be ignored. 1 Kings 8, for example, seems to be exhibit a pro-royal ideology. However, 1 Kings 8:27 appears to call that pro-royal ideology into serious question. Concerning 1 Kings 8:27, Gray argues that the natural connection of 8:26 with 2:28 is ". . . suggesting that v. 27 is parenthetical, and perhaps a later theologizing

---

[106] Barr is in dialog with D.J.A. Clines, "Possibilities and Priorities of Biblical Interpretation in an International Perspective," *BI* 1 (1993): 67-87. (Cf. especially p. 86, to which Barr refers.)

[107] James Barr, *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of a Millennium*, the Hensley Henson Lectures for 1997 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 135.

[108] Ibid., 134-135. Barr, 135, asks whether there was ever a ". . . Pro-Stealing class or party . . ."

interpolation."[109] This tends to make the temple ". . . but the meeting-place of man and God . . . ."[110] While Gray recognizes that verse 27 relativizes the temple, Gray does not acknowledge that it also relativizes the temple-builder Solomon, who is praying the dedicatory prayer over the temple. This implies that not all the ideology is a matter of consensus.

A second problem with Barr's comment that ideology is more a matter of consensus than of conflict is also connected with the example given by Cline. This problem may be expressed in the form of a question: If there was never a "Pro-Stealing class or party," why is stealing so often prohibited in the Old Testament?[111] Of course, the "Pro-Stealing" class would not likely have acknowledged that they were really stealing. They would, no doubt, have embraced an ideology that justified their stealing—which would, thus, not have been considered stealing at all. Therefore, the matter of ideological conflict (and therefore, polemic, at some level) still seems to be present after all.

---

[109] John Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary*, 2nd, fully revised edition (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 221.
Gary N. Knoppers, "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program," *CBQ* 57/2 (1995): 5, argues for a unifying blending of original source and the later deuteronomistic edition. He writes "Even though the Deuteronomist later (in 8:27) distances himself from the immanentization of divine presence proclaimed by his source, his very inclusion of this affirmation underscores the sanctity of the new sanctuary." While the phrase "distances himself" may not suggest a strong polemic, it does suggest a certain dissatisfaction with the source which the later editor was using. Thus, even in the writing of a scholar with a bias in favor of viewing 1 Kings 8 as a unit, there is the recognition of a certain tension within the text. However, neither Gray nor Knoppers seems to note that such tension relativizes the role of Solomon, as well as the role of the temple.
[110] Gray, *I & II Kings*, 221.
[111] Cf., for example, Jeremiah 7:9; Hosea 4:2; 7:1; Zechariah 5:3.

I. ROYAL IDEOLOGY

A. Defining Royal Ideology

Before discussing royal ideology *per se*, it would be best to briefly discuss ideology in a broader manner. What is it, how does one recognize it, and what is/are its purpose/s? However, this is no easy task. As Eagleton acknowledges, "[n]obody has yet come up with a single adequate definition of ideology . . . ." This is ". . . because the term 'ideology' has a whole range of useful meanings, not all of which are compatible with each other."[112] As Dyck points out, ". . . ideology and ideological criticism does and will continue to mean different things to different people both inside and outside the guild."[113] Concerning the term "ideology," Barr notes that "[t]he term is used . . . in a bewildering variety of ways . . . ."[114] Mayes notes that, "[t]he role of ideology cannot, then, be understood simply in terms of integration and constitution; rather from the beginning, it belongs in a context of opposition to other ideologies and thus has a legitimating function."[115] Whether or not ideology is always "legitimating" is open to debate. However, even if it is considered as always legitimating, this would still suggest a polemic against some sort of counter-ideology that might (at least in theory) challenge such legitimating ideology.

---

[112] Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 1991), 1.

[113] Jonathan E. Dyck, "A Map of Ideology for Biblical Critics," in *Rethinking Contexts, Reading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, JSOTSup 299, edited by M. Daniel Carroll R. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 108.

[114] Barr, History and Ideology in the Old Testament, 102.

[115] Andrew D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament," *JSOT* 82 (1999): 64.

Eagleton points out serious problems with defining ideology only in terms of the dominant group.[116] He also has problems with the viewpoint (for example, of Martin Seliger) that ideology is essentially neutral, i.e., as a set of beliefs by which people live.[117] In fact, Eagleton wants to preserve both the narrower and broader definitions, though he acknowledges their incompatibility.[118] However, he also admits that a broad definition tends to make the term "ideology" so broad that it ends up meaning everything and nothing.[119]

On the other hand, not all of the power arrangements between groups must be seen as ideology. Some of these power arrangements are more important than others.[120]

> Not everything, then, may usefully be said to be ideological. If there is nothing which is not ideological, then the term cancels all the way through and drops out of sight. To say this does not commit one to believing that there is a kind of discourse which is inherently non-ideological; it just means that in any particular situation you must be able to point to what counts as non-ideological for the term to have meaning.[121]

Eagleton also points out that whether something that is said or written is ideology depends upon the context. "It is ". . . a question of who is saying what to whom for what purposes. . . . The general point, then, is that exactly the same piece of language may be ideological in one context and not in another; ideology is a function of the relation of an utterance to its social context."[122]

---

[116] Eagleton, *Ideology*, 5-6.
[117] Ibid., 6-7.
[118] Ibid., 7.
[119] Ibid., 7-8.
[120] Ibid., 8-9.
[121] Ibid., 9.
[122] Ibid., 9.

According to Eagleton, ideology implies ". . . conflicts within the field of signification."[123] It is inherently likely that, whenever an ideology is expressed, it implies that there is some other ideology about the matter. Matters such as breathing do not generally require a supportive ideology, since breathing is usually considered a required human activity. Of course, even breathing can become an ideological issue in situations where "ethnic cleansing" needs to be justified by those doing the "cleansing."

Eagleton points out that, in the case of any sort of ideology held by a number of people over time, there is likely to have existed at least some real evidence to support that ideology.[124] However, while some ideology may be true at one level, it may be false at another.[125]

Miller begins his discussion of ideology by referring to ". . . two basic and generally similar definitions of ideology . . . ."[126] Miller seems to be in basic agreement with these, although he later revises them. The first is from Winston White, and the second is from James Luther Adams.

> An ideology is a selective interpretation of the state of affairs in society made by those who share some particular conception of what it ought to be.[127]
>
> . . . .
>
> [An ideology is] that composite myth by which a society or group identifies itself, not only for itself but also for other societies and groups. An ideology posits the group's goals and justification of these goals in terms of which the group deals with other groups and with conflicts within the group; it defines and interprets the situation; it aims to overcome

---

[123] Ibid., 11.

[124] Ibid., 12.

[125] Ibid., 16-17.

[126] Patrick D. Miller, "Faith and Ideology in the Old Testament," in *Magnalia Dei—The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke and Patrick D. Miller (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 466.

[127] Miller, "Faith and Ideology," 466. Miller is quoting from Winston White, *Beyond Conformity* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), 6.

> indifference to the common good; it reduces excessive emphasis on individual action. It makes possible group action.[128]

As with polemics, many Old Testament scholars seem content with discussing royal ideology without defining what they understand by the term. Scott has written one of the seminal works on royal ideology, even though he speaks more generally of "dominant" and "submissive" groups.[129] In particular, Scott's discussion of the distinction between what he calls "public" and "private" transcripts—along with his discussion of the purposes of such transcripts—is helpful for understanding royal ideology.

What is "the public transcript?" Scott answers, "The public transcript is, to put it crudely, the *self*-portrait of dominant elites as they would have themselves seen."[130] Since kings (and their officials) may certainly be described as a type of dominant elite, their ideology may certainly be seen as part of "the public transcript." "The capacity of dominant groups to prevail—though never totally—in defining and constituting what counts as the public transcript and what as offstage is, as we shall see, no small measure of their power."[131] The public transcript is expressed in its most extreme form in royal ideology.[132]

Hettema and van der Kooij set forth a simple definition of polemic as "controversial discourse."[133] The authors also identify ". . . three fields in culture and society, in which this notion of controversial discourse is

---

[128] [128] Miller, "Faith and Ideology," 466. The quote is from James Luther Adams, "Ideology and Religion," [no further publication information available], p. 72, note 12.

[129] Scott, Domination and the Arts of Resistance.

[130] Ibid., 18.

[131] Ibid., 14.

[132] Ibid.,

[133] T.L. Hettema and A. van der Kooij, "Introduction," in Religious Polemics in Context: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR) Held at Leiden, 27-28 April 2000, edited by T.L. Hettema and A. van der Kooij (Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004), xi.

elaborated more distinctly: politics, literature, and religion." However, the question might be asked as to whether these three areas were regarded as distinct in the ANE.

Hettema and Van der Keeij write,

> In politics, polemic goes together with propaganda as a form of persuasive discourse. An extensive repertory of rhetorical devices is applied in political polemic: the use of deceit, disclaiming the rhetorical ability of the opponent, the manipulation of information, the use of nonverbal techniques of communication, etc. Political polemic shows an intentional use of communication as a means of power. Polemic serves to establish a certain political power, and is a linguistics power itself.[134]

The authors hold that political polemics is the realm where the ". . . power, and even violence of language . . . emerges most eminently."[135]

However, it would seem best to not prejudge the rightness, wrongness, or motivation for any ideology. Thus, a neutral definition is tentatively chosen for the argument presented here. For the purpose of this thesis, ideology is defined as a set of ideas that supports a particular position concerning an important person, belief, institution, or any other important social reality. Since humans tend to disagree in their ideas about important institutions, it may be assumed that ideology will often be oppositional in one way or another, and to one degree or another.

B. Recognizing Royal Ideology

In its most direct forms, recognizing royal ideology is generally not as difficult as either allusion or subtle polemic. There are at least two reasons for

---

[134] Ibid.
[135] Ibid.

this. First, royalty permeates the extant literature of the ANE.[136] Second, such literature, no matter the genre, tends to speak of the king in such exalted terms that it would be difficult to miss it.

Murray notes that, at least in broad terms, royal ideology is similar across space and time. "Given what we know of the ebb and flow of political and cultural contacts and dominations within the area, a hypothesis that allows for some degree of general diffusion of such claims and assertions within the area, albeit undergoing decontextualization and recontextualization in the process, is not unreasonable."[137] In a similar vein, Whitelam writes,

> The ideal position of the king as judge, expressed in the well-being of nature and society along with the king's concern for the underprivileged, was found to be consistent with similar conceptions of the *Just King* common to the ancient Near East as a whole. Such ideology also has an important part to play in reality. The failure of the king in his divinely commissioned task of judicial administration seriously undermined his position on the throne (2 Sam. xv 1-6).[138]

Since the thesis here presented also deals with general similarities in royal ideology across space and time,[139] it seems appropriate to refer to other ANE aspects of royal ideology. Even ideologies that are outside of ancient Israel and Judah (and not contemporary with the very uncertain date of the Eden Narrative) may serve to provide at least general analogies to the royal ideology of Israel and Judah.

What were the most significant elements of royal ideology in the ANE? These can be analyzed in several ways. In general terms, victory in battle

---

[136] Cf. Donald F. Murray, Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension: Pragmatics, Poetics and Polemics in a Narrative Sequence about David (2 Samuel 5.17-7.29), JSOTSup 264 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 249-250.

[137] Ibid., 250.

[138] Keith W. Whitelam, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*, JSOTSup 12 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979), 219.

[139] Cf., for example, J. N. Postgate, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad," in *CANE* (New York: Scribner, 2000), 1: 395-411.

against the king's enemies and domestic achievements are the major components of royal ideology. These fundamental aspects of royal ideology are discussed briefly below.

For example, in discussing the god Ninurta, Annus notes that,

> "Ninurta is the defender of the divine world order; he is the god of warfare, agriculture, and wisdom. The connecting point between these seemingly contradictory roles is the institution of kingship Ninurta personifies and the destiny he decrees for a mortal king. . . . He is expected to give his victorious role over to the earthly king who can be seen as his incarnation or 'icon.' . . . Ninurta mythology is widely used in the royal rituals."[140]

In fact, Annus speaks of Ninurta as ". . . the god of kingship . . . ."[141] "Although Ninurta's name seems to vanish in this process of identification with the other gods, the configuration of his cult lingers in royal ideology and rituals until the end of Mesopotamian civilization, and left a legacy for later periods."[142]

Indeed, following Engnell's lead, Annus thinks that the earthly king was identified with Ninurta.[143] Annus also thinks that this connection ". . . is neither unique nor accidental . . . ," but that such a connection perdures.[144]

As Annus points out, eternal life is a reward given to the victorious Ninurta, a gift that would be strange for a god, but more understandable if the earthly king was being addressed, along with the god.[145] "As can be seen from the mythical text *Creation of Man and the King* (Mayer 1987), kingship in the first millennium BC was considered as a part of the primordial world order. According to this text, the creation of the king immediately follows the

---

[140] Amar Annus, *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia*, SAAS 14 ([Helsinki]: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002), 5.
[141] Ibid., 6.
[142] 5-6.
[143] Ibid., 6-8.
[144] Ibid., 6.
[145] Ibid., 6-7.

creation of man."[146] Annus also points out that, "[t]his myth may also reflect the conceptual affinity of the king and Ninurta."[147] . . . "The kingship in the Sumerian cities on earth was directly dependent on the divine kingship in Heaven."[148]

Such language about the attributes of the king and his tasks is not foreign to some texts within the Old Testament. Concerning the lofty language of Psalm 21, Aster notes that, "[d]ivine attributes, such as כבוד, הוד, הדר, and eternity are shared with the king in vv. 6-7[a], and he is welcomed in YHWH's presence in 7[b]."[149] Aster comments,

> In vv. 6-7, the king is described (repeatedly) as partaking of divine attributes and as standing in the divine presence. The language used here is more than "praise in extreme terms".[150] The king is not only the best of humans but also acquires traits that are elsewhere reserved for YHWH. This is exceptional even when compared to other psalms that speak of the king as crowned and assisted by YHWH, such as Psalms 18 and 89.[151]

The king is thus

> . . . more than *primus inter pares*. He is endowed here with supernatural attributes and becomes a sort of superman. The royal ideology reflected in this psalm is exceptional for the Hebrew Bible, even within the corpus of royal psalms. The king possesses divine traits, is endowed by YHWH with what seems to be supernatural force, and benefits from the ensuing total destruction of the king's enemies.[152]

C. The Purposes of Royal Ideology

---

[146] Ibid., 7. And cf. fn. 17 for Annus' sources. Annus appears to be referring to W. Mayer, "Ein Mythos von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs," *Or* 56 (1987): 55-68, but Annus appears to be translating the German title into English.

[147] Annus, *The God Ninurta*, 7.

[148] Ibid., 13.

[149] Shawn Zelig Aster, "On the Place of Psalm 21 in Israelite Royal Ideology," in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*, edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael J. Williams (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 309.

[150] Aster is referring to David J. A. Clines, "The Psalms and the King," in *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967-1998*, JSOTSup 293 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 698.

[151] Aster, "Psalm 21," 311.

[152] Ibid., 314.

In the case of royal ideology, there may well be more than one audience, and more than one purpose. Again, Scott's work on the public transcript of dominant groups is helpful in understanding the purposes of royal ideology. Scott asks the question as to who the audience for the performance of the public transcript might be.[153] To ask about audiences suggests also the question of what a performance of the public transcript is supposed to do either to or for such audiences. Certainly, as Scott points out, the public performances of the public transcript are designed to convince the subordinate class to think of their subjugation as an unavoidable reality.[154]

However, there is another audience: the dominant elites themselves.[155] Scott seems to recognize at least two aspects of the dominant elite's reinforcement of its own public transcript. One aspect is that such performances serve to "police" members of the elite who might be inclined to dissent from the public transcript.[156] Second, Scott asks whether such public performances may be ". . . a kind of self-hypnosis within groups to buck up their courage, improve their cohesion, display their power, and convince themselves anew of their high moral purpose?"[157] Scott answers his own question, though in a tentative manner by writing, "The possibility is not all that farfetched."[158]

However, if the Eden Narrative was a hidden polemic against royal pretensions, as is argued here, another aspect of the motivation of elites must be considered. Why would a body of literature such as the Old Testament

---

[153] Scott, Domination and the Arts of Resistance, 66-69.
[154] Ibid., 66-67.
[155] Ibid., 67-69.
[156] Ibid., 67.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Ibid.

(presumably preserved by some elite—royal, priestly, or otherwise) preserve a story that was questioning of their own undergirding ideology?

While motivation is often hidden to the actors themselves, their motivation is always opaque to observers. However, there are several possibilities. First, it may be that members of the elite who tell or preserve stories that are inimical to the ideology of the dominant class are disaffected, perhaps feeling that they have not received everything that they deserved. Certainly, envy can be a powerful motivator.

Second, it is also possible that some, even those in the elite group, may have wished to at least moderate the ideology and behavior of their own group. Self-criticism in any group is probably rare, but it is not unknown.

Third, it may be that the elite who wrote, adapted, and/or preserved the Eden Narrative were not an independent elite, but subordinate elite. In cases where an external power rules a nation or people, they make use of locals to administer the area. Such administrators may be considered a "subordinate elite." Such people would have a certain amount of power, wealth, and influence, but would have to be very cautious as to how their power was used *vis-à-vis* imperial authority. If such a group were to question the imperial authority at all, a hidden polemic would be very be a virtual necessity for them.

In any case, ambivalent portrayals of royal ideology are not unknown in the ANE. Wyatt has pointed out that at least some West Semitic literature portrays kingship with a divided voice.

> The ideal presentation of the king as one who converses with God or the gods—who may himself be called son of God—expressed a profound longing for not only the benefits of stable and competent government, but also those of true religion, in which all the values

invested in kings and gods were expressed in practical and spiritual benefits. All too painfully, mundane reality often fell short of these aspirations.[159]

[159] Nicolas Wyatt, "The Hollow Crown: Ambivalent Elements in West Semitic Royal Ideology," in "There's such Divinity Doth Hedge a King": Selected Essays of Nicolas Wyatt on Royal Ideology in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature, SOTS Monographs (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2005), 48. [Originally published in UF 18 (1986): 421-436.]

While Amit does not discuss in depth allusion or ideology (whether royal ideology or the theory of ideology), she does discuss the function of polemic in biblical narrative, as well how to detect it. For example, Amit describes the migrations of the ark among the Philistines (1 Samuel 5:1; 6:12) as an open polemic that claims Yahweh's supremacy over other gods.[160]

Amit's approach recognizes a wide range of polemical discourse. Amit does not formally define what she means by the term "polemic," although she does give a description of polemic, from which a definition can be abstracted. Polemics aim to reject, or at least, correct other ideas.[161] Polemical texts "contest" other ideas either in the same text in which they occur, other ideas expressed elsewhere in the Bible,[162] or ideas that are external to the Bible.[163]

> "The description of a biblical text as polemical indicates its attitude toward an issue that lies at the center of some ideological struggle: one which generally—in one way or another—has some bearing upon reality. It

---

[160] Amit, *Hidden Polemics*, 46-48.

[161] Ibid., 6-7.

[162] John D. Currid, *Against the Gods: The Polemical Theology of the Old Testament* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2013), 25, appears to believe that the major polemic aspect of the Old Testament is directed at the gods of other ANE cultures, although he specifically states that, "[t]he relationship between the Old Testament and ancient Near Eastern literature and culture is quite complex." Currid's brief analysis of what he means by the expression "polemical theology" is as follows:

"*Polemical theology* is the use of biblical writers of the thought forms and stories that were common in ancient Near Eastern culture, while filling them with radically new meaning. The biblical authors take well-known expressions and motifs from the ancient Near Eastern milieu and apply them to the person and work of Yahweh, and not to the other gods of the ancient world. Polemical theology rejects any encroachment of false gods into orthodox belief; there is an absolute intolerance of polytheism. Polemical theology is monotheistic to the very core."

While much of the Old Testament may indeed evince a polemical agenda against the gods of the nations, Currid's unspoken assumption that this is the major thrust of Old Testament polemics is questionable. Such an approach seems to suggest a more unified approach than the Old Testament itself demonstrates.

Amit is more nuanced than is Currid in her view that some biblical polemics were directed against various institutions, ideas, or practices, whether outside of Israelite/Judean culture, or within it.

[163] Ibid., 7.

> is the way of the world that ideological struggles are connected with its understanding and with the desire to correct and to shape it."[164]

Murray, writing concerning the polemical nature of 2 Samuel 5.17-7.29, sets forth a more explicit definition of polemics than does Amit. His lapidary comments concerning polemic are quoted at some length.

> I am using it[165] here to refer to the ideological dimension of our text, with particular emphasis on the element of ideological conflict the text generates, conflict between a view I take the text to be promoting, and another (or others) which it seeks to undermine. The conflict concerns the scope and nature of the Davidic monarchy over Israel, in particular, the proper relationship of the king (*melek*) to Yahweh, and to Israel as Yahweh's people. Thus the polemics of our text are made effective through its rhetoric of persuasion, an aggressive but subtly developed rhetoric, kept latent in the earlier part of the text, to be made patent in the final section. . . . [T]his polemic is directed into an ideological situation, much of which is taken as known to the text's reader, but which is no longer known in the same way by modern readers. But given that ideological conflict is bound up with conflicts of power in society, laying bare the polemics in our text also cannot well avoid attempting some identification of what individuals or groups are implied as espousers of the positions depicted, and speculating on what the envisaged author hoped to gain by his text.[166]

For the purpose of the argument here presented, a working definition of polemic literature is given that is slightly different from Amit's implied definition, as well as from Murray's more explicit definition. For the purposes of this thesis, polemic is defined as follows: Polemic literature is any piece of writing that seeks to contest any idea concerning some important institution or idea that has different interpretations. A hidden polemic is one in which a divergent idea expressed concerning an important institution or idea is expressed so indirectly that its very existence may be difficult to uncover.

Amit proposes several criteria for recognizing hidden polemic. The first criterion that Amit proposes for recognizing a hidden polemic is negative. The text mentions neither the topic of the polemic, nor does it reveal the

---

[164] Ibid.

[165] Murray, *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension*, 23. Murray is referring to the term "polemics," particularly as the term pertains to 2 Samuel 5:17-7:29.

[166] Ibid.

narrator's stance toward the polemic. Thus, any piece of Old Testament literature can be considered a candidate to be a hidden polemic if it does not mention the topic. I quote Amit here at some length.

> A polemic is hidden when its subject is not explicitly mentioned, or when it is not mentioned in the expected, conventional formulation. Through various hints, the reader is left with the feeling that a double effort has been made within the text: on the one hand—to conceal the subject of the polemic, that is, to avoid its explicit mention; on the other—to leave certain traces within the text (referred to below as "signs") that through various means will lead the reader to the hidden subject of the polemic. The signs serve as both ruses to bypass explicit mention of the subject, as well as techniques of defamiliarization—that is, linguistic techniques to distract the reader, taking him away from the routine process of reading and turning his attention toward those phenomena in which the author is interested, such as the presence of a concealed polemic.[167]

This first criterion, considered in and of itself, would be inadequate for the purpose of establishing the presence of a hidden polemic. Sharp lodges an appropriate critique of Amit's first criterion for recognizing a hidden polemic (lack of explicit mention of the topic or of the narrator's position on that topic). Sharp writes that it cannot be claimed ". . . that we can know exactly what a text is about because of what it does not say. Yairah Amit strays perilously close to such a formulation when she accords the status of formal criterion to the absence of mention of something as evidence of a 'hidden polemic.'"[168] However, while Sharp's caveat raises an important issue, it ignores the fact that this only one (and not, according to Amit, the most important) criterion.

The second criterion (the first positive criterion) helps the reader to recognize that there is at least the possibility of a hidden polemic in a given text. This second criterion is that the subject dealt with must be openly

---

[167] Amit, *Hidden Polemics*, 93.

[168] Carolyn J. Sharp, *Irony and Meaning in the Hebrew Bible* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2009), page 259, end note 72.

polemicized in other places in the biblical literature. The most important question to ask at this point is whether the subject is controversial.[169] "The underlying assumption behind the claim as to the existence of hidden polemics is that the polemic itself, coupled with the need to conceal it, reflect a concrete problem of the authors' world."[170]

The third criterion involves finding clues in the text itself that there is a hidden polemic. This third criterion, Amit avers, keeps the exegete from imagining or imposing polemical concerns where none would have existed in the ancient world.[171] She refers to the danger of interpreting ancient Scripture in accordance with modern interests in "homiletic exegesis".[172] She does not necessarily think that homiletic exegesis is entirely wrong,[173] but wishes to listen to the author's intention, as revealed in the text.[174]

A particularly important aspect of Amit's third criterion is the presence of multiple signs.[175] "There are cases, however, in which only one sign appears, albeit a number of times, and thus has greater allusive power. Generally speaking, the uncovering of a hidden polemic relies upon accumulative evidence—in this case, a series of signs that converge at one point: the hidden subject of the polemic."[176]

It might be helpful to combine Amit's second and third criteria, when one is looking at other texts in the Old Testament that seem to support a polemic in

---

[169] Amit, *Hidden Polemics*, 94.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid., 94-95.
[172] Ibid., 95. Amit, p. 95, fn. 3, (following Melammed) thinks of homiletic exegesis as being "subjective," whether that subjectivity is conscious or unconscious. In literal exegesis, by contrast, the ". . . exegete attempts to be objective."
[173] Ibid., 95, fn. 4.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Ibid., 95-96.
[176] Ibid., 96.

the text one is examining. In other words, there may be multiple and somewhat similar clues of polemic in other texts, even if the polemic is implicit or hidden. Obviously, if the polemic is explicit, it would be inappropriate to speak of "clues." For example, in Hosea 13:11, the prophet, speaking for God, says, "I gave you a king in My anger And took him away in My wrath." In cases like this, it is not necessary to speak of "clues." The very least that can be said is that the giving of the first king and the removal of the most recent king were both expressions of Yahweh's anger. Whether or not the monarchs in between are critiqued—or monarchy, as such is critiqued—is not directly addressed by this text.[177]

Amit also regards support within the exegetical tradition—the fourth criterion—as an important criterion for recognizing a hidden polemic.[178] "The underlying assumption is that, if the polemic is so well concealed that no commentator throughout the generations has so much as suspected its existence, perhaps it doesn't really exist."[179]

---

[177] Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974). [Originally published in German in 1965.] Wolff notes (page 221, note aa) that although the Greek presupposes *waw consecutives*, ". . . the imperfect in *M* denote repeated actions that continue into the present . . . ." If Wolff is correct, then Hosea would seem to be saying that God has been in the habit of removing kings from office.
Cf. also Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 502-504—especially page 503, where the authors write,"[i]n the *incipient past non-perfective* the speaker has in view the initial and continuing phases within the internal temporal structure of a past situation."
G. I. Davies, *Hosea*, NCBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 293, notes that, "[i]n view of the allusions to I Sam. 8 and the fact that the **kings** are **given** as well as taken away in **wrath**, it is hard to escape the conclusion that a total rejection of the institution of monarchy is intended here."
On the other hand, cf. J. Andrew Dearman, *The Book of Hosea*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 235. Dearman the need for caution ". . . extrapolating a systematic viewpoint on monarchy from these brief references." At the same time, Dearman writes that Hosea's ". . . assessment of the Israelite monarchy was likely no different than his assessment of priesthood, sacrifice, or the national temple at Bethel. They all had failed in the historical moment and resided under YHWH's judgment. At the same time, all were gifts from YHWH in due season that had become corrupted."
[178] Ibid., 96.
[179] Ibid.

Amit's summary of the four criteria for recognizing hidden polemic is worth quoting in full.

> a. Refraining from explicit mention of the subject, which the author is interested to condemn or to advocate.[180]
>
> b. The evidence of other biblical materials regarding the existence of a polemic on the same subject.
>
> c. The presence of a number of signs by whose means the author directs the reader toward the polemic so that, despite the absence of explicit mention of the polemical subject, the reader finds sufficient landmarks to uncover it.
>
> d. Reference to the hidden subject of the polemic in the exegetical tradition concerning the text in question.[181]

Amit goes on to say that, "the main burden of proof thus falls upon the third criterion, concerned with the finding of signs. The claim of the existence of a hidden polemic in a given text has greater weight if it is possible to note a series of signs, or one striking, unmistakable sign, that points toward a polemic."[182] As already noted briefly, it may be that Amit's use of the expression "unmistakable sign" is incorrect in the case of hidden polemics. If a sign, no matter how prominent it may be in a text, were truly "unmistakable," would it even be appropriate to speak of "a hidden polemic" at all? Hidden polemics are likely designed to be uncovered by some, while they remain hidden to others. Without the possibility of mistaking the clues in the story, it would not be a hidden polemic.

It will be argued that there are a number of clues strewn throughout the Eden Narrative that support reading it as a hidden polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology. In particular, knowledge and life, which are

---

[180] Ibid., 97. Compare Amit's presentation in Amit, "Epoch and Genre, 141-142, where she omits this criterion. (However, in an e mail correspondence, Amit stated that she had not changed her mind about this criterion.)

[181] Ibid., 96-97. Cf. also Amit, "Epoch and Genre, 141-142.

[182] Amit, Hidden Polemics, 97.

repeated themes in Genesis 2-3, will be discussed in more detail, while other possible clues will receive a much briefer treatment.

Summary of the Methodology of This Thesis

The thesis argues that Genesis 2-3 is to be regarded as a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology. As such, the argument makes use of the work of a number of scholars who have examined the meaning and function of allusion, ideology, and polemic. Working definitions have been proposed for each of these three crucial terms. How to recognize allusion, ideology, and polemic (especially hidden polemic) has also been addressed. Various possible functions for allusion, ideology, and polemic have also been noted.

The many-sided nature of allusion, the often unconscious nature of ideology, and the very conscious, but careful, intent of hidden polemic have also been briefly addressed. The very nature of these matters makes certainty about conclusions very problematic. If allusions were quotes, if ideology were open and above board, and if hidden polemics were not hidden, there would be no problems with interpretation. However, since human nature is what it is, dealing with anything connected with human nature is likely to produce only inconclusive conclusions. Certainty is not a viable option.

However, the argument presented here, while not pretending to be authoritative or exhaustive, does rest on evidence as well as argument. The evidence is from the Old Testament, other ANE material, and above all from the Eden Narrative itself. It is now time to turn to this evidence and to these arguments.

CHAPTER 2: ROYALTY AND GENESIS 2-3: EARLIER SCHOLARSHIP

Introduction: The Purposes and Limits of this Survey

Genesis 2-3 has demonstrated a seemingly boundless capacity to generate a bewildering number and variety of interpretations and readings.[183] It is not the design here to discuss all of these readings and interpretations. In fact, while Stordalen expresses the need for a detailed survey,[184] some helpful surveys and bibliographies of scholarship concerning the Eden Narrative do exist.[185]

However, some observations will be made concerning some general rubrics under which various scholarly approaches may be subsumed. The approach here presented will be in situated within these approaches.

Literature on the Eden Narrative is massive.[186] However, this survey is primarily concerned with political interpretations of the Eden Narrative. Even within this limitation an exhaustive survey is not possible, since many thought-provoking political approaches to this story have been proposed. The fundamental goal of this survey is to demonstrate that, in the case of Genesis 2-3, Amit's fourth criterion for recognizing a hidden polemic is met. Other scholars have indeed argued for such a hidden polemic against certain royal

---

[183] Cf. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*, translated by John J. Scullion, 3 vols. (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984-6), 211. "The two trees in the middle of the garden have produced not only beautiful fruit but also a vast assortment of literature." This is not only true of the two trees, but of the narrative as a whole.

[184] Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 188. Cf. also his brief, but helpful survey, pages 187-213.

[185] Cf. Stordalen's own extensive bibliography in *Echoes of Eden*, 493-560; P. Joseph Titus, *The Second Story of Creation (Gen 2:4-3:24: A Prologue to the Concept of Enneateuch?* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011). 515-556. Cf. also Phyllis A. Bird, "Genesis 3 in der gegenwärtigen biblicschen Forschung," *JBT* 9(1994): 3-24. Bird acknowledges that her article addresses only one aspect—albeit an important one—of modern research on the meaning of Genesis 3.

[186] Cf., for example, the massive bibliography of Stordalen, *"Echoes of Eden*, 493-560. See also Bernard Gosse, "L' écriture de Gn 3, le serpent dualité de la femme et de l'homme," *BN* 98 (1999): 19.

elements in the Eden Narrative.[187] As will be noted, many scholars have not labeled elements of Genesis 2-3 as a "hidden polemic." However, while terminology varies, it will be demonstrated that the idea of such a hidden polemic is not uncommon in the scholarly literature, even when the particular phrase "hidden polemic" is absent.[188]

First, some general observations on certain basic issues will set forth. These basic issues will suggest several broad rubrics for classifying the welter of interpretations of the Eden Narrative. Second, selected contributions of scholars on political readings of the Eden Narrative will be sampled, situating these political readings in the broad categories that have been identified. At the end of this chapter, the argument presented here will be situated in terms of these basic interpretive choices.

Basic Interpretive Issues in Genesis 2-3: Four Rubrics for Interpretations

The following broad categories for interpretations of the Eden Narrative are here proposed. These are certainly not the only possible classifications. However, they do attempt to encompass several of the major interpretive issues that are involved. One should probably think of these, not in terms of either-or categories, but rather as falling on a continuum. For example, some scholars tend to think of the developments of Genesis 2-3 (and, in particular, chapter 3) as being very positive. Other scholars regard Genesis 3 as a

---

[187] Ibid., 97.

[188] Of course, the contrary view—i.e., that interpretations of the Eden Narrative may not be legitimately linked to the monarchy—are expressed by some. Cf. Rudolf Smend, *"The Unconquered Land" and Other Old Testament Essays*, edited by Edward Ball and Margaret Barker, translated by Margaret Kohl (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 111. Smend writes, "The time when Adam, or at least Abraham, could be presented – even if not without dispute – as a 'type' of monarchy is long since past." However, Smend's obituary for political approaches to Genesis (and indeed the entire Pentateuch) may be a bit premature.

somewhat positive development in human development, and so, along the continuum.

Here, then, are the four rubrics which are proposed.

1. Interpretation of Component Parts of the Story, vs. The Story as a Whole
2. A Univocal vs. a Polyphonic Approach to the Eden Narrative
3. Negative Interpretations of the Movement of the Entire Story, vs. Positive Interpretations, vs. a Mixture of Positive and Negative Aspects
4. Originist vs. Paradigmatic Interpretations

1. Interpretation of Component Parts of the Story, vs. the Story as a Whole

Hamilton's comment about the unity of the book of Genesis as a whole is also relevant to Genesis 2-3. During the first eighteen centuries, Genesis was read as a unit.[189] From the time of Astruc on, Genesis was read as a composite document by an increasing number of scholars.[190] By the early twentieth century, the tendency to read the Old Testament as a composite document was becoming a scholarly consensus. This consensus lasted until roughly the middle of the twentieth century.

Genesis 2-3 was part of this trend. While from the time of Astruc onward some scholars have argued for the same author for Genesis 2-3, beginning with Budde and continuing to the present, many scholars have strongly advocated splitting Genesis 2 from Genesis 3. Budde's argument that there are two major stories in this section dominated scholarly approaches for at

---

[189] Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 11-12.
[190] Ibid., 13.

least half of the twentieth century.[191] As recently as the English edition of his Genesis commentary, Westermann could confidently claim that, at the pre-literary stage, Genesis 2 and 3 were originally different stories that were brought together by J.[192] Composite readings (and their concomitant interpretations) are still common in biblical scholarship.[193]

However, since at least the last twenty-five years of the preceding century, the so-called "final form" of the Eden Narrative has tended to be emphasized by many scholars.[194] It is not that such scholars generally deny the composite nature of much of the Old Testament, or even of Genesis 2-3. However, many scholars think of the final form as being the primary textual interpretive datum.[195] Redactors are no longer thought of as simply collectors of ancient stories, but as having their own agenda and their own story.[196]

---

[191] Karl Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte (Gen 1-12, 5) untersucht* (Glessen: J. Ricker, 1883), 51. Because Budde argues for seeing Genesis 2-3 as originally two distinct stories, he eliminates the tree of life from one of the stories. Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 7-9, xi, argues against the tendency toward ". . . running the tree of life through the chipper of classic source criticism . . . ." Cf. also the references in Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 190.

[192] Westermann, *Genesis* 1-11, 189.

[193] Cf., for example, Markus Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte Redaktions und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Genesis 1,1 11*, BZAW 26 (Berlin: W de Gruyter, 1998), especially, page 81.

[194] Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 197-201. Cf. also Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 41. Concerning reading the Pentateuch in a "final form" manner, cf. Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 249-268. For the argument here proposed, cf. especially 256, where Nicholson raises the question as to the relation of the Pentateuch to the Former Prophets. Many of Nicholson's arguments about the relationship of diachronic and synchronic approaches to the Pentateuch would also be relevant to the larger Enneateuch.

[195] The term "primary textual datum" is used in order to acknowledge the fact that many scholars read give more weight to other data—for example, the data revealed by archaeology or sociological studies.

[196] Cf. the helpful discussion of the history, strengths, and weaknesses of redaction criticism in John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 45-60. Cf. also Yoram Hazony, *The Philosophy of Hebrew Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), fn. on pages 37-38. Hazony notes the inadequacies of both the term "editor" and the term "redactor" for those who were responsible for ". . . the final form of the History." Cf. also Hazony's acknowledgment of his loose use of the term "author" for those responsible for the final form of "The Writings" (page 41, and endnote 27 on page 285).

There is increasing attention to the Eden Narrative in its final form, rather than merely as a mine for extracting "original sources."[197] Until the more or less "final form" of Genesis 2-3 was examined for its own interpretive possibilities, the focus was upon recovering and interpreting the simpler stories and sources (whether written or oral or some combination of the two) that were regarded as being the substrata of Genesis 2-3. However, the Eden Narrative is being increasingly examined as part of larger literary units, whether the Primeval History, the Hexateuch, the Pentateuch, or the Primary History.[198]

There is no need to deny the possibility—indeed, the likelihood— of diverse materials in, as well as various editions of, the Eden Narrative. Tigay has demonstrated convincingly a similar evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*.[199] The problem with using Tigay's model for the Old Testament is that scholars do not (in contrast to Tigay) have the shorter stories that may have provided some of the building blocks for the larger story of Genesis 2-3. Thus, all attempts to reconstruct such smaller units must remain, at best, plausible

---

[197] For a recent and well done example a fairly standard source approach, cf. John Day, *From Creation to Babel*. Day treats in a very helpful manner individual units, but has no general discussion of the Primeval History as such.
Cf. also the "final form" approach of Greenstein in Shaye J. D. Cohen and Edward L. Greenstein, *The State of Jewish Studies* (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1990), 23-46 (especially, page 23), and the spirited, though balanced, response by Levenson, 47-54.
[198] Martin Emmrich, "The Temptation Narrative of Genesis 3:1-6: A Prelude to the Pentateuch and the History of Israel," *EQ* 73 (2001): 3-20. Cf. especially page 3, fn. 7. Emmrich thinks that "[u]ltimately . . . Genesis 1-3 provide an introduction to the entire deuteronomistic history." Cf. also Cynthia Edenburg, "From Eden to Babylon: Reading Genesis 2-4 as a Paradigmatic Narrative," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, SBLAIL 8 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 155-167.
[199] Tigay, *Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*.

speculations. Berlin has appropriately warned of the tentative, and often circular, nature of literary reconstructions.[200]

Moreover, as scholars such as Alter have demonstrated, many elements in the text that were once thought to have indicated multiple sources can (and often should) be understood as integral to the biblical stories. "The biblical text may not be the whole cloth imagined by pre-modern Judeo-Christian tradition, but the confused textual patchwork that scholarship has often found to displace such earlier views may prove upon further scrutiny to be purposeful pattern."[201] Thus, regardless of ancient components or editions of the Eden Narrative, it is reasonable to focus on the text more or less as it now exists.

2. A Univocal vs. a Polyphonic Approach to the Eden Narrative

The attempt has frequently been made to reduce the Eden Narrative to a univocal meaning.[202] Two examples may serve to illustrate the univocal approach to Genesis 2-3, and will further demonstrate how difficult it is to maintain such an approach.

Milgrom, for example, thinks that ". . . there is a plain, unambiguous meaning to the story, which we can readily see by paying close attention to the

---

[200] A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 111-134.

[201] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 133. Much earlier, cf. Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part I: From Adam to Noah (Genesis 1-6:8)*, translated by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 88; *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch: Eight Lectures*, translated by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961) 20ff.

[202] Cf., for example, D. R. G. Beattie, "What is Genesis 2-3 About?" *ET* 92/1 (1980): 8. "I am asking what its author thought it was about, what he intended it to be about. . . . I plead only for a sense of perspective which will distinguish between constructions built upon the text and the plain, inalienable meaning of the text itself."Even such univocal approaches can result in vastly different interpretations.

text, unencumbered by the overlay of subsequent theological traditions. It is a story about sexual awareness and the creativity of which that is a part."[203]

However, maintaining a simple, univocal interpretation of the Eden Narrative is not itself simple. Milgrom seems to violate his own self-imposed limitation when he writes, at the end of his article, that Adam and Eve took of the forbidden fruit, ". . . and we are here today with the power to create God's kingdom on earth or to turn it into hell."[204] "God's kingdom" and "hell" do not naturally arise from the "plain unambiguous meaning" of the text. Thus, even avowedly simple readings fall prey to complicating observations.

Sarna also tries to reduce the Eden Narrative to a simple story. "It wishes to indicate very simply that evil is a human product, that God created the world good but that man, through the free exercise of his will in rebellion against God, corrupts the good and puts evil in its place."[205] Still, in the next paragraph, Sarna acknowledges that the story's message ". . . is complicated by its rich symbolism expressed in fragmentary form, and by its being an interweaving of many and varied mythic strands."[206] Thus, one wonders how Sarna can use the term "simply" in describing the story.

On the other hand, many scholars have recognized that the story of Genesis 2-3 seems to be inherently a multi-voiced and complex text.[207] Even

---

[203] Jacob Milgrom, "Sex and Wisdom: What the Garden of Eden Story Is Saying," *BR* 10/6 (1994): 21.
[204] Ibid., 52.
[205] Nahum M. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis: The Heritage of Biblical Israel* (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), 24.
[206] Ibid.
[207] Reuven Kimelman, "The Seduction of Eve and the Exegetical Politics of Gender," *BI* 4/1, (1996): 1. Cf. also the helpful summary of Bakhtin by L. Juliana Claassens, "Biblical Theology as Dialogue: Continuing the Conversation on Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Theology," *JBL*122/1 (2003): 127-144.

Carr, who also tries to take seriously the diachronic aspects of Genesis,[208] speaks of the whole book of Genesis in terms of ". . . its intense multivoiced character."[209]

There may be at least two reasons for such polyphony in the biblical text. First, composite authorship may be one of the main reasons. For those who hold this view, such authorship has often been regarded as resulting in "unevenness" or "awkwardness" in the text. Thus, Westermann writes,

> The subject matter of the narrative is of universal interest and extent, and so account must be taken of a great number of narrative additions and motifs belonging to the formative period which are now a prominent part of the literary product . . . . This is the reason why there are in Gen 2-3 repetitions, lack of agreement, lack of balance, gaps in the line of thought, contradictions. One could not expect anything else. The interpreter therefore has to come to grips with two factors: first there is the text as we have it extending 2:4b-3:24; then there is the many-sided process of the formation of this text.[210]

Despite the preceding paragraph, Westermann attempts to approach Genesis 2-3 as a unity, and comments a few sentences later,

> The whole event described in Gen 2-3 reveals a carefully constructed arch which begins with the command that God gives to his human creatures, and ascends to a climax with the transgression of the command. It then descends from the climax to the consequences of the transgression--- the discovery, the trial and the punishment. The conclusion, the expulsion from the garden where God has put the man and woman, calls to mind again the beginning. There is a well-rounded, clear and polished chain of events.[211]

Kimelman speaks of ". . . the multidimensionality of the Eden story . . ."[212] In an essay on the theology of Genesis, Kaminsky makes a comment concerning the Old Testament, that could also apply more narrowly to the

---

[208] Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, vii.

[209] Ibid., 3.

[210] Westermann, *Genesis* 1-11, 190.

[211] Ibid. Perhaps the best and most fluid term one might use to describe biblical authorship is "composite artistry." Cf. Alter *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 131-154, especially, page 133.

[212] Kimelman, "Seduction of Eve," 1.

Eden Narrative itself, both in its context, and perhaps even within the confines of the story itself.

> One of the most interesting features of the theology of the Hebrew Bible is the willingness of the final redactors to incorporate diverse and even seemingly contradictory theological ideas within a single text, often in close proximity to each other. The theology of the Bible is in many ways a raucous argument spanning centuries, which in turn has inspired later readers, perhaps more so in Jewish tradition than in Christianity, to continue to argue with the text and each other.[213]

Biblical texts may be polyphonic because there were a variety of positions and attitudes in ancient Israel that sought expression. Thus, at times, different—or even, contradictory—ideas seem to jostle one another within the same passage of the Old Testament. The idea that ancient Israelite religion and/or literature were monolithic may well be a mirage produced by of our distance in time.

Whatever the reason for the apparent polyphony, the composite nature of biblical stories and other genres may be the sign of an ongoing dialogue, or perhaps, even an ongoing conflict, between various ideas.[214] No doubt, elites—in particular, royal elites—found it in their best interests to keep tight control of literary production and of the literary corpus.[215] However, protest

---

[213] Joel S. Kaminsky, "The Theology of Genesis," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup 152, edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 635-656. In a broader sense, Schmid thinks of the entire book of Genesis as largely a dissenting voice within the Pentateuch, compared with Exodus-Deuteronomy. Cf. Konrad Schmid, "Genesis in the Pentateuch," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup 152, edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 27-50, especially, pp. 47-48.

[214] For a helpful approach to the various ways in which Israelite literature responded to the exile, cf. Bradley C. Gregory, "The Postexilic Exile in Third Isaiah: Isaiah 61:1-3 in Light of Second Temple Hermeneutics" *JBL* 126/3 (2007): 475-496. Cf. especially page 489. Gregory writes, "In the Hebrew literature composed in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem and the resulting exile to Babylon, the exile was understood in various ways." While Gregory is not writing with reference to Genesis 2-3, his comments and supporting arguments lend weight to the idea that post-exilic literature contains radically different ideas of what restoration from exile might look like. Gregory notes in particular differing concepts of the restoration (or otherwise) of the Davidic monarchy.

[215] This seems to be the assumption behind Kennedy's approach to Genesis 2-3. Cf. James M. Kennedy, "Peasants in Revolt: Political Allegory in Genesis 2-3," *JSOT* 47 (1990): 3-14.

literature tends eventually to penetrate the literary corpora of any people.[216] This would be especially true if two conditions are met.

First, it should be good literature. Probably very few biblical scholars would dispute that Genesis 2-3 meets this criterion. Sawyer undoubtedly speaks for many others when he describes Genesis 1-3 as ". . . one of the world's best-known literary masterpieces . . . ."[217]

Second, such protest literature would be more likely to be included in a people's literary deposits if the times are unsettled or transitional.[218] Thus, the control of elites over literary production, preservation, and dissemination would be much weaker than during periods of strength and stability. If, as proposed here, Genesis 2-3 reached something like its present form during the exilic or post-exilic time, this might explain its inclusion in the book of Genesis, and as part of Israel's literary deposit, despite its quietly subversive character. Geller's statement may be something of an exaggeration when he states that biblical literature is "essentially polemical."[219] However, when protest literature occurs in sections of the Old Testament along with blatantly pro-royal ideology, the likelihood of polemic must be borne in mind, at least when considering the larger contexts.[220]

---

[216] Cf., for example, Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 14, 19, 164-165.

[217] John F.A. Sawyer, "The Image of God, the Wisdom of Serpents and the Knowledge of Good and Evil," in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, ed. Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 64.

[218] Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 35; Amit, "Epoch and Genre," 135-151.

[219] Stephen A. Geller, *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible* (London: Routledge, 1996), 4.

[220] Cf. J. J. M. Roberts, "In Defense of the Monarchy: The Contribution of Israelite Kingship to Biblical Theology," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 377-396.Roberts (page 380) notes that the Old Testament's inclusion of both pro- and anti-monarchic positions, relativizes both. "If the critique of kingship preserved in the biblical record relativizes kingship and destroys any claim which that form of human government may make to being *the* divinely authorized form of government, the positive appreciation for

However, even if literature cannot be confidently dated to a transitional time—indeed, if such literature cannot be dated with confidence at all—hidden polemic concerning important and controversial topics is always a possibility that should be seriously considered. After all, it is likely that much literature arises out of dissatisfaction with institutions, practices, and ideas, as well as with dissatisfaction with the literature that seeks to justify these institutions, practices, and ideas. Thus, it may be that much literature is at least mildly polemical. The task is to understand the target and nature of such polemic. This is especially difficult with hidden polemic, by the very nature of its hiddenness.

In view of the text as it now exists, a polyphonic approach appears to be more fruitful than one that seeks for a "simple" meaning of the text. Even if the text is composite, the component parts of the story have been placed together is such a way that the voices are speaking at the same time, or at least in rapid succession. The voices may sometimes be modifying, and sometimes seeking to drown out the other voices. The redactors, by placing the various stories (or components within stories) in proximity, have made it virtually impossible to ignore that a conversation is occurring. Sometimes, the voices within the story or among the stories are in such profound disagreement that their juxtaposition can only be called a polemic. When one voice represents a

---

kingship relativizes the claims of any competing form of human government." Roberts (page 382) goes on to say that, "Dtr found this antimonarchical polemic in his sources, preserved it, but by interspersing it within and thereby juxtaposing it to other traditions he softened it, thereby bringing it more into line with his own qualified acceptance of kingship."

position that is not supported by those who are in power, it will likely be muted. In other words, such a polemic will likely be a hidden one.[221]

3. Negative Interpretations of the Movement of the Entire Story, vs. Positive Interpretations, vs. a Mixture of Positive and Negative Aspects

Another great divide in interpreting Genesis 2-3 may be described as the "negative, positive, or mixed-bag" approaches. Is Genesis 2-3 a story that is essentially a story of sin and punishment, or a necessary development for the human race and/or the individual, or is it describing a mixture of positive and negative aspects?

Jewish interpretive tradition has usually regarded the developments in Genesis 3 as fundamentally negative, although Jewish interpreters have rarely regarded the disobedience of Adam and Eve as being determinative for the whole human race.[222] Traditionally in pre-critical Christian interpretation, the story has been read as a story of human failure. Often this has been labeled "sin" or "the fall," and has been taken as determinative for the entire human race, and thus, as very negative indeed.

The general tendency in modern critical scholarship is to discount the sin or fall approach to Genesis 2-3. Indeed, the terms "sin" and "fall" are often encased in quotation marks, in order to show that authors are using conventional terms with which they do not agree.[223] Baker, for example, has

---

[221] It may well be that at least some of the widely—if not wildly—differing modern interpretations of the Eden Narrative are to be attributed to different scholars attending to different voices in the text's conversation.

[222] Cf., for example, W. Guenther Plaut, editor, *The Torah: A Modern Commentary* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981), 38.

[223] John Baker, "The Myth of Man's 'Fall'—A Reappraisal," *ET* 92 (1980/81): 235-237, is typical of many others. See also Lyn M. Bechtel, "Genesis 2.4b-3.24: A Myth about Human Maturation." *JSOT* 67 (1995): 4; Susan Niditch, *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation*, SPSH 6 (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985), 30; Westermann, *Genesis1-11*, 190.

the word "Fall" in the title of his article, but encloses the word in quotes.[224] Beattie, in a similar vein, writes concerning the word "sin," "I begin simply with a suspicion, which arises from the observation that no word for sin appears anywhere in the story. . . . Is it not odd that a writer should fail to mention the subject about which he was writing?"[225] Barr similarly notes the absence of words for "sin" or "disobedience" in Genesis 2-3.[226]

However, the origin-of-sin approach still has its champions.[227] Gordon notes that in biblical narrative, the seriousness of human actions is not always explicitly indicated.

> At any rate, Barr's citing of youthful curiosity rather than hubris certainly understates the significance of Eve's action. The key point about the eating of the forbidden fruit is that it is an act of disobedience, and there is no problem in recognizing that manifestations of the human condition worsened after Eden: this, after all, gives rise to the "spread of sin" theme that others have detected in early Genesis (von Rad 1962, 154-60). Indeed, it is a recurrent feature of Old Testament descriptions of wrongdoing that it is not necessarily the luridness of the fault or sin that determines its gravity.[228]

Concerning the absence of any of the specific words for sin in Genesis 2-3, Gordon points out that, in fact, many stories in the Old Testament lack terminology for what they mean to say. Thus, for example, 2 Samuel 7 lacks the word for covenant (ברית).[229] Gordon thinks that the biblical narratives

---

[224] Baker, "The Myth of Man's 'Fall'," 235.

[225] Beattie, "What is Genesis 2-3 About?" 8.

[226] James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 4. Cf. Beattie, "What is Genesis 2-3 About?" 6. Cf. also Bernard F. Batto, "Paradise Reexamined," in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective*, SIC 4, ANE Texts and Studies 11, edited by K. Lawson Younger, Jr., William W. Hallo, and Bernard F. Batto (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen, 1991), 33-66.

[227] Cf. Robert P. Gordon, "The Ethics of Eden: Truth-Telling in Genesis 2-3," in *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue*, edited by Katharine J. Dell (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 14-15; Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 163, 165, 208, 211-212. For an older, brief expression of the same approach, cf. Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (Chicago: Illinois, 1967), 73. However, Kidner acknowledges that the doctrine of sin is only "latent" in Genesis 3.

[228] Ibid., 14-15.

[229] Ibid., 15.

often ". . . do not use the lexicon of sin because events are left to speak for themselves. Conversely, Gen 6:5-8 speaks of the wickedness of the antediluvians and of their evil imaginings, but that is because the passage does not tell us what precisely they did or thought, and hence the generalizing statement about wickedness and evil."[230]

Gordon's reading of the matter seems persuasive, and represents the view adopted in this thesis. After all, a very clear command is given (Genesis 2:16-17). The command is disobeyed (Genesis 3:6). An inquiry concerning the wrong-doing takes place (Genesis 3:8-13). Punishment is meted out (Genesis 3:14-19, 22-24). As Dennis Bratcher writes concerning the idea of sin in Genesis 2-3, "The word is never used anywhere in our story, perhaps because the message is so clear."[231]

Another fairly common approach to the Eden Narrative is to think of it as recording a development that is a mixture of the negative and positive.[232] Thus, for example, Wellhausen speaks of both emancipation and alienation in connection with the knowledge of good and evil.[233] He writes that, "[a]s the human race goes forward in civilisation, it goes backward in the fear of God."[234] Sawyer thinks of the Eden Narrative as chronicling the continuing development of the image of God (Genesis 1:26-28). However, Genesis 2-3 also conveys that "[s]uch powerful wisdom does not, however, lead inevitably

---

[230] Ibid., 15.

[231] Dennis Bratcher, "The 'Fall'—A Second Look: A Literary Analysis of Genesis 2:4-3:24," in *Biblical Resources for Holiness Preaching: From Text to Sermon*, vol. 2, edited by H. Ray Dunning, (Kansas City, MO.: Beacon Hill Press, 1993), 324.

[232] Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 186-190, and his bibliographies at the beginning of each sub-section or excursus.

[233] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel with a Reprint of the Article Israel from the Encyclopedia Britannica*, MG 35, translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies (Cleveland: Meridian, 1957), 302-303.

[234] Ibid., 302.

to life and success, as the serpent implies (Gen. 3.5), and the glib purveyors of wisdom claim (e.g. Job 5.17-27; Prov. 3.13-18). It can also lead to suffering and death."[235] Nevertheless, Sawyer acknowledges that, in his view, the story seems more positive than negative when it portrays human nature as it presently exists.[236]

However, against the idea that Genesis 3 records a positive and negative event, it will be argued in the chapters on the crucial themes of knowledge and life in Genesis 2-3 that the man and woman are portrayed as knowledgeable before they partook of the forbidden fruit. Furthermore, they are endowed with life and placed in an environment bursting with fertility. Thus, the argument of this thesis is that the Eden Narrative tells of an essentially negative development.

4. Originist vs. Paradigmatic Interpretations

Many scholars regard Genesis 2-3 as a tale of origins.[237] Of course, they may disagree as to precisely what origins are the subjects of the Eden Narrative. As already noted, some pre-critical writers, as well as some critical scholars, have read Genesis 2-3 as a story about the origin of sin.[238] Others hold that the story is an explanation as to why life is difficult.[239] For example, Andreasen holds that the story explains ". . . why existing conditions are what they clearly ought not to be."[240]

---

[235] Sawyer, "The Image of God," 70.

[236] Ibid., 72-73.

[237] Cf., for example, Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch*, 54; Jack M. Sasson, "'The Mother of All . . .' Etiologies," in *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long,* Brown Judaic Studies 325, edited by Saul M. Olyan and Robert C. Culley, 205-220), 205-220.

[238] Cf. 4 Ezra 3:21; 7:118; Robert Saler, "The Transformation of Reason in Genesis 2-3: Two Options for Theological Interpretation," *CTM* 36/4 (2009): 275-286.

[239] Westermann, *Genesis1-11,* 276-277.

[240] N. E. Andreasen, "Adam and Adapa: Two Anthropological Characters," *AUSS* 19/3 (1981): 191.

Other scholars have taken the story to be paradigmatic. For example, Cooper writes,

> "The story of defection in Gen 3 is obviously intended to be paradigmatic: acting autonomously—that is, relying on reason and sense rather than on God's word—defies the order that is inherent in creation, causing the world to revert, in some manner, to its primordial chaos. This paradigm is exemplified in many biblical narratives, undergirds the biblical system of law, and is well attested in prophetic and poetic texts as well."[241]

Several scholars have interpreted the paradigm psychologically.[242] Parker holds that Genesis 2-3 is not a story of sin and fall, but a maturation myth. The process is painful, but necessary.[243]

It may in fact be unnecessary to choose between originist and paradigmatic approaches to the Eden Narrative. Perhaps this modern distinction between the origin of reality and paradigmatic realities would not have been recognized by the peoples of the ANE. Enns points out that, in the

---

[241] Alan Cooper, "The Lord Grants Wisdom": The World View of Proverbs 1-9," in *Bringing the Hidden to Light: the Process of Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Stephen A. Geller*, edited by Kathryn F. Kravitz and Diane M. Sharon (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 29-43. (The quote is from page 30.)

[242] Cf., for example, Kim Ian Parker, "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Must We Leave Eden, Once and for All?: A Lacanian Pleasure Trip through the Garden," *JSOT* 83 (1999): 19-29. Parker holds that Genesis 2-3 is not a story of sin and fall, but a maturation myth. The process is painful, but necessary (29). "It seems that Adam and Eve act out in a very unconscious manner the way in which a child goes through the Oedipal stage and enters into society." Walton takes a similar approach. Cf. Walton, *Genesis*, 213-216.
Cf. also A. York, "The Maturation Theme in the Adam and Eve Story," in *Go to the Land I will Show You: Studies in Honor Dwight M. Young*, edited by J. Coleson and V. Matthews (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 393-410. York makes a strong argument for Genesis 2-3 as a story which tells how humankind is like that gods in knowledge, but not in immortality. However, he regards the tree of life as being incidental to the story. This somewhat weakens his case. If the motif of the tree of life (which symbolizes immortality) is peripheral, then how can the theme of immortality be central to the story?
Furthermore, York does not deal with the command of the deity in Genesis 2:17. Is it really likely that the Yahwist—or indeed any ANE author—would have thought of wisdom as being attained by disobeying a direct command of a god?
While York quite rightly is skeptical about "theological" or "philosophical" interpretations, he ought perhaps to have been more cautious concerning psychological readings as well.

[243] Kim Ian Parker, "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall," 83 (1999): 19-29. It should be pointed out that Parker thus falls into the (mostly) positive camp, which was discussed above. This well illustrates how the various categories identified in this thesis are not airtight compartments.

ancient world, earthly realities are rooted in ". . . formative primordial divine actions . . . ."[244]

While I find many of Enns' observations useful, he does not link Adam with kingship explicitly. Rather, Enns finds in Adam a portrait of the basic outline of Israel's history and of Israel's fundamental struggles to obey God's commands. However, surely kingship is itself an important part of Israel's history. Furthermore, the tendency of kings to disobey God—even as those kings claim to be wise—is also part of Israel's history as conceived by some of the Old Testament literature. One need only to think of the summaries in the Deuteronomistic History,[245] or the repeated prophetic pronouncements about the connection between the sins of kings and God's punishment of Israel to see that royal attitudes and behaviors are closely linked with the exile in some of Israel's literature.[246]

Similarly to the position of Enns, Blenkinsopp notes that, "[t]he impulse to trace the course of history backward to human origins arose not only from a natural curiosity about the remote past, but also from a need to validate the present social and political order. The basic idea was that normative value is to be found only in the past, and the more remote the better."[247]

While Blenkinsopp's observation is correct concerning the connection between stories of origins and present reality, it is questionable whether all myths arise ". . . from a need to validate the present social and political order." Why could myths not, just as easily, be used to challenge the status quo?

---

[244] Peter Enns, The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn't Say about Human Origins (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2012), 61.
[245] 1 Kings 11; 2 Kings 17:7-23.
[246] Cf. Jeremiah 15:4; Hosea 13:10-11. Cf. Günther Wittenberg, "The Image of God: Demythologization and Democratization in the Old Testament," *JTSA* 13 (1975): 16.
[247] Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch*, 54.

Indeed, as already indicated, some scholars seem to treat the Eden Narrative as both a story of origins, and also as a paradigm of ongoing human realities.[248] Concerning the narratives in the Primeval History, Gertz writes that, ". . . these narratives constitute a statement of basic belief, fairly widespread in ancient cultures, emphasizing that everything (present and future) received its essence at the beginning."[249] Similarly, Alonso-Schökel thinks of Genesis 2-3 as etiology in service of explaining (then) present realities.[250] Therefore, this division between originist and paradigmatic interpretations of the Eden Narrative may be somewhat helpful for heuristic purposes, so long as one remembers that it may be a modern category that ancient readers/hearers might have found simply puzzling. Such heuristic divisions may become more misleading than helpful, when they are taken too seriously, or when they become rigid, air-tight compartments for attempting to understand narratives.

There are many reasons for the diverse approaches and interpretations that have been discussed above. Differing understandings of this supposedly composite account lead scholars to exceedingly varied positions.[251] In particular, those who think in terms of composite authorship often tend to be satisfied with deciding what the "original" elements of the composition meant,

---

[248] Andreasen, "Adam and Adapa," 179-194. Andreasen thinks of Adam and Adapa as being two very different characterizations of humankind, but characterizations, nevertheless. While Adreasen does not use the word "paradigm" or "paradigmatic," his reading of *Adapa* and the Eden Narrative would seem to fall under that rubric.

[249] Jan Christian Gertz, "The Formation of the Primeval History," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup 152, edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 107.

[250] L. Alonso-Schökel, "Sapiential and Covenant Themes in Genesis 2-3," in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, edited by J. Crenshaw, 468-480 (New York: Ktav, 1976), 468.

[251] Cf. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 188, fn. 2.
For a general discussion of the composite nature and authorship of the so-called "J" document, cf. Cuthbert Simpson, *The Book of Genesis*, IB 1: 439-448.

without seeming to be very concerned with the document in its final form.[252] However, even those who take the final form as being the primary—or exclusive—text to interpret often find little common ground in their conclusions.[253]

Of course, these diverse understandings may be attributed to varying degrees of "literary competence," or different understandings of what such literary competence entails.[254] In particular, a difference regarding genre may lead to very different understandings of the meaning of any text.[255] There is

---

[252] Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 48-53, 456-463, 64-70. Budde argued that the original contribution in the story was the tree of knowledge. An unimaginative redactor later added the tree of life, which was a mythological motif in the ANE. Because Budde argues for seeing Genesis 2-3 as originally two distinct stories, he eliminates the tree of life from one of the stories. More recently, see Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*. While Westermann states that it is not the purpose of the study of tradition history to simply break the text into smaller bits (588-589), he scarcely comments on the tree of life (212-213).
Opposed to this approach, cf. Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 7-9. Mettinger, xi, argues against the tendency toward ". . . running the tree of life through the chipper of classic source criticism . . . ." Cf. also the references in Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 190.

[253] Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 250-251. Westermann refers to Th. C. Vriezen with approval: "The great variety of possible opinions rests above all on the enigmatic nature of the text which is deliberately only suggestive." Westermann himself thinks that something has been lost by the transgression of the man and woman, but that the knowledge of the man and woman is "positive", and shows that they have ". . . progressed by eating the fruit."

[254] Cf. John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 11-12; David G. Firth. "Ambiguity," in *Words and the Word*, edited by David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 154.

[255] For some helpful sources which discuss the meaning, importance, and limitations of genre analysis, cf. E. D. Hirsch, Jr. *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 68-126; John Frow, *Genre*, NCI (London: Routledge, 2006); Frans de Bruyn, "Genre Criticism," *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory : Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, edited by Irena R. Makaryk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 79-85; A. R. George, "The Epic of Gilgameš: Thoughts on Genre and Meaning," in *Gilgameš and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Mandelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21-23 July 2004*, edited by Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 37-65; Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982); David Duff, editor, *Modern Genre Theory*, LCR (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000); Tremper Longman III, "Literature, Interpretation, and Theology," *NIDOTTE* 1: 103-124; Richard L. Schultz, "Form Criticism and the OT," *DTIB*: 233-237; G. J. Brooke, "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Pesher," *DSS* 17 (2010): 361-386.
For discussions of the genre of Genesis 2, cf. Richard F. Carson and Tremper Longman III, *Science, Creation and the Bible: Reconciling Rival Theories of Origins* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2010), 56-69. However, the authors deal with Genesis 2, largely in isolation from Genesis 3. Since the Eden Narrative is treated here as being essentially a unity, this approach must be found wanting. In order to understand the genre of a text, it is vital to correctly identify the general boundaries of the text.

much truth in Hirsch's comment that, "[i]n fact, every disagreement about an interpretation is usually a disagreement about genre . . . ."[256]

However, there is still another possible reason for such diversity, and one that is adopted here. It may be that varied and evenly contradictory clues were left intentionally in the Eden Narrative. This would have served to disguise the polemical nature of the narrative from those in power who would likely have caused trouble for the author, readers, and hearers. For the reader who was the hoped-for comprehending one, such clues served to confuse the reader enough to make the reader wonder what is really going on in the text. At this point, the reader may begin to notice some clues that point in the direction of a hidden, but major, theme—a polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology.

The present thesis proceeds on the assumption that the Eden Narrative is at once a story about human origins, and a story that is paradigmatic. Evidence that it is operating on more than one level and with more than one agenda will be presented in the chapter on Genesis 2-3.

Political Interpretations of Genesis 2-3

There are not a few scholars who have taken the various basic approaches just discussed, who have also introduced proposals for a political connection of some kind in Genesis 2-3. Thus, the contention that Genesis 2-3 relates to ancient royal ideology is not entirely new. For example, Stordalen notes that ". . . an astonishingly large number of studies propose that Genesis 2-3 is

---

While this thesis confines itself primarily to Genesis 2-3, it would be helpful to investigate the larger context of Genesis 1-3, 1-4, the Primeval Narrative, and the entire book of Genesis, in order to examine the presence of royal concerns in these chapters. For example, would it be possible for ancient Israelites to hear the name of "Babylon" (בָּבֶל) in Genesis 11:9, without thinking of an oppressive royal approach? This would likely have been the case at any time from the time of King Hammurabi until the end of the Old Testament period.

[256] Hirsch, Jr. Validity in Interpretation, 98.

commenting upon political events or situations contemporary with 'J'."[257] Stordalen distinguishes between studies that suggest a critique of royal ideology in general,[258] and those that deal with particular political affairs.[259] This distinction, although useful, may be overdrawn. After all, a criticism of royal ideology in general might easily be applied to particular political situations or actors. By the same token, criticism of any particular king might well undermine royal ideology in general.

This political approach to the Eden Narrative, despite appearing to gain momentum, still seems to be a minority position.[260] This is surprising since, as Mein points out, "Kings are a source of perpetual moral interest in the Hebrew Bible. Their virtues and vices take up great swathes of the narrative

---

[257] Stordalen, *"Echoes of Eden*, 314. Some more recent studies include Mira Morgenstern, *Conceiving a Nation: The Development of Political Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009); Mark G. Brett, *Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity*, OTR (London: Routledge, 2005); Ron Moe-Lobeda, *The Mystery of Eve & Adam: A Prophetic Critique of the Monarch* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2012); One of the earlier hints of a Jewish political interpretation of the Eden Narrative is in *Genesis Rabbah* 21:8, which connects the expulsion of Adam from the garden with the destruction of the temple and thus with exile. Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "The Concept of Exile in Josephus," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, edited by James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 149-150. Feldman contrasts *Genesis Rabbah* with Josephus, who merely says that God had "removed the man and woman to another place." For a discussion of critical scholars who have seen some aspect of royal ideology in Genesis 2-3, cf. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 312-316. Cf., for example, Anne Gardner, "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel," *SJT* 43 (1990): 1-18; Enns, *Evolution of Adam*, 65-70; Edenburg, "From Eden to Babylon," 155-167.
On the other hand, see Norman K. Gottwald, *The Politics of Ancient Israel*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001). Although Gottwald is tremendously interested in reading the Bible politically, he does not even have an index entry for Genesis 1-11 in the index of biblical passages and ancient sources. It is as though political thought does not begin until the call of Abram.

[258] Ibid., 188, fn. 5.

[259] Ibid., fn. 6.

[260] For example, Rüdiger Jungbluth, *Im Himmel und auf Erden: Dimensionen von Königsherrschaft im Alten Testament*, BWANT, 10th series, volume 16 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011). In his monograph, Jungbluth does not refer to Genesis 2-3 at all.

books. They are frequently on the receiving end of prophetic invective and (less frequently) the subject of hopeful prediction."[261]

There may be several reasons for this under-recognition of a political element in the Eden Narrative. First, as Rosenberg has pointed out, there is an historic tendency to read the Old Testament theologically, rather than politically.[262] Second, the emphasis upon individualism, especially associated with the Enlightenment, may well have predisposed scholars to read Genesis 2-3 in a non-political, individualistic manner. Third, some scholars have regarded Genesis 2-3 as a myth, and hence, as incapable of conveying a serious political message, or of only being useful for preserving the status quo.[263] Fourth, some scholars have argued that the elite of Israel and Judah would have only written or preserved pro-royal literature. Fifth, from the standpoint of modern scholars, the non-existent or weakened monarchies of our own time do not naturally predispose us to see any connection between ancient literature and royal ideology.

Furthermore, since Genesis 2-3 is part of the Primeval Narrative, and thus set before the stories of the Patriarchs and the exodus, the Eden Narrative is often regarded as being about a period prior to Israelite kingship, even in its earliest possible formulation. Thus, in the only form in which Genesis 2-3 now exists, the presence of a hidden political agenda is often thought to be excluded.

---

[261] Andrew Mein, "Psalm 101 and the Ethics of Kingship," in *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue*, edited by Katharine J. Dell (New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 56.

[262] Cf., for example, Joel Rosenberg, *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1986), x.

[263] For precisely this position, cf. Kennedy, "Peasants in Revolt," 3-14.
For the view that myth may either support, question, or modify royal ideology, cf. H. A. J. Kruger, "Myth, ideology, and wisdom: A brief survey," *OTE* 14/1 (2001): 47-75 (especially, page 52).

However, the Eden Narrative is now attached to larger literary blocks, and appears to provide an introduction to them. Also, Genesis 1:26-30, the immediate context for the final form of Genesis 2-3, uses royal language to describe the man and woman whom God has created. Furthermore, the genealogy of Chapter 10—and thus the final form of the Primeval History—mentions "the beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom as being Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar, as well as, Nineveh, Rehoboth-Ir, Calah, and Resen Assyria.[264] It is also likely that the name "Babel" in Genesis 11 would have possessed a political resonance with the readers/hearers of the Primeval History. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that nowhere is there a clear reference to Israelite or Judean kings in either the Eden Narrative or in the Primeval History.

Even when a connection between the Eden Narrative and kingship has been posited, the theme has often been thought of as a minor or more remote strand in the story.[265] Van Seters argues that, in Genesis 2-3, J used themes from Ezekiel 28:12-19 and Ezekiel 28:2-10, but not in a royal manner.

> However, the royal figure of Ezekiel has lost all aspects of royalty in Genesis and become a human pair. They do not have royal vestments but are naked and only clothed by the deity when expelled from the garden. They do not have wisdom until after they disobey the divine command and eat the fruit, and this is not presented as an act of *hubris* so much as the result of youthful curiosity.[266]

On the other hand, Van Seters thinks that the naming of the animals and the association of the man and woman with the garden of pleasure may be

---

[264] Genesis 10:10-12.

[265] Cf., for example, the careful manner in which Brueggemann writes: "This text may be a reflection on the role of *wisdom*, perhaps in an aggressive *royal* context." Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis*, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 51. See also his cautious comments concerning the possibility of a royal critique on page 40.

[266] John Van Seters, "The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King," *ZAW* 101 (1989): 333-342.

remnants of the royal theme.[267] This stripping the story of royal trappings may not, however, suggest a lack of royal interest, as Van Seters thinks. Indeed, this would be strange in light of van Seter's own argument. Why would the author of Genesis 2-3 use so many royal motifs, without intending any connection with royalty?

Mendenhall was by no means the first scholar to argue for a political understanding of Genesis 3. However, his position is worth serious discussion in connection with the investigation here presented for several reasons. First, he makes a strong argument for a political reading of Genesis 3. Second, his contribution concerning the dating, genre, and meaning of Genesis 2-3 has been widely influential, being cited by other secondary literature.[268] Third, although his arguments and observations are strong, the approach adopted here may further strengthen and clarify some of his observations.

Mendenhall's approach to Genesis 3 is set forth as follows:

> The thesis to be presented here is nearly as simple as the story itself---namely, that the apparently naive and childlike story is actually a work of utmost artistry and sophistication that stems from the "wisdom" tradition of ancient Israel. It is a *mashal*: an "analogy" or, better yet, a "parable" that was told to convey a point, one that could hardly be communicated in any other way with such pathos and sympathy.[269]

Mendenhall states that, "Similarities or classifications pointed out and taught by the elite have social status, and it is an affront to respectable society to point out analogies that are in conflict with the accepted social system. It is

---

[267] Ibid., 340.

[268] Cf., for example, Beverly J. Stratton, *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3*, JSOTSup 208 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 226.

[269] Ibid., 320.

only when a social system is destroyed that a new value system can make its claim to validity, and this is the historical context of Genesis 3."[270]

Certainly, such a time of societal unrest would be fertile ground for such an anti-elite value system to germinate. However, it is questionable whether the destruction of an elite system would be the only time in which such an anti-elite system would sprout or thrive. Ideologies that contest the dominant ideology are, no doubt, always present in any society. At times of complete (or nearly complete) political dissolution, such "minority reports" may become the dominant attitude of a given society. Thus, it is arguable that there is less need for a *mashal* (which Mendenhall argues is the genre of Genesis 3) in a time of radical dislocation than during a time of a pervasive pro-royal ideology. A more hidden approach, such as he proposes for Genesis 3, would be more likely whenever there is still some elite group that is dominating society. Thus, if indeed Genesis 3 is, as Mendenhall writes, ". . . actually a work of utmost artistry and sophistication that stems from the 'wisdom' tradition of ancient Israel," then it might be more appropriate to look for a time and provenance when royal ideology needed to be questioned in a more cautious manner. However, when would such a time and provenance exist? Speaking truth to power is always and everywhere a difficult and dangerous task.

Indeed, the examples Mendenhall gives had their settings during times when monarchy was either being initiated, as in Jotham's fable, or was being challenged in some way, as in 2 Samuel 14:1-24. Perhaps the best case of a

---

[270] George E. Mendenhall, "The Shady Side of Wisdom," in *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (ed. Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Cary A. Moore (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974), 327.

parable that challenged the king's prerogative to do whatever he wished is found in 2 Samuel 12:1-15.[271] Regardless of whether these stories reflect courtly reality, they likely would have possessed a flavor of verisimilitude for an ancient author and his audience. Thus, Mendenhall's own examples might suggest that the genre of parable—at least when the genre challenges, rather than supports royal ideology—might be more likely found during a time when royal ideology was strong, rather than at a time when such ideology was weak.

In fact, Mendenhall himself appears to acknowledge this, although he does so in the form of a question. After pointing out the existence of an educated elite of the wise ". . . upon whom rested the whole structure and function of the political state," Mendenhall asks if it is not the case that, ". . . educated elitism is an international phenomenon, and has similar effects in radically different societies?"[272] If his question must be answered in the affirmative, as Mendenhall implies, then criticisms of such elites and the political ideologies might arise at any time. Such criticisms would nearly always be unwelcome to the current rulers, since criticism of one king or dynasty might be interpreted as criticism of all kings and dynasties.[273] However, if the criticisms were disguised, it might well endure, and even be preserved, by the very elites and kings at whom the criticism was directed.

Therefore, the quest for a time in which a story such as the Eden Narrative might have received something approaching its final form needs to be broadened. Mendenhall assumes that Genesis 3 is critical of the

---

[271] Ibid., 326. Indeed, Mendenhall cites this passage in his article.

[272] Ibid., 322.

[273] This is noted by J. G. McConville, *God and Earthly Power: An Old Testament Political Theology: Genesis –Kings* (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 29. He writes, "In the nature of the case, what holds for Assyria may hold also for Babylon, Persia and so on. Indeed, the biblical literature itself exploits the possibilities for typology inherent in the language and imagery it employs . . . ."

Israelite/Judean monarchies and the elite who at once supported royal ideology and were supported by such ideology. However, it is more probable that the disguised nature of the Eden Narrative is an indicator that an uncritically pro-royal mindset was still prevalent at the time when the story was written. The precise target of the "minority ideology" that called into question royal pretensions may have been intentionally obfuscated. Such deliberate obfuscation would have served several purposes for those who told the story. First, it would have helped keep the story teller/writer and the listener/reader alive. Second, it would have helped the story to be preserved.[274] Third, such an indirect criticism in a story that might be read or heard in different ways would tend to draw the reader/hearer into the story in a way that more direct criticisms do not. The rhetoric of indirectness is a powerful tool of communication.

One aspect of the disguised nature of Genesis 3 (that Mendenhall notes, but does not fully explain) is the apparently archaic language of Genesis 3. "The contention here is that Gen 3 is a parade example of Exilic imitation of archaic language, entirely in harmony with its setting and purpose. The language is no more tenth century than is the prose of the prologue to the book of Job."[275] It should be noted here that, although Mendenhall speaks of such "archaic" language being consonant with the story's purpose, he does not explain how such language is in line with that purpose.

Perhaps such archaizing language is an intentional aspect of literary misdirection. By using ancient Hebrew words—as well as by telling a story of

---

[274] What happens to direct, prophetic critiques of royal ideology and behavior is well illustrated by King Jehoiakim's disposal of Jeremiah's scroll (Jeremiah 36:20-26). Direct criticisms of kings were likely not considered food for thought, but, rather, as fuel for the fire.
[275] Mendenhall, "Shady Side of Wisdom," 327.

man *qua* man and by setting the story in primeval times—the author is attempting to deflect the suspicion that he is doing precisely what he is doing: criticizing certain excesses of royal ideology. Thus, Mendenhall's arguments are strengthened by the argument here presented.

Where does Mendenhall's approach to the Eden Narrative fall in terms of the typology of basic approaches that is proposed here? First, in terms of interpretation of component parts of the story, vs. the story as a whole, Mendenhall is difficult to categorize. On the one hand, he does not deal with "sources" in a classical, nineteenth or twentieth century manner. On the other hand, Mendenhall deals only with Genesis 3, without so much as a reference to chapter 2. Is this because he believes that chapters 2 and 3 come from different sources or traditions? He does not say.

However, Mendenhall does refer to the story's reinterpretation of more ancient traditions.[276] The term "traditions" is probably preferable to "sources" in most cases. The idea of appropriating, adopting, or even transforming older traditions, recognizes the intergenerational and fluid aspects of stories. Certainly, elements of Genesis 2-3 should be recognized as, at the very least, analogous to various ANE traditions—in particular, some of the elements of *Gilgamesh*. Nevertheless, Mendenhall basically approaches the story of Genesis 3 as a whole, acknowledging the presence of older elements in the story, but without a detailed analysis of those putative older elements.

In terms of the univocal versus polyphonic nature of the story, Mendenhall's approach seems to straddle the two. As with many other advocates of an essentially univocal or "simple" meaning, Mendenhall also

---

[276] Ibid., 321.

recognizes that, behind this apparent simplicity, the story ". . . is actually a work of utmost artistry and sophistication . . . ."[277] His use of this word (as well as his modifying of the adjectives "naïve" and "childlike" with the adverb "apparently") reveals that Mendenhall does not, after all, take a simplistic approach to this seemingly simple story.[278] Indeed, he recognizes that Genesis 3, which he takes to be a *mashal*, tells ". . . a story, completely irrelevant to any existing contemporary vested interests . . . ," which nevertheless involves a principle that relates precisely to those contemporary vested interests.[279] Thus, for Mendenhall, the polyphonic nature of Genesis 3 is endemic to its genre and rhetorical purpose.

Concerning the division between those who approach the Eden Narrative as a positive, negative, or ambiguous (mixed) story, Mendenhall's approach falls clearly in the camp of those who take the story as a tale of a negative development. In fact, Mendenhall dismisses "[t]he attempt to read into the narrative a fall 'upward' . . ." as ". . . a simple illustration of the misuse of biblical narrative."[280] Commenting on Eve's desire for wisdom (i.e., the knowledge of good and evil), Mendenhall writes,

> This is a very subtle jibe---a comment upon King Solomon's wisdom that also effectively neutralized the old Israelite covenant theology and ethic in favor of becoming 'modern.' The result: schism, and destruction at the hands of Shishak. For wisdom as a means of achieving goals has rarely been able to evaluate the goal itself.[281]
>
> The old wisdom had proclaimed: "An expectation deferred is a sickness of heart; but a 'tree of life' is an object of desire realized." One is immediately reminded of the case of poor Amnon, wasting away in his incestuous desire for his half sister, until his "wise" ways and means committee found a way for realization---which also turned out to be a "tree

---

[277] Ibid., 320.
[278] Ibid.
[279] Ibid., 325-326.
[280] Ibid.
[281] Ibid.

> of life" for no one (2 Sam 13). The expulsion from Paradise made the "tree of life" inaccessible, and the divine curses constantly reminded Adam's children that the experience of evil is not necessarily being "like God, knowing good and evil."[282]

In terms of the fourth category of basic approaches to Genesis 2-3—originist versus paradigmatic—Mendenhall is difficult to categorize. Although he does not use the word "paradigm", the idea does seem to be implied. For example, Mendenhall writes, "After the final destruction, predicted by virtually all the pre-exilic prophets, some anonymous and chastened "wise man" saw the course of history in a new light and used old traditions to construct a new parable of the human plight."[283] The references to "the course of history" and "human plight" take Mendenhall's approach out of the etiological, and into the paradigmatic. He is not speaking of the quest for origins, but of the recognition of patterns of royal ideology and its consequent behavior and the results such ideology and behavior for the monarchy and the nation. Mendenhall's use of the words, "analogy" and "parable" also identify him as falling into the paradigmatic camp. Both words suggest a story told at one level, with implications at another level.

Mendenhall's position may be summarized as follows. He regards Genesis 2-3 as a *mashal*, or parable that was told to question royal pretensions concerning wisdom. It is thus in the stream of skeptical wisdom, a type of wisdom that was aware of the limits of wisdom. As such, Genesis 2-3 has much in common with the book of Job, as well as with certain stories within the Deuteronomistic History. The story of Genesis 3 is read holistically—although Mendenhall seems to assume that Genesis 3 is to be considered

---

[282] Ibid., 331.
[283] Ibid., 325.

separately from Genesis 2. This contrasts with Budde and others.[284] Mendenhall approaches Genesis 3 as being capable of being read at two distinct levels. He definitely thinks of Genesis 3 as a negative portrayal of Israelite kingship, and thinks that such a portrayal came from the time when Israelite kingship was no more. For this reason, and for others, he conceives of the story as being told during the exilic period.

Mendenhall makes a strong argument that Genesis 3 is a criticism of royal ideology. However, his argument might be further strengthened by connecting Genesis 3 more closely with Genesis 2. It will be argued that the language of life and related motifs—which are especially prominent in Genesis 2—also serve to call into question royal pretensions. Furthermore, the archaizing language may be one aspect of the author's/redactor's disguising of a polemic that questions royal ideology.

However, it is questionable whether the destruction of an elite system would be the only time in which such an anti-elite system would sprout or thrive, as Mendenhall asserts. The story could have assumed something close to its final form at any time when criticism of royal ideology was present, yet was perceived as dangerous by some of the elite intelligentsia. Since such criticism may always be present, and is always dangerous since it challenges powerful vested interests, it seems best to remain a minimalist concerning the methods and assumptions that are used by Mendenhall to date Genesis 2-3.

Furthermore, while it is certainly true that archaizing language may account for the more seemingly archaic words, it is always possible that such words appear because the story is, in fact, archaic. Later words and phrases

---

[284] Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, 51; Westermann, Genesis1-11, 212.

might well be regarded as an updating of more ancient language. Thus, archaic words are not necessarily indicative of an early date, and late biblical Hebrew words are not automatically indicative of a late date.

However, the fact that some of the language and stories of Genesis 2-4 do have significant points of contact with the monarchy—particularly with David and Solomon—may argue that the story received its final form after the end of the Davidic Monarchy.[285] This goes against the grain of many arguments that assume that connections with the Davidic Monarchy prove the time of the writing of the Eden Narrative. However, if one wishes to criticize royal ideology, it is most unwise to leave clues as to which precise royal line one is criticizing. Thus, the language of the setting of the story may point to the monarchical era, but this does not necessarily argue for an early date. On the contrary, such a setting in a story that is critical of royal ideology may be part of the disguise that is being adopted as part of the hidden polemic.

Another scholar who has identified an "*undertone*" of political criticism in the Genesis 2-3 story is Holter.[286] He notes that the serpent has sometimes been taken as representing ". . . a polemic against non-Yahwistic *religion*."[287] However, Holter also acknowledges that the mention of Yahweh having

---

[285] Cf. Gary A. Rendsburg, "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Genesis," in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, edited by Adele Berlin (Bethesda, Maryland: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 47-70. Rendsburg argues strongly for an early date for Genesis, based primarily on what he takes to be many clues which link Genesis with the period of the United Monarchy.
However, his modern analogies of Miller's "The Crucible" and the television show M*A*S*H* seem ill-conceived to illustrate his point. Miller's work and M*A*S*H* are, by Rendsburg's own admission, set in earlier times, yet related to (then) contemporary events, yet Rendsburg uses the clues for an early date for Genesis to argue for the time of composition, rather than the time of setting for the book.

[286] Knut Holter, "The Serpent in Eden as a Symbol of Israel's Political Enemies: Yahwistic Criticism of the Solomonic Foreign Policy?" *SJOT* 4/1 (1990): 107. (For the entire article, cf. 106-112.

[287] Ibid., 107.

created the serpent sits awkwardly with this reading.[288] Holter thinks that the repeated use of the Hebrew root עשה, used in close connection with both the serpent and the woman, ". . . reveals a deliberate contrasting between the serpent and the woman".[289]

Holter argues that even though J hardly could understand the religion of Israel's neighbors as initiated by Yahweh,[290] he would certainly regard these peoples as a part of Yahweh's creation. It is well known that J elsewhere uses a theriomorphic phraseology in his description of a nation or people. For example, in Genesis 49 some of Jacob's sons are compared with animals.[291] In particular, Holter points out that Israel's enemies are described as "serpents". This is true of the Philistines (Isa. 14:29), and of Egypt (Jer. 46:22). This may also be the thrust of Jer. 8:17.[292] Even though he acknowledges that ". . . these three texts are younger than Gen 3, they make it clear that the 'serpent' might act in the Old Testament as a metaphor for political enemies of Israel, a phenomenon which of course is linked to the important religious function serpents had among Israel's surrounding peoples."[293]

Holter also points out that the word used of the conflict between the woman (and her seed) and the serpent (and his seed)—איבה—may support his

---

[288] Ibid.

[289] Ibid., 108. However, this Hebrew root is so commonly used that Holter appears to be straining on this point.

[290] On the other hand, cf. Judges 11:24, where Jephthah states that at least one Israelite thought of the god Chemosh as giving their land to the Ammonites. The fact that this was recorded in the Old Testament may indicate that the Old Testament (and those who preserved it) was more comfortable with polytheism than Holter suggests.

[291] Ibid.

[292] Ibid., 108-109.

[293] Ibid., 109.

thesis, since this same noun is used in Ezekiel 25:15 and 35:5 of the Philistines and the Edomites, respectively.

Ezekiel 25:15 כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה יַעַן עֲשׂוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים בִּנְקָמָה וַיִּנָּקְמוּ נָקָם
בְּשָׁאט בְּנֶפֶשׁ לְמַשְׁחִית אֵיבַת עוֹלָם

NAU Ezekiel 25:15 'Thus says the Lord GOD, "Because the Philistines have acted in revenge and have taken vengeance with scorn of soul to destroy with everlasting enmity,"

יַעַן הֱיוֹת לָךְ אֵיבַת עוֹלָם וַתַּגְרֵאת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־יְדֵי־חֶרֶב בְּעֵת אֵידָם בְּעֵת עֲוֹן קֵץ

Ezekiel 35:5
כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה יַעַן עֲשׂוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים בִּנְקָמָה וַיִּנָּקְמוּ נָקָם
בְּשָׁאט בְּנֶפֶשׁ לְמַשְׁחִית אֵיבַת עוֹלָם

NAU Ezekiel 35:5 "Because you have had everlasting enmity and have 1delivered the sons of Israel to the power of the sword at the time of their calamity, at the time of the punishment of the end,"

Holter is in basic agreement with W. von Soden[294] and M. Görg,[295] who had ". . . suggested that the dependence of Adam on Eve in Gen 3 reflects the dependence of Solomon on his Egyptian wife."[296] However, Holter thinks that the critique is broader than that proposed by von Soden and Görg.

How is Holter to be situated in terms of the rubrics that are identified in this survey? Holter clearly deals with the final form of the text, even as he deals with individual elements within it. Certainly, his highly symbolic interpretation of the serpent puts him in the category of a more complex

---

[294] Wolfram von Soden, "Verschlüsselte Kritik an Salomo in der Urgeschichte des Jahwisten?" *WO* 7/2 (1974): 228-240.

[295] M. Görg, "Weisheit als Provokation: Religionsgeschichtliche und theolgische Aspekte der Südenfallerzählung," in *Die Kraft der Hoffnung. Fs J. Schreiner*, edited by A. E. Hierhold, et al. (Bamberg : St. Otto, 1986), 19-34.

[296] Ibid., 110-111. This "dependence" (for Holter, von Soden, and Görg), is shown by the fact that the woman seems to be the main actor in Genesis 3.

interpretation of the story. Holter seems to regard the Eden Narrative as largely a warning, and not as any kind of "fall upwards." Finally, Holter thinks of the story as being paradigmatic, with the serpent symbolizing and the humans' responses to him as a warning paradigm for Solomon and his foreign and domestic policies.

While Holter regards the Eden Narrative as, at least to some degree, criticising royal ideology, Kennedy thinks of Gen. 2-3 not as questioning royal pretensions, but rather as legitimizing those pretensions.[297] Kennedy's reading of the story accounts for many (though not all) of the elements of the story, and presents a coherent interpretation of the story as a whole. A detailed summary of Kennedy's reading of the story is in order.

Following Sternberg, Kennedy asserts that literature is always ideological.[298] Furthermore, following Thompson, Kennedy holds that ". . . ideology designates the process by which meaning or signification serves to sustain or legitimate social relations of domination . . . ."[299] Kennedy goes on to point out that other ANE cosmologies, such as *Enuma Elish*, are ". . . expressions of power that legitimated the social and political agenda of the culture that produced them."[300]

Kennedy's reading of the story presupposes a very close connection between God and the king.[301] Such a close connection does seem to be behind such sayings as Proverb 24:21, as well as Psalm 110. It may well be that, if

---

[297] Kennedy, "Peasants in Revolt: 3-14.
[298] Ibid., 3.
[299] Ibid.
[300] Ibid., 4.
[301] Ibid., 4. Cf. also Gale A. Yee, "Gender, Class, and the Social-Scientific Study of Genesis 2-3," *Semeia* 87 (1999): 177-192, who also assumes a close correlation between Yahweh and king on the one hand, and Adam and Eve and peasants on the other hand.

the story of Genesis 2-3 ever circulated independently of Genesis 1, the Eden Narrative was indeed intended to be read as legitimating royal ideology in precisely the way Kennedy proposes. However, it is more difficult to read it purely in this way, once it is considered in tandem with Genesis 1, and with the rest of Genesis and the Primary History. In Genesis 1:28, the man and woman are told to rule (וּרְדוּ) over the animals. As Sawyer has pointed out, the image of God that is mentioned in chapter 1 may well inform our reading of Genesis 2-3 in some way. If so, the theme of the image of God in Genesis 1:26-28 may be a challenge to the then prevailing ANE symbolism of kings as the image of a god, rather than a close linking of the king with God.[302]

Furthermore, as Sanders notes, ". . . as the notion of hostile takeover present in a term such as 'appropriation' implies, adaptation can also be oppositional, even subversive. There are as many opportunities for divergence as adherence, for assault as well as homage."[303] Indeed, Sanders has an entire chapter that deals with "constructing alternative points of view."[304]

As Kimelman writes,

> There is probably no episode of the Bible that has been subject to a greater variety of interpretations than the story of the Garden of Eden. This variety is due to the fact that no single line of interpretation has accounted for all the data. That is to say, no single meaning of the story has exhausted all its features. If every reading perspective leaves a remainder, the only question is whether one reading accounts for more of the data than another in a coherent way. Indeed, it may even take multiple readings to account for all the data. The claim to significance of the following reading lies in its capacity to minimize the remainder by providing a structure for illuminating

---

[302] J. Richard Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005), 104.

[303] Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, NCI (London: Routledge, 2006), 9.

[304] Ibid., 97-119. There are many verbal hints in Genesis 2-3 that the man is described in royal language. This will be argued in more depth in subsequent chapters. However, some of these hints should perhaps be mentioned here: the man receiving the breath of life, the commission to till and guard the garden, the task of naming the animals, and the phrase "the knowledge of good and bad," all suggest the humans' royal status. Kennedy seems to be focusing on some of the clues, while ignoring others, which seem to point in a different direction from the interpretive direction Kennedy has taken.

> the narrative that explains its overall thrust, accounts for the interaction of its characters, and sheds light on interpretational difficulties.[305]

Kennedy is perhaps ignoring some of the clues listed above[306] due to his presupposition concerning the ideological monopoly of elites on literary production. He writes that ". . . ideology designates the process by which meaning or signification serves to sustain or legitimate social relations of domination . . . ."[307] Certainly, much literature can and does serve to legitimize political domination. However, this is not inevitably so. Literature can also challenge the status quo.[308] At the very least, as part of the Primary History—the section of the Old Testament that stretches from Genesis through 2 Kings—a very mixed picture of kingship obtains.[309] Examining the Eden Narrative as part of this larger context makes it less likely that Genesis 2-3 can be read, in its present form, as an uncritical validation of pro-royal ideology.

Gnuse argues for granting ". . . anti-royal fervor and the radical equality of people" more prominence in our understanding of the Primeval History of Genesis 1-11. Indeed, he labels these themes of anti-royal fervor and radical equality of people as an overlooked message.[310] He thinks that this is

---

[305] Reuven Kimelman, "The Seduction of Eve and Feminist Readings of the Garden of Eden," (http://wjudaism.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/wjudaism, accessed 10-29-2014).

[306] Cf. fn. 295.

[307] Kennedy, "Political Allegory in Genesis 2-3," 3.

[308] Cf., for example, Mark G. Brett, *Genesis: Procreation* and *the Politics of Identity*, 8. Brett speaks of the final form of Genesis as resistance literature which exerts its influence ". . . behind the back of powerful ideologies." As will be argued in the chapters on knowledge and life, the *Gilgamesh Epic,* as well as certain portions of the Old Testament, seems to question royal pretensions and practices, at least in some measure.

[309] Cf. J. J. M. Roberts, "The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms," *CBQ* 64/4 (2002): 675-686. Even Roberts, 675-676, who argues for a fairly positive portrait of kingship in the Old Testament nevertheless acknowledges that the biblical judgment on the monarchy is ". . . ambiguous and multivalent . . . ."

[310] Robert K. Gnuse, "An Overlooked Message: The Critique of Kings and Affirmation of Equality in the Primeval History," *BTB* 36/4 (2006): 147. This is in contrast to his basic approach (only a few years before) in Robert K. Gnuse, "A Process Theological Interpretation of the Primeval History in Genesis 2-11," *HBT* 29/1 (2002): 23-41.

especially likely when Genesis 1 and 2 are considered together.[311] Humankind being "in the image of God" is a common ANE way of speaking about kings.[312] Furthermore, the fact that it is Yahweh who plants the garden, rather than the man, demonstrates that *Yahweh*, and not Adam, is the king in Eden.[313] This is true, even if the man and woman are portrayed in a royal fashion in certain ways, for example, as fulfilling a royal function in naming the animals.[314] Thus, Gnuse deals primarily with the final form, opts for a complex ("overlooked") message in the Eden Narrative and, indeed, in the entire Primeval History. Gnuse argues for both a positive interpretation (human equality) and a negative interpretation (the critique of kings) in Genesis 2-3, and in the rest of the Primeval History. Finally, Gnuse is clearly reading the Eden Narrative as paradigmatic.[315] In another article, Gnuse is less explicit concerning his paradigmatic approach. However, when he writes of such "themes" as "the radical equality of people,"[316] and "a strident critique of kingship," it is clear that he is broadening his interpretation to the point of making it paradigmatic.[317]

Coats seems to take a moderating position regarding royal ideology in the Eden Narrative. Genesis 2-3 does speak in royal language, but also calls into question certain royal pretensions.

---

[311] Ibid., 150-151.
[312] Ibid., 150.
[313] Ibid.
[314] Ibid., 150-151.
[315] Cf. Gnuse, "Process Theological Interpretation of the Primeval History," 23-41, in which the paradigmatic aspect is even more explicitly expressed. For example, Gnuse, 25-26, speaks (with approval) of theological approaches which have identified "patterns" of grace, sin, punishment, and forgiveness.
[316] Gnuse, "An Overlooked Message," 147.
[317] Ibid., 146.

> . . . As a tale the unit derives in some manner form the royal court (see Richter). The Paradise Man is the royal man; his garden, his animals, his wife constitute his court. He exercises dominion over them as he names them (cf. 1:28). The Paradise Man thus wields power in his garden, power to know good and evil, to discriminate between alternatives for the future of his subjects. Yet, the tale is not simply a propaganda piece for the royal man. His knowledge of good and evil was originally denied him. His grasp of it was an act of disobedience, an affront to God. His expulsion from the Garden is a denial of his power. The story thus derives from circles (wisdom?) who stand over against the king to admonish, instruct, and correct him, or finally to impeach him.[318]

One scholar who has approached Genesis 2-3 from a political standpoint—at times cautiously, and at other times less so—is Brueggemann. Parrish notes ". . . three methodological pillars . . ." on which Brueggemann's work rests. "He has a preference for literary modes of reading biblical literature; he is intensely concerned about the social function of biblical texts; he is fiercely dialectical."[319]

At the confluence of Brueggemann's social concern and dialectical approach is his conception of the ambiguity of the legitimating and countercultural aspects of texts. As Parrish points out,

> Depending on who wields authoritative texts and traditions, they are either a part of the prevailing culture's process of constructing, legitimating and maintaining social worlds, or they are countercultural in their effort to construct alternative social worlds. The same text can sometimes function in both ways, as his shrewd analysis of Psalm 37 demonstrates (Brueggemann 1995, 235-57).[320]

One of Brueggemann's early writings in which he interpreted Genesis 2-3 in a political manner was published in 1968.[321] Speaking of a consensus that no longer exists, he writes, "Because of the work of von Rad and Wolff, we

---

[318] George W. Coats, *Genesis with an Introduction to Narrative Literature*, FOTL I (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1983), 59.

[319] V. Steven Parrish, "Brueggemann, Walter," *DMBI*: 244-245.

[320] Ibid., 245.

[321] Walter Brueggemann, "David and His Theologian," in *David and His Theologian: Literary, Social, and Theological Investigation of the Early Monarchy*, edited by K. C. Hanson; Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011), 1-28. [Originally, published as Walter Brueggemann, "David and His Theologian," *CBQ* 30 (1968):156-181. Pagination is given in the 2011 reprint.]

can now safely conclude that these stories are an attempt to create theological legitimacy for the monarchy and speak a warning in the context of covenant to the ambitions of the Davidic house."[322] Brueggemann argues for close links between Genesis 2-11 and the Succession Narrative of 2 Samuel 9-20, 1 Kings 1-2.[323] His hypothesis is that, "[t]he J construction in Genesis 2-11 is dependent upon the David story. The particular order of the Genesis materials is dependent upon the career of the sons of David in their quest for the throne."[324] Human sin, as well as God's judgment and grace, are mirrored in the Davidic dynasty. The task of the theologian in Genesis 2-11 is that of

> . . . extending the experience of this representative man and his family to the experience of all Israelites. This extension was a natural, legitimate thing to do, for in such a society, what happens to the king does indeed happen to every member of the realm. Thus the theologian is not simply applying a personal experience to the community but is asserting that the experiences of the royal house are in fact events in the life of the whole realm.[325]

Brueggemann posits that four stories in Genesis 3-11 are to be related to four stories in the Succession Narrative.[326]

Adam and Eve (Gen. 3:1-24), and David and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11-12)
Cain and Abel (Gen. 4:1-16), and Amnon and Absalom (2 Sam. 13-14)
Noah and the Flood (Gen. 6-9[327]), and Absalom and David (2 Sam. 15-20)
The Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9), and Solomon and David (2 Kings 1-2)

According to Brueggemann, the same basic factors are present in each of these stories. He notes in particular two factors. "(a) The dramatic sequence moves persistently toward a more precarious relation between Yahweh and his

---

[322] Ibid., 2-3.
[323] Ibid., 3-4.
[324] Ibid., 4.
[325] Ibid.
[326] Ibid., 5.
[327] Ibid., 5. The precise listing of verses which Brueggemann takes to be the relevant story of the flood has not been listed in this thesis.

human family. (b) The tendency in each story is to show that the real issue is the graciousness of Yahweh."[328]

While there are certainly some apparent points of contact between the stories of Genesis 2-11 and the Succession Narrative, these points are so general as to remain less than fully convincing. This is shown by the fact that Brueggemann resorts to such general concepts as ". . . sin, confession, judgment and graciousness."[329] Brueggemann seems to acknowledge the weakness of his parallels with such statements as he makes concerning his linkage of Adam and Eve with David and Bath Sheba. "The parallel in Genesis 3 is not precise . . . ."[330] In the case of the linkage of Noah and Absalom, Brueggemann admits that ". . . the points of similarity are not pervasive . . . ."[331]

Brueggemann thinks that, in Genesis 2-3, the Yahwist transforms David into "every man" both in his reception of God's good gifts, and in his temptations to misuse God's good gifts.[332] Brueggemann comments that, "[i]n the David narrative, the loss of the kingdom or part of it is threatened. It is not, I think, forcing the narrative to see a parallel in Gen 3:23-24 in which the man is expelled from his garden. The loss of garden and loss of kingdom come to mean the same thing, exile."[333]

---

[328] Ibid., 5.
[329] Ibid., 7.
[330] Ibid., fn. 32, p. 8. (The fn. begins on p. 7.)
[331] Ibid., 13.
[332] Ibid., 23. Cf. also Walter Brueggemann, "The Trusted Creature," in *David and His Theologian: Literary, Social, and Theological Investigation of the Early Monarchy*, (edited by K. C. Hanson; Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011), 61. [Originally published as "The Trusted Creature," *CBQ* 31 (1969): 484-498. Pagination is from the 2011 reprint.]
[333] Ibid., 9.

While many of the conclusions Brueggemann draws appear cogent, he does not account for the reason for the less than convincing parallels between Genesis 2-11 and the Succession Narrative. However, Brueggemann's argument is strengthened if, as is argued here, the inexact parallels between the Eden Narrative and the Davidic materials may be the result of the need to speak allusively and elusively concerning the subject. In any case, his work meets Amit's fourth criterion (i.e., other scholars who have proposed guarded criticism of the monarchy) in Genesis 2-3.

Is Brueggemann correct, however, when he argues that the points of contact between Genesis 2-3 and the stories about David suggest the dating of the materials in Genesis 2-3? It may well be that, precisely because of the allusiveness of the references in the Eden Narrative, such allusions would remain too strong to have assumed their final form during the time of the reign of David or Solomon, since such references, indirect though they may be, would likely result in repression of the story. These oblique references to David would more likely stem from a time during the divided monarchy, or even later, when even those fairly close to the throne may have entertained some doubts about the exercise of kingship, and royal ideology that underpinned it. It would still have been very important to mute such misgivings. The clues in the Eden Narrative that appear to point toward the Davidic period would have served well the purposes of such a muted protest.

It has been demonstrated that political interpretations of Genesis 2-3 are not lacking in the exegetical literature. It has also been shown that such political interpretations differ greatly from one another. Some scholars have taken Genesis 2-3 as legitimating royal ideology. Others have interpreted the

Eden Narrative as calling royal ideology into question. Still others have posited a support of royal ideology, but with reservations and provisos. Even those scholars have posited a royal (or an anti-royal) agenda have disagreed as to how prominent this theme in the Eden Narrative. Furthermore, scholarly approaches may be divided into interpretations that see a particular polemic against particular kings—especially King Solomon—and interpretations that are generally critical of royal ideology.

But does a choice need to be made between those approaches that may refer to a specific king, or to monarchy in general? Perhaps anything that challenges a political policy, attitude, or action undermines or calls into question some aspect of royal ideology. Perhaps, too, any challenge to royal ideology renders all individual royal policies, attitudes, and actions open to criticism. On the other hand, if Genesis 2-3 is a hidden polemic against royal ideology, it would logically be prudent to make the details of the story reflect earlier times and/or different geographical locations from the time and place that was the real target of the polemic. This stratagem would be less likely to raise royal suspicions than a setting that was more contemporary or closer in geography.

One possible approach to the divide between so-called pro-royal and anti-royal interpretations of the Eden Narrative is the qualified legitimization approach. This has often been thought to be the result of composite authorship. One author may have been legitimizing royal ideology, and another may have been questioning—at least in some measure—royal ideology. It is not clear, even if this is true, that it can be determined which version of the story came first, and which version was the polemic. One can

certainly imagine a situation in which an earlier, legitimizing story was first, while a later author called such legitimacy into some question. This would especially occur when the downsides of royal rule had become clearer over time.

However, one could also imagine a situation in which an earlier, somewhat skeptical story could be co-opted by a later, legitimizing author. Early on in the process of the centralization of power, there might well have been voices raised in opposition. Later, when royal power had been consolidated, earlier questioning voices would have been muted (or, at the very least, moderated) by a pro-royal emphasis.

On the face of it, it seems more likely that the pro-royal story was the earlier of the two versions. Certainly, a negative attitude toward kings would accord with Judah's and Israel's later experience with kings who were, at best, of dubious value. At worst, these kings would have been either of two unpopular sorts: either oppressive puppet kings, in charge of collecting taxes for their foreign overlords, or rebels against those foreign kings who ended up bringing retribution in the form of siege, death, and destruction.

In any case, the redactor apparently thought that the earlier material made a coherent story—along with the redactor's own (or other) contributions. Even if the redactor merely combined earlier accounts without contributing anything substantial to them, the fact still remains that the redactor thought the accounts were compatible. If the redactor blended the two accounts, adding what he thought appropriate, then there is another story, in addition to whatever stories he may have used and blended. In either case, if this is a

story about royalty, in its final form, it seems to be somewhat dubious about certain aspects of royal ideology.

The mythical elements in Genesis 2-3 have been frequently noted,[334] and often denied.[335] There are those who would not speak of "mythical elements," but would simply refer to Genesis 2-3 as myth.[336] It is sometimes assumed that myths inherently support the status quo, and would thus be pro-monarchical.[337] However, as Kruger and others have pointed out, myths may either support or challenge prevailing power arrangements.[338]

Conclusion

What may be concluded from this brief and selective survey of scholarly work on Genesis 2-3? The following are preliminary observations.

First, political interpretations of the Eden Narrative are much more common than is sometimes recognized. They are represented throughout much of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century as well. Thus, Amit's fourth criterion—that of a hidden polemic (although not always called that)—has been satisfied.

Second these political interpretations range from those that think of a political angle as the primary interpretive motive of Genesis 2-3, to those scholars who think of any political aspect of the story as remote at most.

---

[334] Cf.. e.g., Brevard S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*, 2nd ed., Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1962), 49.

[335] Cf. for example, John N. Oswalt, *The Bible among the Myths: Unique or Just Different?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009). Oswalt, 17-18, does not deny the presence or use of mythic elements in the Bible. However, he pleads ". . . that we not overplay those similarities so that they obscure the much more significant differences that affect every interpretation of the similarities."

[336] Cf. Robert Gordis, "The Significance of the Paradise Myth," *AJSLL* 52/2 (1936): 86-94. Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 69-70, 73, eventually refers to the Eden Narrative as a myth, although he does not wish to prejudge the issue in the earlier part of his analysis (p. 1).

[337] N. Wyatt, Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition, UBL 13 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996), 367-369, especially page 367.

[338] Kruger, "Myth, ideology, and wisdom," 47.

However, if the argument here presented has validity, this apparent remoteness may be, in fact, one technique of the hidden polemic in the Eden Narrative.

Third, even among scholars who take the story to be strongly political in nature, there is a vast range of approaches. On the one hand, there are scholars who think that the Eden Narrative is pro-royal ideology at its very core. Others regard it as questioning the pretensions of kings. Between, there are scholars who argue that the Eden Narrative is cautiously supportive of royal ideology.

Fourth, it has been argued that the position of scholars who take a political approach to Genesis 2-3 is strengthened in certain ways by regarding the story in its final form as a hidden polemic. One aspect of this strengthening is the clarification of the reason for some of the lack of clarity in the story and the differences among interpretations—i.e., that apparently contradictory details of the story were placed (or left) in it in order to make sure that the story could be read and interpreted in more than one fashion.

Where does the present argument fall in terms of these interpretive rubrics? The present argument is attempting to examine the Eden Narrative as a whole, rather than in its parts. The contention here is that the story is not limited to one possible meaning. In fact, it may be read—indeed was likely intended to be read—as a story within a story. The argument here presented holds the Eden Narrative to be paradigmatic, interpreting Genesis 2-3 as a hidden polemic warning against certain royal excesses in ideology and practice based on such ideology. Thus, the argument here is that the Eden Narrative is not a "fall upward." To the contrary, Genesis 2-3 is a narrative that presents a decidedly negative development.

CHAPTER 3: ROYALTY AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST AND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Knowledge and Royal Ideology in the Rest of the ANE

This chapter on knowledge in relation to kings is a great deal shorter than is the next chapter on life and kings. The reason for this is simple: the connection between kings and knowledge or wisdom is more commonly acknowledged by the scholarly community than is the connection between kings and life.

This discussion will attempt to accomplish three major tasks. The first is to establish that knowledge is one of the major components of royal ideology in the ANE (outside of Israel and Judah) across time and geography. The second major task is to establish the fact that not all of these portrayals are positive. In fact, some of the connections between kings and knowledge seem to be polemical. They appear to call into question the knowledge of the king to one degree or another. Third, it will be argued that the Old Testament also recognizes the connection of knowledge and royalty, but also, in some texts, problematizes that connection.

Kings and Knowledge in the ANE

Knowledge is often predicated of kings in the ANE.[339] Kalugila points out that divine wisdom is predicated of kings in Egypt,[340] Mesopotamia,[341] and

---

[339] Leonidas Kalugila, The Wise King: Studies in Royal Wisdom as Divine Revelation in the Old Testament and Its Environment (Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1980); Stuart Lasine, Knowing Kings: Knowledge, Power, and Narcissism in the Hebrew Bible (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001); Marc Zvi Brettler, God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor, JSOTSup 76 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[340] Ibid., 12-38.

[341] Ibid., 38-61. See also K.M. Streck, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum untergange Niniveh's II*, Vorderasiatische Bibliothek (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1916), 5, 255ff., 257.

the West Semitic region.[342] For example, Kalugila notes that, in Egypt, "[t]he king's wisdom is often expressed in terms of Sia."[343] Sia was the god of perception.

Queen Hatshepsut's made an inscription in the temple of Amun at Karnak, in which she claims (among other things) to have fulfilled the command of Amun by setting up the obelisk. She claims that her heart was Sia, the god of intelligence, before Amun. It is worth noting that understanding is closely connected to obedience to the god in Hatshepsut's inscription.

"I did not stray from what he commanded.
My heart was Sia before my father,
I entered into the plans of his heart."[344]

Turning to Mesopotamian royal ideology, a close connection between knowledge/wisdom and kings can be detected. George writes, primarily concerning Gilgamesh, but with a wider view,

> The epic . . . bears some relation to the well-established literary genre of "royal counsel." Kings, by virtue of their many counselors and the special trappings and rituals of kingship, were expected to be wise and sagacious. Many ancient Near Eastern collections of proverbial sayings purport to be the teachings of a king or other notable to his son or successor.[345]

Indeed, the Pennsylvania manuscript of *Gilgamesh* bears the title *Shūtur eli sharrī*, "surpassing all other kings," emphasizing that this epic is about a king, and not simply about a man as man. George writes,

> The fear of death may be one of the epic's principal themes but the poem deals with so much more. As a story of one man's "path to wisdom",

---

[342] Kalugila, *Wise King*, 62-68.
[343] Ibid., 21.
[344] Miriam Lichtheim, translator, *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings: Volume II: The New Kingdom* (Berkeley: University of California, 1976), p. 27, lines 12-14.
[345] A.R. George, translator, *The Epic of Gilgamesh: The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian* (London: Allen Lane, 1999), xxv.

> of how he is formed by his successes and failures, it offers many profound insights into the human condition, into life and death and the truths that touch us all. The subject that most held the attention of the royal courts of Babylonia and Assyria was perhaps another topic that underlies much of the poem: the debate on the proper duties of kingship, what a good king should do and should not do.[346]

Gilgamesh is presented in the prologue as being wise,[347] and as "knowing all things," or "knowing the depths."[348] George notes that "[t]he word *naqbu* has two meanings, (a) 'totality' and (b) the deep body of an underground water believed to supply springs and wells, that is, the cosmic realm of Ea better known as the Apsû. The root is seen in the rare verb *naqābu*, an equivalence of Sumerian bùr, 'to be deep'. On this evidence meaning (b) of *naqbu*, ir primary; meaning (a) arose through idiomatic expression in which the 'depth' of something meant the totality of it."[349]

George acknowledges that "[t]he translator is left in a quandary as to which meaning of *naqbu* to choose . . . ."[350] While George admits that evidence for both "totality" and "the Deep" are present in the epic, he opts for the meaning ". . . the 'Deep' (or 'Deeps') . . . ."[351] However, he concludes his discussion by saying, "It remains possible that we are expected to understand *naqbu* in both its literal meanings, 'all" and the 'Deep' (or 'Deeps'), but the line becomes more pregnant with meaning if the word is understood as symbolizing profound wisdom."[352]

---

[346] Ibid., xxi.
[347] Ibid., 1. Cf. also George's comments on line 2, in A.R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts,* Volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 444.
[348] Ibid., line 4.
[349] Ibid., 444.
[350] Ibid.
[351] Ibid.
[352] Ibid., 444-445.

While the precise nature of Gilgamesh's knowledge is debatable, it would seem that two things are not debatable. First, Gilgamesh is portrayed as having significant knowledge. Second, Gilgamesh is portrayed as a king. In light of the evidence throughout the ANE that kings are pictured as being endowed with significant knowledge, this ought not to surprise either ancient hearers/readers or modern interpreters.

However, what might be surprising to ancient hearers and readers of the Epic is that Gilgamesh does not know that he cannot avoid death, without a long and seemingly fruitless quest. This would seem to problematize, if not polemicize against, the knowledge of King Gilgamesh.

The relation of Genesis 2-3 to *Gilgamesh* has often been noted.[353] It may well be that the Eden Narrative should be viewed as not only using some of the motifs of the *Gilgamesh Epic*, but also as having at least some of the "generic" flavor of *Gilgamesh*. Davenport has made a strong case for taking *Gilgamesh*—at least in its eleven-tablet version—as being a critique of the imperialistic tendencies of the Assyrian Empire.[354] Might not the Eden Narrative have a similar agenda?

In a similar fashion to *Gilgamesh*, the *Adapa Myth* speaks of Adapa as having been given wisdom by the gods, but not life. The similarities between Adapa and Adam seem, at the very least to reveal some common motifs, so the fact that Adapa has knowledge, but not eternal life may well be appropriate to

---

[353] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Gilgamesh and Adam: Wisdom through Experience in *Gilgamesh* and in the Biblical Story of the Man, the Woman, and the Snake." In *Treasures Old and New: Essays in the Theology of the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004, 85-101; Ronald A. Veenker, "Forbidden Fruit: Ancient Near Eastern Sexual Metaphors," *HUCA* 70-71 (1999-2000): 57-73.

[354] Tracy Davenport, "An Anti-Imperialist Twist to 'The Gilgameš Epic'," in Gilgameš and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Mandelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21-23 July 2004, edited by Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks, ANESSup 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 1-23.

the discussion here.[355] While Adapa is nowhere called a king, not too much should made of this, since the distinction between ancient kings and priests was not often clear. In any case, it is of interest that Adapa and the other sages were all connected with kings. In the case of King Sargon II, he is said to be "the wise king, the master of all lore, the equal of the sage (i.e., Adapa)."[356]

Knowledge and Royal Ideology in the Old Testament

It requires little argumentation to make the case that the Old Testament is tremendously interested in kingship. Whether it is the recurrent phrase in Judges, "for in those days, there was no king in Israel,"[357] the frequent references to human kings or the divine king in Psalms, the very circumscribed role of kings in Deuteronomy, or the references to kings in Isaiah, kings figure very largely among the interests of the Old Testament.[358]

Knowledge and related themes are also exceedingly common in the Old Testament. Indeed, the Hebrew root ידע is so common as almost to appear commonplace. Furthermore, the root ידע has a wide range that defies limitation to a few simple meanings. However, while knowledge and wisdom are common themes in the Old Testament, and while they are not limited to kings, they do seem to be especially connected with kings.

In Israel, knowledge and wisdom are especially linked with the name of King Solomon. The attribution of the book of Proverbs to Solomon is

---

[355] Andreasen, "Adam and Adapa," 179-194.

[356] Cf. D. G. Lyon, *Keilschifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien, 5 (1722-705 v. Chr.)*, AsB (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1977), 6:38. For various connections between Adapa and Neo-Assyrian kings, Cf. Charles Halton, "Allusions to the Stream of Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Oracles," *ANES* 46 (2009): 50-61. Halton notes some connections between kings of vastly different times and regions: e.g., Adapa and Esarhaddon (52-54), Zimrī-Lim (54-55), and Sîn-šarra-iškun (55).

[357] Judges 17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25.

[358] The interest in kings in Samuel and Kings scarcely needs to be mentioned.

frequently ignored, because it is perceived as being a mere convention. Clements' reference to Solomon as ". . . a figurehead to which the ascription of wisdom could be attached" is typical.[359] Without entering into the debate as to the accuracy of this ascription, its presence is still worth noting. Such an attribution clearly shows that knowledge and wisdom were especially associated with kings, no matter what the degree of accuracy of the references to Solomon in Proverbs.

1 Kings 4:29-34 summarizes Solomon's great wisdom, linking it with international wisdom. Since kings in the ANE were routinely connected with wisdom and knowledge, this implies an intimate connection between Israelite kings (or at least, with King Solomon) and knowledge as well.

29 Now God gave Solomon wisdom and very great discernment and breadth of mind, like the sand that is on the seashore.
30 Solomon's wisdom surpassed the wisdom of all the sons of the east and all the wisdom of Egypt.
31 For he was wiser than all men, than Ethan the Ezrahite, Heman, Calcol and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was known in all the surrounding nations.
32 He also spoke 3,000 proverbs, and his songs were 1,005.
33 He spoke of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even to the hyssop that grows on the wall; he spoke also of animals and birds and creeping things and fish.
34 Men came from all peoples to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all the kings of the earth who had heard of his wisdom.

Besides the general attribution of wisdom to Solomon, there are several specific instances that may be closely connected with the knowledge of good and evil in particular.[360] For example, many scholars have cited the reference

---

[359] Ronald E. Clements, *Wisdom in Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 19. Similarly, cf. Tremper Longman III, *Proverbs*, BCOTWP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 23-26.

[360] Cumbersome as the whole expression is in both Hebrew and in translation, it is questionable whether the phrase can be shortened for this tree of Genesis 2-3, without changing the meaning. Many interpreters do argue in terms of "the tree of knowledge", rather in terms of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil". Cf., for example, Nicholas John Ansell, "The Call of Wisdom/The Voice of the Serpent: A Canonical Approach to the Tree of

to knowing good and evil in 2 Samuel 14:17, 20 as evidence for their various approaches to the meaning of the phrase in Genesis 2-3.[361] In particular, those scholars who have taken the phrase "good and evil" as a meristic expression have appealed to 2 Samuel 14:17 as corroboration of their position.[362] This instance is especially congenial to the meristic approach, since in v. 20 the king is said "to know everything that is upon the earth".[363] Even Hamilton, who does not think that the phrase "good and evil" is being used meristically in Genesis 2-3, admits that the phrase הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע in 2 Samuel 14: 17 functions as a merism. Hamilton notes that v. 20 clearly speaks of universal (or, at least,

---

Knowledge," *Christian Scholar's Review* 31:1 (2001): 31-57. In addition to the title, Ansell frequently refers to "the tree of knowledge," but only twice to "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil".
However, since the Eden Narrative consistently speaks of the knowledge/knowing/ knowers of good and evil as a package, it seems preferable to take the phrase as it stands. Furthermore, it is implied that the man and woman had some degree of knowledge even before the pair had partaken of the forbidden fruit, as Gordis and Bledstein have noted. Cf. Adrien Janis Bledstein, "The Genesis of Humans: The Garden of Eden Revisited," *Judaism* 26/2 (1977): 191; Robert Gordis, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls," *JBL* 76 (1957): 127. See also Anthony Tharekadavil, "Is Genesis a Confusion?" *Bible Bhashyam* 28 (2002): 627. This tree does not represent knowledge per se, as noted by Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 244.

[361] Cf., for example, Howard N. Wallace, *The Eden Narrative*, Harvard Semitic Monographs (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 126; Gerhard Charles Aalders, *Genesis* vol. I, Bible Student's Commentary, trans. William Heynen (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 88. See also Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 165. Hamilton thinks that 2 Samuel 14:17 is the clearest example of a meristic nuance for the phrase "good and evil". Cf. also Barr, *Garden of Eden,* 62. Even Barr acknowledges the similarity of 2 Samuel 14:17 to the phrase in Genesis 2-3. "Of the various biblical passages that use the phrase טוב ורע, some seem to me not to be a parallel except under misleading semantic arguments, and the one that strikes me as closest is II Samuel 14.17 . . . ." However, Barr seems to hold that, even in the case of 2 Samuel 14:17, "[k]nowing the difference is the essential thing (page 62)." See also John A. Bailey, "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3,"*JBL* 89 (1970): 137-150. On the other side of the argument, Bailey writes, "Most of the parallel OT passages in which 'good and evil' occur point to its meaning 'everything possible,' the two opposites good and evil being employed not for their own sake but to express a totality (what lies between the two)---a case of merism"(146).

[362] In addition to the references in the preceding fn., see Gordis, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Poets, Prophets, and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), 204, 213, fn.s 31-33. Gordis seems to be proposing that the phrase *is* a merism, but then Gordis limits the opposites of "good" and "evil" to "normal" and "unnatural sex". See also Gina Hens-Piazza, *Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings: A Sociorhetorical Approach to Exegesis*, Studies in Old Testament Interpretation (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1996), 114.

[363] The Hebrew reads #r<a'B' rv,a]-lK'-ta, t[;d:l'.

omni-terrestrial) knowledge.[364] The relevant verses, 2 Samuel 14:17 and 20, are as follows.

WTT 2 Samuel 14:17

וַתֹּאמֶר שִׁפְחָתְךָ יְהִי־נָא דְּבַר־אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ לְמְנוּחָה כִּי
כְּמַלְאַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים כֵּן אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ לִשְׁמֹעַ הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע וַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְהִי
עִמָּךְ

NAU 2 Samuel 14:17 "Then your maidservant said, 'Please let the word of my lord the king be comforting, for as the angel of God, so is my lord the king to discern good and evil. And may the LORD your God be with you.'"

WTT 2 Samuel 14:20

לְבַעֲבוּר סֹבֵב אֶת־פְּנֵי הַדָּבָר עָשָׂה עַבְדְּךָ יוֹאָב אֶת־הַדָּבָר
הַזֶּה וַאדֹנִי חָכָם כְּחָכְמַת מַלְאַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים לָדַעַת אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ

2 Samuel 14:20 "in order to change the appearance of things your servant Joab has done this thing. But my lord is wise, like the wisdom of the angel of God, to know all that is in the earth."

However, the propriety of using the phrase in 2 Samuel 14:20 to argue for a particular usage of the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" is open to some question. It should be noted that the phrase is not precisely the same as that in Genesis 2-3. One major difference is that the verb that governs the words הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע is not a form of the root ידע, as in Genesis 2-3, but rather of שמע. On the other hand, as Fretheim has pointed out, the terms "knowing" and "hearing" in the Old Testament are frequently closely connected.[365] In any case, the root ידע does occur in v. 20 on the tongue of the Tekoite woman.

---

[364] Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17*, 165.

[365] Terrence E. Fretheim, "ידע," *NIDOTTE* 2: 410.

This tends to confirm that, at least in 2 Samuel 14, the two Hebrew roots ידע and שמע are closely connected.

Without denying the value of using 2 Samuel 14:17, 20 to elucidate the phrase in Genesis 2-3, it might also be appropriate to take into consideration the larger context of 2 Samuel 14, and the function of knowledge in the over-all rhetorical purpose of this section of Samuel.[366] What is often not noticed in the wider context of 2 Samuel 14, however, is the fact that David's knowledge becomes rather questionable.[367] Can it really be that it takes the king so long to realize that the woman is telling him his story? It is especially natural to wonder about this, since earlier David had been induced by the prophet Nathan to pronounce judgment against David himself by means of a fictitious story. It should also be noted that the chapter tells the reader/hearer at the beginning of this chapter that Joab knew (using the root ידע) the heart of the king. The readers/hearers are also told that the woman was a wise woman. On the other hand, it is only in the (wisely) flattering language of the woman that David is said to be able "to hear (לִשְׁמַע) the good and evil" (הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע).

---

[366] It should also be noted that, even at the level of phraseology, the words which the wise woman of Tekoa uses are obviously heavily laden with flattery. While this is not a bad idea when one is approaching a king with a fictitious case designed to get him to reverse course in a messy family, dynastic succession, and justice issue, it may somewhat lessen the seriousness with which her ascriptions of wisdom to King David should be taken by the reader/hearer.

[367] This wider context and its problematizing of David's wisdom is noted in Larry L. Lyke, *Parabolic King David with the Wise Woman of Tekoa: The Resonance of Tradition in Parabolic Narrative*, JSOT Sup 255 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997). William H. Propp, "Kinship in 2 Samuel 13,"*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 55/1: 39-53, has pointed out this dynamic of interpretation in connection with chapter 14. He writes (page 40), "David's plight is all the more painful if the reader can find solutions for the king's problems that elude the king himself. I will suggest that the parable of the woman of Tekoa (1 Sam 14:5-11), properly interpreted, could show David the way out of his difficulties. But the king, in getting Joab's point, misses the author's point--implicitly, Yahweh's point . . . and comes to a wrong judgment in the matter of Absalom. The demonstration will demand rather fine analysis, but I presume that the original audience, living within the same kinship system as the characters in the text, understood the plight of David's family better than modern readers, and intuited what we today must painstakingly deduce." Similarly, cf. Robert Alter, *The Story of David* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999), 279.

In the larger context of the so-called "Succession Narrative," the words of the woman become even more ironic. It would seem that neither David nor Joab "knows" that Absalom, who is being brought back by David, will shortly rebel against the king and seize the kingdom, thus endangering both Joab and David. In this larger context, then, David's ability to "hear the good and evil," his earth-encompassing knowledge that is like an angel of the LORD (v. 17) or of God (v. 20) becomes deeply problematic.

It is not being argued here that the presentation of David in 1 Samuel-1 Kings 2 is completely negative. As Gilmour points out, even if the unity of 1 Samuel 8-12, ". . . incorporates a number of tensions within the text . . . ," [s]uch a position requires an understanding of the ideology of the text that is more nuanced than the extremes of pro- or anti-monarchy."[368] A text, when considered in isolation, may well evince a pro-royal ideology. However, that same text, when considered in its context, may call that pro-royal ideology into question.

Another occurrence of seemingly similar usage of the phrase "good and evil" and the royal connection with such knowledge is found in 1 Kings 3:3-15. Again, it is important to look not only at words and phrases, but also at this story about the knowledge of good and evil in its larger context. Often it is assumed that the knowledge of good and evil in 1 Kings 3 is viewed in a positive light. However, there are some clues within the story that should give the reader/hearer pause. Furthermore, in the larger context, this type of knowledge is viewed as ambiguous, at best, and highly problematic at worst.

---

[368] Rachelle Gilmour, Representing the Past: A Literary Analysis of Narrative Historiography in the Book of Samuel, VTSup 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 169-170.

First, as various scholars have pointed out, Solomon is presented as something of a problematic character, even in chapter 3.[369] The mention of Solomon's marriage to the daughter of Pharaoh, for example, in 1 Kings 3:1, and the mention of the people ". . . still sacrificing on the high places . . ." (v. 2) immediately precede the account of Solomon's dream.

It is arresting that although Solomon's request "was pleasing in the sight of the LORD" (v. 10), God does not echo Solomon's words regarding the knowledge of good and evil.[370] This is arresting since God does, in fact, repeat verbatim several parts of Solomon's dream request. It would seem that 1 Kings 11 casts its shadow back across the preceding chapters.[371]

---

[369] Cf. Vladimir, Wozniuk, "The Wisdom of Solomon as Political Theology," *Journal of Church & State*, 4/1 (1997): 657-681. See also Johnny E. Miles, *Wise King-Royal Fool*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 399 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), especially 41-43.
Christina Duncker, *Der andere Salomo: Eine sychrone Untersuchiung zur Ironie in der Salomo-Kompostiion 1 Könige 1-11* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008), 185, also points out that, in the light of Solomon's ruthless actions in 1 Kings 2, his claim to youthfulness and inexperience in chapter 3 take on a decidedly ironic tone.

[370] Cf. Helen A. Kenik. *Design for Kingship: The Deuteronomistic Narrative Technique in 1 Kings 3:4-15*, SBLDS 69 (Chico, California: Scholar's Press, 1983), 121-127. Kenik notes the variation in the terms used for God in this Solomonic dream section—אֲדֹנָי ("lord"), יהוה ("LORD"), אלהים ("God"). Whether or not the distinction among the names is as bright as she argues is questionable. However, she may well be correct in noting that these distinctions may signify more than—or something other than—different sources. Kenik also notes the similar variation in Genesis 3:1-5, where (in contrast with the verses which come before and after), the serpent and the woman both refer to אלהים, rather than to the יהוה אלהים. The difference between אלהים and יהוה may often be, as Cassuto has pointed out, the distinction between the God of Israel (יהוה) and a more international view of God (אלהים). Cf. Umberto Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch: Eight Lectures*, translated by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961) 20ff. If Genesis 3 is read as a critique of Solomon, one wonders if the author/redactor of Genesis 3 is not signaling the trouble ahead with Solomon's "internationalism".

[371] In dealing with Proverbs 1-9, Johnny E. Miles, *Wise King-Royal Fool*, *JSOT* Supplement Series, 399 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 30, fn. 7, acknowledges that ". . . the indirect language of satire imbues it with a power to conceal its critique from some (most especially its chief target) listening to its discourse." Miles notes that, whether or not Proverbs 1-9 is satire "in the formal sense of genre," it can be read as satire (30-31). The same might be said of 1 Kings 2-11.

CHAPTER 4: ROYALTY AND LIFE IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST AND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Introduction[372]

While the connection between the theme of life and ANE kings in general (and Israelite kings in particular) has sometimes been exaggerated,[373] this connection has also been downplayed. An overemphasis on the part of some scholars on a particular theme tends to trigger an opposite reaction.

However, the perceived exaggeration of an approach to a text ought to make scholars more cautious, but not so cautious as to reject that approach out of hand. For example, as Ringgren has pointed out, there is a close connection between the king and the vocabulary of eternal life in the Old Testament.[374]

Life and related concepts are frequently associated with kings in the ANE world-view.[375] This is true across time and geography. The association between kings and life is found in a wide variety of genres, from myths, to inscriptions, to letters. This theme also appears to be present in

---

[372] General comments are made in this introduction. Evidence and arguments will be presented (and scholarly works cited) in the body of the chapter.

[373] One thinks here of Geo Widengren, *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion* (Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1951). Widengren's wide-ranging quests for parallels to the tree of life, and many of the connections he makes may well have provoked a reaction against the very idea of such a connection between life and kings. Certainly, Widengren's methodology (as well as some of his detailed conclusions) may be faulted. However, this does not automatically mean that all his conclusions are entirely wrong.

[374] H. Ringgren, "חיה," *TDOT* 4:324-344.

[375] Cf. Mark W. Hamilton, "Prosperity and Kingship in Psalms and Inscriptions," in *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*, edited by David S. Vanderhooft and Abraham Winitzer (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 185. Hamilton thinks that the concern of ancient kings for the prosperity of their subjects ". . . appears only sporadically in surviving texts." While this may indeed be true for prosperity as such, if one expands the search to royal concern for the well-being of subjects (for example, in the provision and management of water, which is a vital condition for prosperity), the evidence is considerably more abundant. Such evidence will be presented later in this chapter.

iconography.[376] The connection seems to be positively portrayed in most extant materials.[377] However, negative portrayals are not absent.

Sometimes, this connection between the king and life may have been understood in a very straightforward manner. For example, after a period of foreign invasion or internal strife, even the common people may have yearned for the stability that only a long reign could provide. At other times, the language of life would have amounted to nothing more than *hofstil*, the language of courtly protocol. This would have been especially likely with letters to the king, and particularly where those letters are explaining why something the king desires has not been done, or with letters making some request of the king.

No doubt, kings encouraged this association of themselves with life. Such an association would have strengthened their authority and control. Whether the kings believed their own ideology is beyond recovery, or at least, it is beyond the argument here presented.

---

[376] Concerning the various possible relationships between iconography and literary remains, cf. Irene Winter, "Touched by the Gods: Visual Evidence for the Divine Status of Rulers in the Ancient Near East," in *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond,* OIS 4, edited by Nicole Brisch (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2008), 76. However, trying to make specific connections between the iconography of a so-called "tree of life" in the ANE on the one hand, and the Eden Narrative on the other hand, is highly suspect. Cf. Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, "Stylised Tree and its 'Rituals'," *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992), 170-171.

[377] Since it has often been palaces and administrative buildings which have been the primary target of archaeologists in the past, the positive portrayal of kings ought not to come as a surprise. On the other hand, more negative portrayals of kings would have been less likely to be preserved in royal or administrative archives.
Additionally, it may well be, as Sparks has pointed out, that the writing materials themselves militated against certain kinds of writings surviving for long. It would have been advisable for criticisms of royal ideology and behavior to be written on perishable materials. Cf. the perceptive comments by Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 17. Sparks points out one obvious aspect of genre which is easy to ignore: the material on which documents are written. For example, when a king or scribe writes on stone, it is because a text is important (at least in the mind of someone) and intended to last.

Nevertheless, no matter how differently royal ideology may have been understood at various times and places (and among various strata of society, even during the same period), the language of royal ideology was relatively stable throughout the ANE, and across time.[378] Mowinckel's assessment, that Israel shared many aspects of culture—including royal ideology—with its ANE neighbors, still seems fundamentally true.[379] This commonality of language and general themes suggests that a mind-set or "worldview" concerning kings was common in the ANE, including Israel/Judah.

While this connection is most frequently portrayed positively in the extant literature and iconography, there are some indications of another, more negative assessment of the connection of life and the royal worldview. The life of a particular king may be shortened by the decree of the gods, based on the king's actions. In addition, there are certain stories that deny that the king can live forever. Rather, he shares the mortality of all humankind.

---

[378] J. N. Postgate, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad," 395, strikes the correct balance, considering ancient royal ideology both stable and dynamic. Cf. also the caveat of Scott R. A. Starbuck, *Court Oracles in the Psalms: The So-Called Royal Psalms in their Ancient Near Eastern Context*, SBLDS 172 (Atlanta: SBL, 1999), 7-8.

[379] Sigmund Mowinckel, *He that Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, translated by G. W. Anderson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 23, 25. See also John Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, edited by John Day, JSOTSup 270 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 72-90. Similarly, cf. Bernard M. Levinson, "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah," *VT* 51/4 (2001): 511.
On the other hand, Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 338-339, thinks that the differences between Israel's monarchy and that of other ANE states are more significant than the similarities. While Frankfort's work is an appropriate caution against assuming too much similarity between the various states in the ANE, he sometimes seems to draw too stark a contrast. For example, he thinks of 2 Samuel 23:3-4 as being the exception, rather than the rule in terms of the connection of the king, the people, and nature. However, is it certain that it is exceptional? As will be pointed out later in this chapter, there are many other clues that the view of kingship which is reflected in 2 Samuel 23:3-4 is found in other sections of the Old Testament as well.

Furthermore, the king is sometimes portrayed as one who does not mediate life to his people, but rather, death.[380]

Similarly, life is frequently associated with kings in the Old Testament in a positive manner. The king is one who receives life from God. The king (or perhaps the king's dynasty) is wished eternal or long life, or is said to possess eternal or long life. The king also mediates God's gift of life to his people, by providing water and fertility.[381]

At other times, the king's connection with life is portrayed in a negative fashion in the Old Testament. His reign may be shortened by God, due to the king's disobedience. The king is sometimes depicted in the Old Testament as one who fails to mediate life to his people, or even as one who mediates death. Indeed, the wish for a long or "eternal" life for the king and/or his dynasty is sometimes presented in a very problematic light.[382]

In this chapter, some of the positive and negative portrayals of kings, and their connection with life, will be surveyed. There will be two major sections. In the first section, positive and negative portrayals of kings and their connection with life in the ANE, excluding for the moment, the portrayal of the kings of Israel and Judah, will be discussed. In the second section, positive and negative portrayals of kings in the Old Testament, leaving out Genesis 2-3, will discussed.

---

[380] Evidence and citations of scholarly literature, as well as of primary sources (in translation) for these general observations will be given below.

[381] Evidence for these observations will be given below.

[382] Evidence for these observations will be given below.

It has often been assumed that, with the possible exception of certain segments of Israelite society, kingship was uniformly portrayed in a positive light in the ANE[383]. This is not entirely accurate. Certainly, monarchy is the only form of government that the ANE seems to have recognized. As Baines notes, in Egypt, "[f]rom the state perspective, the ideological alternative to kingship was not some other form of rule but chaos."[384] This seems to have been the general mind-set in the ANE.

On the other hand, it may well be that this widespread assumption of a positive perception of kingship has resulted from an excessive concentration upon royal monuments and inscriptions. As Leprohon points out, scholars need to ". . . investigate all of the primary sources, from the loftiest royal rescripts and sacred temple images to the profane classic folktales, the last of which can portray the kings in less than respectful tones."[385] The same may be said of royal ideology in Mesopotamia and the Western Levant.

However, it can scarcely be denied that the extant literature is primarily from elites. It would, no doubt, have been difficult for much anti-royal polemic to be preserved. Subordinate groups may tell stories and sing songs, but more durable media (such as stone inscriptions) are not as likely to be preserved for them.

---

[383] Israel may seem to be an exception. Cf. Norman K. Gottwald, "Early Israel as an Anti-Imperial Community," in *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*, edited by Richard A. Horsley (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 9. For the contrary position, cf. J. M. Roberts, "In Defense of the Monarchy," 377-396.

[384] John Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 17.

[385] Ronald J. Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," in *The Ancient Near East*, edited by Jack Sasson, 1:273-287 (New York: Scribner, 2000), 274. Of course, folk tales are often transmitted orally. When such tales are written down, they are likely preserved by a powerful elite, if not by the royal court itself. These tales would, then, likely be edited so that anti-elite or anti-monarchic elements would be softened.

Although life is regarded as a gift of the gods to all humankind in the ANE, it is especially a gift given to kings. While metaphors that describe this gift vary somewhat from culture to culture—as well as across time—the connection itself is fundamental to ANE royal ideology. This worldview frequently referred to the king as the receiver of life from the gods. Another positive way of expressing this royal worldview is the statement, or the wish, that the king, or his dynasty, will or should "live forever". The king is also the mediator of life and fertility to his people. At times, the king is also portrayed as giving life to the peoples of other lands.

The Royal Ideology of Life in Egypt

Perhaps the closest connection between the king and life is to be found in Egypt,[386] although this connection may have been more an ideal than a reality.[387] While life is seen as a divine gift to all humankind,[388] it is especially the king who receives life from the gods.[389] The Egyptian symbol for "life", the pictogram ☥ (*ankh*), is the final element in many Egyptian royal titles, providing a statement that the pharaoh is "given life".[390] Often this is associated with a god who gives to the pharaoh life that is like the life of that god.[391] This recognition that pharaoh is given life by one or more gods is

---

[386] Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 309-310.

[387] Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," 273.

[388] James P. Allen, "From Papyrus Leiden I 350 (1.16)," in *COS* 1:24. Of Amun it is said,
"He began crying out while the world was in stillness,
his yell in circulation while he had no second,
that he might give birth to what is and cause them to live,
and cause every person to know the way to walk.
their hearts live when they see him."

[389] Elke Blumenthal, Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches I: die Phraseologie. ASAW, p.-h. 61/1 (Berlin (East): Akademie-Verlag, 1970), 82-84.

[390] John Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 22. Similarly, see Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 28-30.

[391] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship, 2.

attested from earliest dynastic times onward.[392] Leprohon points out that the *ankh*, the sign of life, is one of three major symbols of the pharaohs that grace their scepters. These symbols are frequently portrayed in iconography as being given to the pharaohs by the gods.[393]

Several of the pharaoh's have the word *ankh* in their names, particularly in their throne names.[394] These names seem to posit some connection between the pharaoh and life. Such names as Merenre ('Ankhkatu) Intef II (Wah'ankh), Senwosret I (Ankhmeswe), Ameny Intef IV (Seankhibre), and Semenkhare (Ankh-kheperu-re) are typical.

It must be acknowledged that the king receiving life from the gods may suggest a position of inferiority to the gods.[395] Indeed, Egyptian kings are sometimes listed as separate from both humanity and the gods.[396] However, no matter the precise understanding of the connection, there does appear to be a close connection between pharaohs and life—at least in terms of the language used.

In Egypt the king not only received life from the gods, but also mediated life to humans.[397] In iconography, he often holds the hieroglyph for life,[398]

---

[392] Ibid., 22.

[393] Cf. Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt, 276.

[394] However, other Egyptians besides Pharaohs also had names which incorporated the *ankh* symbol, and it is impossible to ascertain the precise function of the word *ankh* in royal names.. For example, cf. Peter A. Clayton, *Chronicle of the Pharaohs: The Reign-By-Reign Record of the Rulers and Dynasties of Ancient Egypt* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994), 71. Ankhtify, a warrior during the weak Herakleopotian Dynastic Period (2160-2040 B.C.E.) has the *ankh* symbol as part of his name. There is no way of discerning if many of the common people might have had the *ankh* as part of their name as well. It is therefore unwise to infer too much from its use for kings.

[395] John Baines, "Kingship, Definition of Culture, and Legitimation," in *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*, edited by David O'Connor and David P. Silverman (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 11.

[396] Ibid., 10.

[397] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship," 22.

[398] Cf. Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," 276.

and ". . . faces toward an implied humanity rather than toward the gods."[399] *The Instruction of Ptahhotep* (plausibly, according to Lichtheim, toward the end of the Sixth Dynasty) speaks of the putative author, Ptahhotep, who is ". . . Mayor of the city, the Vizier . . ." as having received ". . . one-hundred-and-ten years of life as gift of the king . . . ."[400]

Often, his function in the giving of life is associated with air or breath,[401] as well as with the provision of water, and fruitfulness.[402] Wifall notes that, ". . . a building inscription of Amen-hotep III to the god Amon-Re states that the god 'gives to them the breath of life.'" The word "them" refers to the Asiatics who bring to the pharaoh their children, so that the pharaoh may give them "the breath of life".[403] While life is certainly a gift given by god or the gods—in this case, by Amon-Re—life is also a gift that the pharaoh mediates to others. In a similar vein, Bonhême notes that ". . . "Ahmose 'infuses the noses of women with the breath of life.'"[404]

Indeed, as Mowinckel notes, in Egypt, all life, order, and fertility was associated with the king.[405] "In himself he embodies and holds in harmonious equilibrium the two powers, Life and Death, the gods Horus and Seth, who are in conflict, and yet, by the very tension between them, create and renew

---

[399] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship," 23.

[400] Miriam Lichtheim, translator, Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings: Volume I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms (Berkeley: University of California, 1975), 76.

[401] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship," 23.

[402] Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 57-60.

[403] Walter Wifall, "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b," *CBQ* 36/2 (1974): 238, fn. 11. Cf. James B. Pritchard, editor, 3rd edition, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press) 1969, 376, column 1, lines 24-25. Note also (lines 36, 38-39) that "the countries of Punt come to pharaoh to beg him for "the breath of [his] giving".

[404] Marie-Ange Bonhême, "Kingship," *OEAE*. 2: 239. Ahmose reigned from ca. 1550-1525 .

[405] Ibid., 28-29.

life."[406] Furthermore, the pharaoh ". . . gives life to men. He is the 'ka' or life-force of all his subjects."[407]

In Egypt, the king is frequently wished a long or eternal life. Indeed, the king is often thought of as living, in some sense, forever. Pepi I (ca. 2332 – 2283), in a royal temple decree, speaks of himself as having been given ". . . life, duration, and dominion; may he live like Re."[408] In a tomb inscription, Neferkare (Pepi II) speaks of himself as one ". . . who lives forever."[409] The *Instruction of Ptahhotep* speaks of King Isesi (ca. 2388-2356) as one ". . . who lives for all eternity."[410]

However, not all the references to Egyptian kings are favorable, as Leprohon points out.[411] Our understanding of Egyptian royal ideology cannot (or, at least, should not) be based exclusively on royal inscriptions or formal art. Some genres seem to have presented the king more favorably than did other genres.[412] Of Khufu (ca. 2609-2584 BCE), Clayton writes, ". . . Khufu's character was severely blackened by later chroniclers and strongly contrasted with the lives of his successors Chephren (Khafte) and Mycerinus (Menkaure)."[413] Baines argues that references to Egyptian kings were not necessarily as universally positive as has been previously thought.[414] Particularly, in the first millennium, kings were portrayed in very mortal

---

[406] Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 28.

[407] Lichtheim, Volume I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms, 29.

[408] Ibid., 28.

[409] Ibid., 27. He does seem to have lived a long life, although not the one-hundred years which earlier scholars proposed. Cf. Jean Leclant, "Pepi II," *OEAE* 3: 34-35.

[410] Ibid., 62.

[411] Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," 274.

[412] Silverman, "The Nature of Egyptian Kingship," 50. Cf. also Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," 274.

[413] Clayton, *Chronicle of the Pharaohs*, 46. It would seem that these "later chroniclers" were very late indeed. Zahi Hawass, "Khufu," *OEAE* 2: 234, cites only late Greek sources as portraying Khufu in a negative manner.[413]

[414] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship," 46.

terms.[415] Wente points out the fact that particular kings are sometimes criticized in private letters.[416] According to Posener, some Egyptian kings appear to be compromised in some of the tales.[417]

One example of a very negative portrayal of a pharaoh is noted by Silverman. Silverman notes that Queen Hatshepsut was portrayed in pornographic graffiti that seems to be a form of political satire. The artist, who was apparently a scribe, was probably commenting on this particular queen rather than on the institution of kingship per se.[418]

The words of Rib-Adii to the pharaoh also paint a somewhat negative picture of pharaoh's capacity to "give breath" to his dependents in the Levant. Rib-Adii complains that the pharaoh has sent him no troops to hold his city, and that ". . . there was no breath of the mouth of the king to me . . . ."[419] The life-giving breath of pharaoh is only experienced if pharaoh sends archers to his loyal minion.

In the *Tale of Sinuhe*, when Sinuhe praises pharaoh rather extravagantly to his host in Canaan, one Ammunenshi, his host says, in effect, "That is all very well and good, but you are here. If you stay with me, I will do you good."[420] Thus, pharaoh's praise seems to cease at the border of Canaan, at least in this story. Yet, it is a story told in Egypt. This suggests that even

---

[415] Ibid.," 46-48.
[416] Edward Frank Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt*, SBLWAW 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 183, no. 301.
[417] Georges Posener, *De la Divinité du Pharaon*, CahSA 15 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1960), 89-103.
[418] Ibid., 57-58.
[419] Cf. Prichard, editor, *ANET*, 484, EA, No. 137, lines 71-72. Abimilki refers to Pharaoh as the one ". . . who gives life by his sweet breath."
[420] Lichtheim, Volume I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms, 226, lines 76-78.

Egyptians can tell and hear stories in which pharaoh is spoken of in less than exalted terms.

However, even when Egyptian kings were criticized, such criticism was couched in royal terms, and was implicit, if not hidden.[421] This tendency to critique certain aspects of royal ideology, or to criticize individual kings with royal language, demonstrates how prevalent the idea (and the ideal) of kingship was. Even in its breach, the connection between Egyptian kings and life was implied.

The Royal Ideology of Life in Mesopotamia

Concerning the relationship of rulers to the gods, and concerning the purpose of the kings, in Sumer, Assyria, and Babylonia, Lambert writes, "In one respect all three of these cultures were unanimous. Rulers ruled by the express authority of the gods, and were expected to create a prosperous, well-governed land. Documents of royal origin frequently state that this aim was achieved, but we do not know how far the subjects of the rulers agreed."[422] As in Egypt, Mesopotamian kings were most often portrayed in a very positive way. As Lambert has noted, nearly from the beginning of writing, writing existed mostly for ". . . the king, high officials and wealthy businessmen. Thus, royalty figures often in the surviving documents, but rarely is criticism of it preserved—for obvious reasons."[423]

In Mesopotamia, life was also considered a gift from the gods, sometimes said to be given to humankind in general. Note the phrase, "Gula, who gives

---

[421] Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship," 17.

[422] Lambert, "Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by John Day, 55.

[423] Ibid., 54.

life to mankind . . . ."[424] However, life is more often regarded a gift given by the gods to kings. In a document entitled, "Prayer of Ashurbanipal to Ninlil," Ashurbanipal affirms both Ninlil's gift of life to all people ("the dark-headed race"), but is especially grateful for Ninlil's concern for protecting the life of the king. Thus, in line 7, Ashurbanipal writes, "Mankind, the dark-headed race, pray unto thee for their life." In line 17, Ashurbanipal writes, "Thy . . . . ., whom thou hast succoured unto life, and whose soul thou hast protected,—." Despite the broken nature of this line, it occurs immediately after a section that begins with Ninlil's gifts to Ashurbanipal and the royal line from which he has sprung (line 15ff.)[425] For example, "you kept me protected in your life-giving baby-sling and watched over me."[426]

Another text that speaks of life as a gift that the gods gave to all mankind, but also that life was especially given by the gods to kings is from Samsuiluna, son of Hammurabi (ca. 1750-1712). He names a wall "Shamash-Has-Bestowed-on-Samsuilua-Lordship-Strength-and-Life."[427] The sturdiness of the wall (as well as the inscription itself) was, no doubt, designed to impress upon the one seeing them the power and vitality of the king.

Sometimes, the gift of life to Mesopotamian kings is intensified by a wish for "everlasting" life. Wishes for a long life (or even for "everlasting" life) for the king abound, a fact that is often obscured by English translations that

---

[424] Cf. "balāṭu," *CAD* 2:47. [The reference is to Küchler Beitr., plate 2:25.] Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, revised edition, completed by Erica Reiner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 304-305 notes that Gula was the goddess "of death and healing", and is referred to as "the Great Lady Physician."

[425] S. Langdon, Babylonian Penitential Psalms to which are added Fragments of the Epic of Creation from Kish in the Weld Collection of the Ashmolean Museum Excavated by the Oxford-Field Museum Expedition, OECuT 7 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927), 72-73.

[426] "balāṭu," *CAD* 2:47. [The reference is to *OCuT* 6, pl. 13:17.]

[427] "balāṭu," *CAD* 2:47.

translate with the words "be well", or "be in good health."[428] Michalowski points out that a common Sumerian expression (which has the Sumerian word *ti*, the equivalent to Akkadian *balāṭu*) is used is used as a blessing for King Shulgi, and that the same expression is used for Hammurabi.[429]

Michalowski suggests as an idiomatic rendering of the wish, "Long live the king!" Similarly, a lack of concern for the king's life is a serious sign of disrespect, if not of insubordination. Shulgi's grand vizier, Aradmu, is irate at the fact that neither Apilaša nor his servants enquire about the king's life.[430]

Often the king is wished eternal life.[431] However, here (as will be seen later in dealing with the comparable Hebrew root עלם), one should not think of eternity as timelessness. Rather, one should probably think in terms of a long reign, and extended dynasty, and enduring fame.[432] Nevertheless, whatever the particular, and no doubt varied, understandings of the wishes for life may have been, it is noteworthy that the language of life is so often part of royal ideology.

Furthermore, Mesopotamian kings not only receive life from the gods, but are also responsible to mediate that life in relation to their subjects. King

---

[428] Although these translations may accurately reflect the meaning of the phrase, they may also obscure the fact that the same (or similar) Akkadian words and phrases are being used.
[429] Piotr Michalowski, *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur: An Epistolary History of an Ancient Mesopotamian Kingdom* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 253-254. "This expression has a very specific technical meaning in this context. The term silim-ma is not "hail" or "bon santé" but a very specific obligation to inquire about the king's well-being and safety. It seems to allude to a blessing that was used in the time of Šulgi that might be idiomatically rendered as "Long Live the King." The wording of this blessing is explicitly provided in ArŠ4: 6–7 (letter 8). Cf. also Winter, "Touched by the Gods," 82-83.
[430] Ibid., 250. It should be noted (275-276) that Shulgi, in his letter which replies to Aradmu, seems to be unconcerned about the supposed breach of royal protocol. Shulgi is more concerned with how things are really going on the frontier. This might suggest that Shulgi was not enamored by his own royal ideology.
[431] Cf. "dārū," *CAD* 3: 115-118. The word dārū is used of kingship and royal lineage (116-117). It is also worth noting that it is sometimes connected with life (117).
[432] These are some of the translations which are suggested by the *CAD* article.

Lipit-Ishtar of Isin (ca. 1934-1924 B.C.E.),[433] claims to be "the life of the land of Sumer".[434] His strength and his beneficent provisions for the land of Sumer stem from the fact that he is the son of Enlil, as Lipit-Ishtar repeatedly states.[435] Thus, the king and his god—as well as other gods who are also given honorable mention in the hymn—are very closely identified in the mediation of life.[436]

Kings are sometimes associated with a "plant of life," although the exact nature of such an association may elude us. There is, for example, a mysterious reference to "the plant of life" in a letter from one of the servants of the king. "When I acquired the plant of life of the eclipse of Tammuz (IV), it disappeared in the king's presence."[437] In another letter, a man named "Rašil" thanks the king for his past mercies to him, but also says, "You are a merciful king. You have done good to all the four quarters of the earth and [placed] the plant of life in their nostrils."[438]

Shulgi is described as ". . . a fruit-bearing mes-tree that stands beneath the gods and above the watercourses".[439] It is said of Shulgi,

---

[433] A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, revised edition, completed by Erica Reiner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 406.
[434] A. Falkenstein, and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und Akkadische Hymnen und Gebete* (Zürich: Artemis Verlags, 1953), 127.
[435] Ibid., 126, 127, 130.
[436] Cf. Alasdair Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea*, SAA 3.39 (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1989), page 100, #39, lines 25-26, where the king seems to be identified with the god Ninurta.
[437] Simo Parpola, editor, *State Archives of Assyria, Volume X: Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993) letter 371, p. 308, lines 12-13. This reference to the plant of life may or may not be connected with the sending of "sorceresses" to the king, which is mentioned in the same letter. However, the fact that they are mentioned in the same letter may indicate a connection.
[438] Ibid., letter 166, p. 128, line 13.
[439] Andrew C. Cohen, Death Rituals, Ideology, and the Development of Early Mesopotamian Kingship: Toward a New Understanding of Iraq's Royal Cemetery of Ur, AMD 7 (Leiden: Brill/Styx: 2005), 123. Cf. also Jacob Klein, The Royal Hymns of Shulgi King of Ur: Man's

> On the day of his elevation to kingship,
> He radiated like a fertile m e s – tree, watered by fresh water,
> Extending (his) blossoming branches toward the pure water-course;
> Upon his blossoming branches Utu conferred the (following) blessing:
> "Being a fertile m e s – tree, he has borne pure fruit,
> Sulgi, the righteous shepherd of Sumer, will truly spread abundance!"[440]

Other Mesopotamian literature also refer to the king's role as being (or providing) the plant of life. For example, in a neo-Babylonian letter, the writer says, "the king, my lord, has revived us . . . he has placed the Plant-of-Life at our nostrils".[441] Esarhaddon prays, ". . . [M]ay my royal rule be as pleasing to people as the Plant-of-Life".[442]

In a flattering letter of petition from Adad-shumu-uṣur to Ashurbanipal, Adad-shumu-uṣur refers to the king's reign as established and blessed by the gods Shamash and Adad, and bringing great fruitfulness in human births, an abundance of water and crops.[443] Furthermore, the king has pardoned prisoners and healed the sick. This is a description of the good life indeed! Hammurabi is also referred to as "the lord who keeps Uruk alive, providing its people with water in abundance."[444] Of Iddin-dagan, it is said: "According to the word of Enlil, your gaze gives life to men, your word heals men."[445] Zaccagnini points out that this theme of providing water, and even the way the

---

Quest for Immortal Fame, TAPS 71/7 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1981), 11.

[440] Ibid., 24, fn. 122. While Klein points out various "tree-metaphors" in connection with various early Mesopotamian kings, he also warns about the danger of interpreting the metaphors literally, or pressing the metaphors too far.

[441] "balāṭu," *CAD* 2:49. Cf. *ABL* 771:6, edited by R. F. Harper [14 vols.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1892-1914).

[442] "balāṭu," CAD 2:49. Cf. R. Borger, Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien (=AfO 9), 26.

[443] Lambert, "Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia," 69-70. Cf. also Tammi J. Schneider, *An Introduction to Ancient Mesopotamian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 119, 128. Schneider notes (119) that one of functions of kings in Mesopotamia was "providing abundance" for his people. This seems to be especially significant because Mesopotamian religion is very oriented toward this life, rather than some future life after death.

[444] Theophile J. Meek, "The Code of Hammurabi," in Prichard, editor, *ANET*, 3rd edition, page 164, column ii, lines 39-40.

[445] Cf. *SAHG*, 253.

theme is expressed, span the period from Hammurabi (1792-1750 B.C.E.) to the time of Sennacherib (704-681).[446]

Many other ANE materials show evidence of a various connections between the king and life.[447] For example, in Hammurabi's inscription in connection with building the wall of the cloister in Sippar,[448] the king says the following.

> I, Ḫa[m]mu-rāpi, [mighty], k[ing of Babylon],, when the god Utu, my lord, . . .,. . ., I, being one who heeds the word which he has spoken . . . .[449]
>
> At that time, in order to increase (the amount of) food, I piled up a dike in the flooded field (and) built the wall of the cloister upon it.[450]
>
> I dug there the canal Aia-ḫegal ("Aia is abundance") and poured abundant water in it.[451]

In the prologue to the Law Code of Hammurabi, the king says that he ". . . brought about plenty and abundance . . . ."[452] In the prologue to the law code that bears his name, Hammurabi boasts of several things. These may be summarized as his appointment by the gods, his proficiency in war, his piety, particularly in caring for or reestablishment of temples, his provision of water and abundance for the various cities that he controlled, and giving life to the cities under his charge.

---

[446] Carlo Zaccagnini, "An Urartean Royal Inscription in the Report of Sargon's Eighth Campaign," in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis: Papers of a Symposium held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980, OAC 17 (Roma: Instituto Per L'Oriente, 1981), 259-295. Cf. especially 286-291.

[447] Cf. especially *CAD* 2:55-56.

[448] Cf. Douglas Frayne, The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Early Periods / 4: Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595), (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 332.

[449] Ibid., 332.

[450] Ibid., 333.

[451] Ibid., 333.

[452] Robert Francis Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, about 2250 B.C.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904),

Often related to the provision of water, although sometimes mentioned separately, is the planting of gardens, or being a gardener.[453] However, the idea that kings in the ANE were routinely referred to as "gardeners" *per se* is difficult to substantiate.[454] Gowan has warned against thinking that the references to kings as "gardeners" in the ANE are clearer than they are.[455]

On the other hand, it seems safe to speak more generally and say that kings are frequently associated with gardens, both textually and iconographically.[456] In particular, large and varied orchards, by their very nature, would have been established and maintained by the wealthy and powerful. Who would be more wealthy and powerful than the king? Thus, it is not at all surprising to find kings boasting of establishing large and elaborate gardens.[457] Stronach thinks that 900 and 500 B.C.E. was ". . . a period within which one or another outstanding monarch, whether Assyrian, Babylonian, or

---

[453] Nicolas Wyatt, "'Supposing Him to be the Gardener' (John 20:15): A Study of the Paradise Motif in John," 61-76.

[454] A student at Hebrew Union College, Michael, stated that Dr. David M. Weisberg said to him that the Akkadian word for "gardener" is really only used in connection with the birth narrative of Sargon.
Unfortunately, Dr. Weisberg has departed this world, so this could not be verified. Certainly, the *CAD* does not list the words, which relate to gardening as particularly related to kings. Indeed, these words are more often used of common gardeners.
Even in the Birth Narrative of Sargon, the precise function of Sargon saying, "During my garden work, Ištar loved my (so that) 55 years I ruled as king," is by no means certain. Does it suggest, as was thought by scholars early on, that Sargon had usurped the throne? This would be strange in an otherwise laudatory tale. Is it simply a motif which the author used to highlight the "rags-to-riches nature of this story? (This seems to be the basic approach of Brian Lewis, *The Sargon Legend: A Study of the Akkadian Text and the Tale of the Hero Who Was Exposed at Birth,* ASORDS 4 (Cambridge, MA.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980), 249. Similarly, see Sabina Franke, "Kings of Akkad: Sargon and Naram-Sin," *CANE* 2: 831-841, especially page 836.

[455] Donald E. Gowan, *When Man Becomes God* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1975), 79-80. Cf. also Jacob Klein, *The Royal Hymns of Shulgi King of Ur: Man's Quest for Immortal Fame*, TAPS 71/7 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1981), 11, 24, fn. 122.

[456] Cf. Kathryn L. Gleason, "Gardens in Preclassical Times," *OEANE* 2: 382-385; David Stronach, "The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C." *BAI*, n.s. 4 (1990): 171-180.

[457] Cf. Arie Van der Kooij, "The Story of Paradise in the Light of Mesopotamian Culture and Literature," in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms: A Festschrift to Honour Professor John Emerton for his Eightieth Birthday*, VTSup 135, edited by Katharine J. Dell, Graham Davies, and Yee Von Koh (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 3-20.

Achaemenid, can be seen to have turned to the creation of a great park or garden in order to underscore the accomplishments of his reign."[458] While specific reference to the king as a "gardener" seems to be limited to Sargon I, the association of kings with gardens is widespread.[459]

This positive assessment of kings is not, however, the only way in which kings are presented in Mesopotamia. Postgate thinks of the *Curse of Agade* as evincing the same royal ideology as is seen in other Sumerian and Akkadian materials. It simply does so more covertly.[460] However, one wonders if the *Curse of Agade* may have been intended to provide guidance for the present king. Under the text, there might well be a subtext that carried the message, "And if you, the present king, make the same mistakes, you and your (our) city will face a similar fate."[461]

The classic case of a negative portrayal of a king's connection with life is in the *Gilgamesh Epic*. This negative portrayal of a king is especially noteworthy because it occurs in a document that seems to have been widespread in its distribution and its influence. Furthermore, many later kings of Mesopotamia portrayed themselves as descendants (or "brothers") of Gilgamesh.[462] This negative aspect is especially important to the argument

---

[458] David Stronach, "The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, n.s. 4 (1990): 171.
[459] Ibid.
[460] Postgate, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad," 396.
[461] Cf. Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, 285. Sparks thinks of the *Curse* as a theological justification of the transition from Akkad in the north to Ur in the south. However, as Sparks acknowledges concerning the author, ". . . his more subtle motivations for composing the text are not clear."
[462] Christopher Woods, "Sons of the Sun: The Mythological Foundations of the First Dynasty of Uruk," *JANER* 12/1 (2012): 78-79.

here presented, because the Eden Narrative has so many points of contact with themes and motifs in *Gilgamesh*.[463]

Sometimes, the polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology of kingship in *Gilgamesh* has been deemphasized (or even ignored) because Gilgamesh has been interpreted as "everyman" by Western readers and scholars.[464] However, it seems significant that Gilgamesh is the king of Uruk.[465] The futility of his quest for eternal life (or for eternal youthfulness) is finally made apparent to him by the loss of the plant of life to the serpent. This plant would have "made the old man young again." Gilgamesh returns to reign over Uruk, knowing that he cannot live forever. Even a king—indeed, even a king who is two-thirds god—must die.

---

[463] Cf. Blenkinsopp, "Gilgamesh and Adam," 85-101. Blenkinsopp, 93-95, holds that Enkidu is more similar to Adam than is Gilgamesh. There are many similarities between Enkidu and Adam, but also between Adam and Gilgamesh. The combining of some of the characteristics and motifs of the two main characters from *Gilgamesh* is interesting, and would be worthy of further investigation. However, working this out in detail is beyond this present work.

[464] Cf., for example, Tzvi Abusch, "The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay," *JAOS* 121/4 (2001): 614. For a perceptive critique of this approach, cf Wyatt, *Myths of Power*, 368-369.

[465] Cf. Andrew George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh: The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian* (New York: Barns and Noble, 1999), xiii. George thinks of "the proper duties of a king" is one of the themes of the epic. See also Tzvi Abusch, "The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay," *JAOS* 121/4 (2001): 614-622. See also David Damrosch, *The Hidden Book: The Loss and Rediscovery of the Great Epic of Gilgamesh* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), 199. Damrosch comments, "The Gilgamesh epic highlighted a range of problems confronting ancient kings and their subjects. . . . For all his godlike splendor, though, Gilgamesh is far from a model ruler. The initial verses introduce troubling notes of violence, excess, and lack of control . . . ."

On the other hand, cf. Daniel E. Fleming and Sara J. Milstein, *The Buried Foundation of the Gilgamesh Epic: The Akkadian Huwawa Narrative*, CM 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 37, 61, who point out that some of the older Akkadian versions of the *Huwawa Narrative* (which they take to be based on a separate narrative) do not make much of Gilgamesh's royal status, at least not explicitly. Appropriate caution must be used at this point. Not all versions and antecedents of *Gilgamesh* can be reduced to one meaning or one emphasis.

George points out that mortality is one of the crucial themes of the *Epic* in all its permutations.[466] However, even George seems to think that Gilgamesh becomes a type of "everyman".

> Gilgameš, formerly a lofty hero and majestic warrior-king, becomes a figure that, above all, suffers, a person with whom any man can identify. In this way he turns into a character more akin to the subject of the Poem of the Righteous Sufferer (a first-person autobiography) than to the mighty monarchs glorified in an earlier epoch—Šulgi and Sargon, for example. When the poem was restructured as a third-person autobiography in the format of *narû*-literature, it became more explicitly a vehicle for wisdom. The evolution of the poem's message lies in the manner and emphasis of its delivery, rather than in a preoccupation with new concerns.[467]

The tendency to treat *Gilgamesh* as a paradigmatic story that deals with universal human realities, may have contributed to a downplaying of the story's agenda of calling into question certain aspects of royal ideology of kingship.[468] However, Gilgamesh is repeatedly described as a king.[469] Furthermore, in ANE thought, the king was sometimes connected with ancient kings. In addition, the king was, in a sense, the embodiment of his people. As Tigay has pointed out, the late version of the *Gilgamesh Epic* begins with conventional language of being chosen by the gods for kingship from birth.[470]

---

[466] A. R. George, "The Epic of Gilgameš: Thoughts on Genre and Meaning," 37-65. (Cf. especially p. 57.)

[467] Ibid., 57. Similarly, cf. N.K. Sandars, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Penguin Classics (London: Penguin, 1960), 7. In the first line of his introduction, Sandars mentions that Gilgamesh was the king of Uruk. However, Sandars almost immediately describes the story as expressing ". . . a very human concern with mortality . . . ."

[468] Cf., for example, Blenkinsopp, "Gilgamesh and Adam," 85-101 (especially, p. 86).

[469] The same may be said of Ziusudra. Cf. Jacobsen, Thorkild. "The Eridu Genesis." *JBL* 100/4 (198): 516, 522. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading*, JSOTSup 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 66-67, notes that, "[i]n the Sumerian Flood Story Ziusudra bears the title of king. . . . The portrait of the hero as a king corresponds to the section before, which deals with the origin of civilization (co. 11). Essential for the establishment of civilization is that "the lofty crown and the throne of kingship had come down from heaven" (11, 89). The sentence introduces the foundation of the five cities that according to the composition became the cornerstones of civilization in antediluvian time. In Gilgamesh Utnapišti is not directly called a king, but his royal status seems presupposed. He is connected with Shuruppak, the last city in the list of the cities in the Sumerian Flood Story, where he is called "son of Ubar-Tut" XI, 11-13, 23)."

[470] Tigay, Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic, 153-158.

> Like the hymnic epithets at the beginning of section c, the description of the divine creation and endowment of the hero seems to have been modeled on that topos as it appears in royal inscriptions and hymns. The closest parallels currently known are found in inscriptions. In view of the numerous parallels between royal inscriptions and royal hymns, and of the biographical content of the latter, it would not be surprising to find this topos in royal hymns as well. The hymns do indeed contain numerous formulas of the type "endowed with such-and-such a quality by the god so-and-so.[471]

Tigay also notes the similarity of the late version of *Gilgamesh* to the self-description of Ashurbanipal.[472] Indeed, as Tigay points out, there are many parallels between the account of Gilgamesh's birth and that of Mesopotamian kings.[473]

This emphasis upon Gilgamesh as king is not merely a late development in the stories about Gilgamesh. In the Sumerian tale, *The Death of Gilgamesh*, Enlil created Gilgamesh for kingship, but not eternal life.[474] Here, kingship and life are mentioned in contradistinction to one another. The king is not the mediator of life. He does not even possess eternal life himself. George comments, ". . . the incipit of at least one of the Old Babylonian versions of the epic, that represented by the Pennsylvania and Yale tablets, was 'Surpassing all other kings' (*šūtur eli šarrī*)."[475] Yet such preeminence does not include eternal life. If this is so for Gilgamesh, how much more true would it be of lesser kings?

---

[471] Ibid., 156.

[472] Ibid., 156, 154. Tigay's reference here is to D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, 2 volumes (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1926-1927) vol. 2, § 986.

[473] Tigay, Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic, 153-158.

[474] S. N. Kramer, "The Death of Gilgamesh," in *ANET*, 3rd edition, p. 50, section A, lines 33-35.

[475] A.R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts,* volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 29. George acknowledges that in the Standard Babylonian Text, the first twenty-eight lines, which speak of the travails of Gilgamesh, are added, and thus the incipit (which is, of course, no longer an incipit) is moved to l. 29 of tablet I.
For references to the possibly historical aspect of Gilgamesh's kingship, cf. George, *Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 101-106.

George also notes, in his introduction to *Gilgamesh*, that the epic is concerned, not only with the theme of mortality, but also with the proper behavior of kings.[476] Davenport regards *Gilgamesh* as having to do with royal behavior. According to her, the epic is designed to be specifically "anti-imperialist".[477]

Abusch suggests a very schematic way of understanding the meaning of the three successive major versions of the epic.[478] Abusch's essay also holds that all of the three major versions of the story deal with kingship in some way.[479] He thinks that in all three versions, Gilgamesh seeks immortality, and discovers that this is impossible.[480] In the Old Babylonian Version, he is told by Siduri that he needs to settle down and become a family man.[481] In the "Eleven-Tablet Version" (which Abusch takes to be identical with the first eleven tablets of the Standard Babylonian Version[482]), Gilgamesh is urged to become a responsible ruler.[483] In the twelve-tablet version, he prepares to be the king of the world of the dead.[484] It may be doubtful as to whether such a schematic approach can account for all the differences and similarities in the various fragmentary versions that have been discovered thus far. However,

---

[476] George, The Epic of Gilgamesh, xiii.

[477] Tracy Davenport, "An Anti-Imperialist Twist to 'The Gilgameš Epic'," in *Gilgameš and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Mandelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21-23 July 2004*, edited by Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks, ANESSup 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 1-23.

[478] Tzvi Abusch, "The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay," *JAOS* 121/4 (2001): 614-622. (Cf. especially 614.) Similarly, see Tigay, *Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*, 242.

[479] Abusch, "Development and Meaning of Gilgamesh," 616.

[480] Ibid., 621.

[481] Ibid., 621-622.

[482] Ibid., 618.

[483] Ibid., 622.

[484] Ibid.

Abusch seems to be on target when he asserts that the *Gilgamesh Epic* is connected with kingship.

The Royal Ideology of Life in Hatti and the Western Levant

Concerning the Hittite Empire, Beckman notes that ". . . a boon granted to the king and his family constituted a gift to all of Hittite society. A prayer delivered to the god Telipinu on behalf of Murshili II requests. "To the king, queen, princes, and to the Land of Khatti give life, health, strength, long years, and joy in the future! [And to them] give future thriving of grain, vines, fruit, cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, asses—together with wild animals—and of human beings!"[485]

It is worthy of note that the royal family is mentioned first, and only afterwards the land. Furthermore, the prayer is for "life" and "long years", as well as for fertility of plants, animals, and humans. While the nature of the connection between the blessings upon the royal family and the rest of the blessings is not made explicit, it seems significant that they can be mentioned in the same breath, and that the royal family is mentioned first.

Bachvarova has discussed a Hurro-Hittite ritual in which kings from long ago and far away are all linked to the present king.[486] She thinks "[o]verall, the *šarrena* ritual suggests that the histories of the divine and human worlds were linked into a single master narrative by the middle of the second

---

[485] Gary Beckman, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Hittite Anatolia," in *The Ancient Near East*, edited by Jack Sasson (New York: Scribner, 2000), 1:531.
[486] Mary R. Bachvarova, "From 'Kingship in Heaven' to King Lists: Syro-Anatolian Courts and the History of the World," *JANES* 12 (2012): 97-118.

millennium BCE."[487] Such a narrative serves to legitimate a local royal court.[488]

While there is not as much literary and iconographic evidence from the Western Levant as there is from Egypt or Mesopotamia, the evidence there is suggests a similar attitude toward life and kingship. The material sometimes portrays this connection in a positive manner, with the king receiving life from the gods, mediating life to his people, and having life or living forever. At other times, the connection between kings and life is placed in a more negative, problematic manner.

Turning to West Semitic writings, there is a very similar terminology connecting kings and life.[489] For example, in a letter from Abimilki of Tyre to Pharaoh Akh-en-Aton, Abimilki speaks of both Pharaoh and the Sun-God as those who give life through their sweet breath.[490]

Healey notes some interesting connections between Ugaritic materials and the Psalms.[491] He argues that Ugaritic kings were regarded as partaking of some sort of blessed life after death.[492]

(25) . . . *wtʿn. btlt*
ʿnt . ʿirš . ḫym . l aqḫṭ . ġzr
irš . ḫym . l atnk . bl mt
w ašlḥk . aššprk . ʿm . bʿl.
šnt . ʿm . bn il . tspr . yrḫm
(30) *k bʿl . k yḥwy . yʿšr . ḫwy . yʿš*
r . w yšqynh . ybd . w yšr . ʿlh

---

[487] Ibid., 97.

[488] Ibid., 98-99. While it is not pursued in this thesis, the literary linking of kings with ancient (even primeval) figures could be another piece of evidence for a royal aspect in the Eden Narrative.

[489] Douglas J. Green, "I Undertook Great Works": The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions, FAT, 2nd series 41 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[490] *ANET*, 484, EA, No. 147.

[491] Cf. J. Healey, "The Immortality of the King: Ugarit and the Psalms," *Or* 53 (1984): 245-254.

[492] Ibid., 249-250.

nʿm[n . w y] ʿnynn . ap ank . aḫwy
aqhṯ [.ġ]zr.
(35) *šrgk. ḫḫm.mt. ʾuḫryt.mh.yqḥ*
mh.yqḥ.mṯ. ʾaṯryt.spsg.ysk
lrʾiš. ḥrṣ.ḫr. qdqdy
[ ]mt.kl. ʾamt.wʾan.mtm. ʾamt[493]

25 And she answered, the virgin
'Anat: "Ask for life, O Aqhat, warrior,
ask for life, and I will give (it) to you, immortality,
and I will bestow (it) upon you. I will make you count with Baal'
years, with the sons of El you will number months.
30 Like Baal, as he gives life—he makes a feast for the one given life,
makes a feast and makes him drink; there chants and sings for him
a sweet singer—", and she said to him, "so I too will make live
Aqhat, the warrior." And Aqhat, the warrior, replied:
"Do not lie, O virgin. Behold to the warrior
35 your lies are filth. Death, the final lot, nothing takes away,
nothing takes away death, that which comes after. Glaze will be
poured upon (my) head, potash on top of my pate.
. . . the death of all I will die; indeed I will surely die."[494]

Whether or not Healey is correct in his understanding of the meaning of the terminology, it is worth noting that the language of eternality—however understood—occurs in connection with kings in material that is geographically close to Israel. It is clear that Anat is offering Aqhat, at the very least, a very long life. Furthermore, the language is very similar to that of Psalm 61:7.[495]

It should be noted that the language Anat to the king need not taken as sincere. Indeed, it almost certainly should be taken as a lie. In fact, Aqhat takes her words as untruthful.[496]

Keret and *Aqhat* deal with the theme of immortality (or, rather, its lack among human kind, even among kings). In addition to the theme of immortality, *Aqhat* also deals with the theme of fertility, as it is related to the

---

[493] Ibid., 246-247.

[494] Ibid., 247. For a somewhat different translation, cf. *ANET*, p. 151. Both translations agree on the matter of Anat's basic offer and Aqhat's adamant refusal.

[495] Psalm 61:7 will be discussed further in the sub-section, where Old Testament texts which connect the king with life will be treated.

[496] Cf. Healey, "The Immortality of the King," 247. Cf. lines 33-35 of the Ugaritic text.

earthly king, in the form of the crown prince. Thus, although Coogan thinks that *Aqhat* ". . . was preserved because it was, in the end, a good story,"[497] he comments in his introduction to the work,

> Nearly every Ugaritic text translated here has to do with fertility in some way, and *Aqhat* is no exception. Just as Baal's subjection to Death resulted in drought, so a drought followed Aqhat's murder. As the fragmentary texts which we have called *The Healers* suggest, the Aqhat cycle presumably continued with his restoration to life and the consequent return of fertility to the fields. For the king and, by extension, his son were vital to continued agricultural prosperity.[498]

Indeed, Anat herself connects Aqhat's death with the drought. Anat says, "and because of his death, the first fruits of summer have withered, the ear in its husk."[499] Natan-Yulzary thinks that the drought ends with Pughat's revenge upon Yatpan.[500] Ntan-Yulzary invokes 2 Samuel 21:1-14 as an example of the same motif.[501]

In the *Keret Story*, there are some of the same themes and motifs as in *Aqhat*, though developed in a somewhat different fashion. Parker has noted that there are ". . . two broad categories . . ." in the interpretation of *Keret*: the

---

[497] Cf. Michael David Coogan, editor and translator, *Stories from Ancient Canaan* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 31.

[498] Ibid., 30-31. Cf., however, Simon B. Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition*, SBLRBS 24 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 134-135. Parker does not agree with connecting *Aqhat* with *The Healers*, and thus thinking in terms of Aqhat's revivification. However, this does not touch the essential point. It is not argued here that Aqhat was restored to life. It does seem likely, however, that the drought ended with Aqhat's remains being given a proper burial, and with the avenging of Aqhat's death. In this, there may be an interesting parallel, but also a difference between *Aqhat* and 2 Samuel 21:1-14. In *Aqhat*, the order is proper burial, and then revenge. In 2 Samuel 21, the order is revenge, and then proper burial. If one thinks of end stress, the story in Aqhat may emphasize revenge, while 2 Samuel 21 may emphasize proper burial. However, both stories have both elements (revenge and proper burial), and in both cases these themes are connected with kings.

[499] Ibid., 40, tablet 3, lines 7-9.

[500] Cf. Shirly Natan-Yulzary, "Contrast and Meaning in the 'Aqhat Story," *VT* 62 (2012): 433-449.

[501] Ibid., page 446, fn. 34. He simply refers to the 2 Samuel passage, without comment.

"mythico-cultic or historico-political".[502] Parker himself seems to be in the historico-political camp.[503]

However, it may be asked if this is not a false dichotomy. Why could not history intersect with mythical and cultic concerns?[504] As is often the case, modern categories may serve heuristic purposes, but they may also mislead as to how the ancients would have told, heard, and thought about their own stories.

Whether the royal elements in *Keret* are "historicized myth" or "mythologized history", the royal element is prominent in the story. As Coogan points out, "The centrality of kingship as a Canaanite institution is well illustrated by the three tablets containing the story of Kirta."[505] Coogan goes on to note that, "[t]he hero of the cycle is a king, . . . and the basic theme that unites the episodes is the survival of his dynasty."[506]

Keret is also concerned with the connection between the king and the fertility of nature.

> . . . [T]he king was responsible for the prosperity of his subjects. There was a direct connection between the health of the king and the agricultural cycle, or, more accurately, the king and the gods were jointly responsible for the harvest. When Baal died, Death reigned and nothing grew; when the king was ill, the crops failed and famine resulted. Thus Kirta's sickness, the subject of the cycle's second episode, was a failure of kingship . . . .[507]

---

[502] Parker, The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition, 205.

[503] Ibid., 205-206.

[504] For a good discussion of the difference and overlap of myth and history, cf. Richard H. Moye, "In the Beginning: Myth and History in Genesis and Exodus," *JBL* 109/4 (1990): 577-598.

[505] Coogan, *Stories from Ancient Canaan*, 52. However, cf. Murray Howard Lichtenstein, "Episodic Structure in the Ugaritic Keret Legend: Comparative Studies in Compositional Technique" (PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1979), 410-431. Lichtenstein thinks that the primary themes of *Keret* are loss and restoration, as well as loyalty and its lack.

[506] Ibid.

[507] Ibid., 55.

Malamat has pointed out some of the concerns of the king of Byblos are particularly important for understanding Israel's royal ideology. These concerns include longevity of life, reign, and dynasty.

> "The pursuit of longevity for the monarch is a widespread motif in the ancient near East and frequently appears in royal petitions to patron deities. Particularly close in time and location to Solomon, kings of Byblos entreat their gods to grant them long life. An inscription of king YeHimilk (mid-10th century B.C.E.) states:
>
> May Baalšamem and the Lady of Byblos and the Assembly of the Holy Gods of Byblos prolong the days and years of YeHimilk over Byblos, for [he is] a righteous and upright king before the Holy Gods of Byblos!"[508]

It is difficult to decide how to categorize some of these examples of the portrayal of royalty just given. Should they be regarded as positive or negative?

Additionally, does a text call into question the immortality of only one king, or of kings in general? Certainly, the denial of life in the case of a particular king might be a criticism of that king, rather than a criticism of royal ideology, per se. However, the denial of a close and positive connection between a king and life in even one text could call the connection into question more generally. In any case, it can be stated with a fair degree of confidence that the language of life is closely associated with kings in the Ugaritic material.

Summary: Life and Kings in the ANE Outside of Israel

Outside of Israel, life is the gift of the gods to humankind. However, life is especially a gift that the gods give to the king. The king in turn gives life (or is life) to his people. Occasionally, the king is even the mediator of the life for foreign peoples. In a similar vein, kings are often associated with the

---

[508] Abraham Malamat, "Longevity: Biblical Concepts and Some Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," *AfOB* 19 (1982): 215-224, reprinted in *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues*, CHANE 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 397.

provision of water, with large and ornate gardens, and with fertility, all of which are related to and help to comprise life.

Kings are also frequently associated with eternal life. The exact nature of the ancient reader/hearer of such stories and language may be impossible to ascertain. However such language was understood, such language is redolent of royal ideology in the ANE.

There are also literary materials that seem to call into question the association of life with kings. The lives and reigns of certain kings may be shortened, due to their injustice or impiety. Especially stories such as the *Gilgamesh Epic*, *Keret*, and *Aqhat* seem to convey that, in at least some cases, kings are not to be associated in an unreserved manner with life and fertility. Kings are sometimes rather pointedly portrayed as not living forever.

Life and Kings in Israel/Judah in the Old Testament Excluding Genesis 2-3

While the connection between kings and life does not seem to be quite as strong in Israel and Judah as elsewhere in the ANE, the connection is still present. Sometimes, these associations are positive in nature, but at other times, the associations are negative. First, the positive associations will be discussed, and then those connections that seem to have a negative valence with regard to royal ideology. Then, the evidence will be examined under the same rubrics that were used for the rest of the ANE: the connections of God as the giver of life—and sometimes, as the giver of "eternal life"[509]—to kings, and kings as mediators of life to their people, including motifs and themes related to life (fertility, water, and gardens).

---

[509] The expression "eternal life" is enclosed in double quotation marks in order to express the treatment of it as a questionable term, which is patient of many nuances, most of which may not suggest never-ending life.

Similarly to the conception of the rest of the ANE, in Israel and Judah, life is a gift that God gives to all humans.[510] Indeed, the fact that God gives life to all humankind seems to be emphasized in the Old Testament more than it is in the rest of the ANE—at least, in the documents now extant. This, in itself, may be significant. Frequently, these Old Testament references are in contexts in which the king does not make even a cameo appearance. This may suggest a relatively lesser significance for the king as mediator of life in the Old Testament's conception of human life.

However, not too much should be built on this narrow foundation. As is often the case, the quantity of ANE documents that evince a particular emphasis may be connected primarily with the documents that have been discovered, rather than with the real literary remains of a people. This realization should render all conclusions tentative.

Even in the Old Testament—and similarly to what is observed in the rest of the ANE—God gives life to the king. While this certainly suggests a positive connection between the king and life, it is not usually expressed in a categorical statement, but rather, is expressed as a wish or prayer.[511] Furthermore, a precise interpretation of the relevant phrases may be impossible to establish. Is the primary emphasis upon the words "God gives," or on the words "to the king?" Is the gift of life to the king conditional, or unconditional?

---

[510] Cf., for example, Deuteronomy 8:3; 32:39; 1 Samuel 2:6; Job 27:3; 34:14; 34:15; Psalms 22:29; 30:3; 68:20; 104:30; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Isaiah 38:16-20. However, note that, even in the case of 1 Samuel 2:1-10, there are royal overtones (cf. v. 10).

[511] 1 Kings 1:31 (in which the verb is jussive) is typical.

1 Kings 3:3-15 is illustrative. When Solomon's prayer pleases the LORD (in part, at least, because Solomon does not ask for a long life[512]), God offers him a long life.[513] However, it should be noted that such long life is contingent upon Solomon's obedience.

Other parts of the Old Testament seem to be more confident in their claims concerning God's gift of life to kings. Particularly in Psalms, God's gift of life to kings is prominent.

WTT Psalm 61:7

יָמִים עַל־יְמֵי־מֶלֶךְ תּוֹסִיף שְׁנוֹתָיו כְּמוֹ־דֹר וָדֹר

NAU Psalm 61:7

Thou wilt prolong the king's life; His years will be as many generations.

This psalm expresses royal ideology, though not entirely in a triumphant vein.[514] Hossfeld and Zenger note that, "[b]ehind the petition for long life for the king stands the notion, typical of ancient Near Eastern concepts of kingship, that a long and happy life for the king is a sign of divine blessing for his land (cf. 72:5; 89:37)."[515] However, it should be noted that the prayer is for a long life, even for a life that spans many generations, but not an unending

---

[512] 1 Kings 3:11.

[513] 1 Kings 3:14. The long life and other blessings God promises to Solomon are contigent upon his obedience. Note that the nominal form of the root is used in 1 Kings 3:14, and that the verbal form of the same root is used in Genesis 2:16 and 3:11, 17.

[514] On the possibility that this psalm is not a royal psalm, but that verses 6-7 [E., 7-8] are a later interpolation, cf. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2*, Hermeneia, translated by Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 106-107. These scholars argue that the verses are indeed an interpolation, but that they are an appropriate insertion in what they regard as the "so-called Messianic Psalter . . ." (107). Even if these verses are a later interpolation, the fact remains that a redactor thought it an appropriate insertion. Thus, it would, in any case, reflect royal ideology at some stage in Israel's (or Judah's) history. This would be the case whether the final redactor of the psalm was looking back with nostalgia, forward with longing, or was praising the present king.

[515] Ibid., 108.

life.[516] Furthermore, these are not confident statements, but prayers. Still, the fact that such a prayer is made for the king seems to reflect a high royal ideology with respect to God's gift of life to the king.

Psalm 21 contains similar statements concerning the king.

WTT Psalm 21:5

חַיִּים שָׁאַל מִמְּךָ נָתַתָּה לוֹ אֹרֶךְ יָמִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד

NAU Psalm 21:4

He asked life of Thee, Thou didst give it to him, Length of days forever and ever.

This psalm portrays the king as having received the gifts for which he prays.[517] He has a responsibility to pray to God for these gifts, and to trust God.[518] While Aster may overstate his case, this psalm seems to imbue the king with almost superhuman qualities.[519] Commenting on Psalm 21:4, Terrien writes, "If the expression 'a multitude of days, forever and ever,' is not oriental hyperbole and should be taken literally, it may have been influenced by Egyptian mythology. The god Amon-Re declares to Thutmosis III (ca. 1444 B.C.E.), 'Mayest thou live eternally.'"[520] However, it should also be noted that Psalm 21 appears to be linked with Psalm 20. This perhaps narrows the meaning of עוֹלָם considerably. In Psalm 21, it may be that the king is simply giving thanks for the granting of deliverance in battle, as he had

---

[516] The word עוֹלָמִים ("forever") does occur in Psalm 61:4. However, caution must be exercised as to how the expression is understood.

[517] J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, SBT, second series 32 (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, [1976?]), 117.

[518] Ibid., 118.

[519] Aster, "Psalm 21," 307-320, "Place of Psalm 21 in Israelite Royal Ideology," in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment*, edited by Fox, et al. See especially p. 314.

[520] Samuel Terrien, The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 222.

requested in Psalm 20. As Broyles points out, "[b]oth psalms make abundantly clear that the king's power is not absolute but derived—from Yahweh (esp. 20:1-2; 21:7; 21:1, 5, 7, 9, 13)."[521] Broyles goes on to note that, "[t]he psalm is careful to circumscribe the king's exalted position not only with respect to God (as noted above) but also with respect to his subjects."[522]

Holtz argues that the same accomplishments that are combined in royal inscriptions in Mesopotamia—namely, victory in war and providing domestic abundance—are also present in Psalm 144.[523] Concerning Psalm 144, Broyles notes the transference of what had once been royal prerogatives to the exilic community as such.[524]

The king is associated with life in other genres outside of Psalms as well. In some cases, someone is swearing by the life of the king.[525] 2 Samuel 15:21 is of particular interest. Ittai, one of David's mercenaries, swears his loyalty with the words "As the LORD lives, and as my lord the king lives". It may be worth noting that it is a mercenary (and thus not necessarily a follower of Yahweh) who speaks of the life of the king's god and of the king himself in parallel.

Mulder notes the prevalence of similar language ". . . from the Amarna letters to Greek literature . . . ."[526] While Mulder notes that the expression "forever" may have ". . . originally related to the deification of the king . . ." in

---

[521] Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms*, NIBC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 110.

[522] Ibid., 111. Cf. also James Luther Mays, *Psalms*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1994), 103-104. Mays notes that the king must request whatever endowments and victories he has from God. "None of his gifts and endowments were inherent in his person."

[523] Shalom E. Holtz, "The Thematic Unity of Psalm cxliv in Light of Mesopotamian Royal Ideology," *VT* 58 (2008): 367-380.

[524] Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms*, NIBC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 501-502, 503.

[525] Cf. 1 Samuel 17:55; 2 Samuel 14:19. Cf. also G. Gerleman, "חיה." *TLOT* 1:414.

[526] Martin J. Mulder, *1 Kings: Volume 1: 1 Kings 1-11*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 64.

surrounding cultures, ". . . in Israel it is no more than a hyperbole of the courtly style of speech . . . ."[527] However, as Mulder also notes, the word עוֹלָם is emphasized especially in connection with David's name.[528]

It should be kept in mind that the word "forever" is parallel with the phrases "length of days" and "generations and generations." This suggests a great length of time, but not necessarily limitless time. As Anderson points out, the request for "life" may well be a request for ". . . a life characterized by vitality and prosperity."[529] Anderson may also be correct in holding that the king is hoping to live on through his descendants. Thus, the request for eternal life may really be a request for a long-lived dynasty.[530]

References to eternality (or length) of life are not common in the Old Testament, but when such a concept does occur, it is frequently associated with kings.[531] Thus, Nehemiah says to the Persian king, "Let the king live forever."[532] Bathsheba says to King David—after he has decided that her son, Solomon, will be king after David—"May my lord King David live forever."[533] This may support Anderson's point made above that the desire for

---

[527] Ibid., 64.

[528] Ibid.

[529] A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms, Volume I: Psalms 1-72*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 181.

[530] Ibid. This approach might suggest that Bathsheba's wish for the king to live forever (1 Kings 1:31) may not be ironic after all. It is also possible that this is an example of *hofstil*, and is a way of speaking euphemistically of a wish that King David would still reign for a long time. In this regard, see Ernst Jenni, "Das Wort 'ōlām im Alten Testament," (Part 2), *ZAW* 65/1 (1953): 5. However, Jenni does acknowledge that a more "concrete conception" ("konkrete Vorstellungen") of the very essence of kings is in the background of this conventional courtly language.

[531] Brettler, *God is King*, 52-53, points out that, even when the idea of eternality is transferred to God, it is almost always associated with God's reign.

[532] Nehemiah 2:3.

[533] 1 Kings 1:31.

eternal life is the desire to live on through one's offspring.[534] In the story of the succession to the throne (especially in the light of what readers/hearers are told of David's sexual impotency and unawareness of what is going on his own kingdom), there may be a heavy dose of irony in this expression. This is especially the case since Bathsheba does not express a desire for the king to live forever at the beginning of her audience with King David, but at the end, after he has granted her request for her son, Solomon, to succeed David as king.

This is not to say that the king, his advisers, or servants (or ordinary working peasants) all necessarily interpreted these words that connect kings with life (or "eternal" life) in the same way, or took them with the same degree of seriousness. It is sufficient for the argument that is here made that the language of life and death was associated with kings in Old Testament literature, at least linguistically.

Brettler thinks of the wish that the king would "live forever" and similar phrases as being hyperbole.[535] "These phrases serve a double function: they are intended to flatter the king, but also reflect the hopes of the people for stability since chaos often broke out when a king died or was assassinated." No doubt, this is true. The argument that is being made here does not turn, however, on a precise understanding of ancients. No matter how these phases may have been understood, it seems to represent the language of royal ideology.

---

[534] Anderson, *Psalms . . .*, 181. Cf. also Ernst Jenni, "עוֹלָם *'olām* eternity," *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2:859.
[535] Ibid., 51-52.

> Since human kings cannot attain perpetual life, this wish becomes modified into the desire for an everlasting dynasty (North, 1932:24).[536] This is reflected in various types of divine promises to the Davidic monarchy (see Weinfeld, 1970), where God promises to perpetuate the dynasty forever (Pss. 89:5, 30; 132:12; 1 Chr. 22:10; 28:7; 2 Chr. 13:5), or to make it as stable as the astral bodies (Ps. 89:37-38). Although non-Davidic kings are promised dynasties (1 Kgs. 11:38), the promises are never phrased in such superlative terms. Similar dynastic promises to non-Judean kings probably existed in antiquity, but were not preserved in the predominantly pro-Judaean historiographical texts.[537]

Brettler points out that even God's eternality is often associated with God's kingship. Indeed, according to Brettler, "[i]nstances where God's eternal nature is connected to his kingship outnumber cases where he is generally declared eternal by a ratio of five to one; this suggests that the Israelites understood God's eternal life primarily as an entailment of his kingship."[538]

Brettler suggests that the king's "longevity" becomes God's "eternal life". Thus, while people speak of the human king's "eternal life" in jussives, they speak of God's eternal life in the indicative. Furthermore, God has lived from eternity past (Ps. 102:25b-27), ". . . a claim that no human king could make." Brettler writes, "Among the attributes shared by Yahweh and the king are eternal life, wisdom, wealth, and strength. These are bestowed by God, who can remove them as well, as narrated in reference to the transition between Saul and David in 1 Sam 16:13-4 . . . ."[539]

> Immortality is often seen as the element that typifies divine beings; it is thus significant that Ps 21:4 says of the human king, "He asked you for life; you have it to him—length of days forever and ever." This is

---

[536] The reference is to C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," *ZAW* 50 (1932): 24.

[537] Ibid., 52.

[538] Brettler, *God is King*, 52-53. Some of the texts which Brettler lists as examples of this linkage of God's eternality with the fact that God is king: Numbers 23:21; 1 Samuel 12:12; Isaiah 6:5; 19:4; Jeremiah 8:19; Micah 2:13; Zephaniah 1:5; Malachi 1:14; Psalms 5:3; 10:16; Daniel 4:34. (These are found on pages 172-173, endnote 2, which is erroneously listed as endnote 3 in the text of the book on page 52.)

[539] Marc Zvi Brettler, "King, Kingship," *NIDB* 3:508.

> expressed in toned-down form elsewhere, with the promise that the Davidic dynasty will last forever, or in Ps 72:17, "May his name endure forever, his fame continue as long as the sun."[540]

In a similar vein, Rose points out how common are wishes for the immortality of the king and/or his dynasty. The epithet *'olām* ". . . appears regularly in contexts in which *royal* dimensions of the divinity are emphasized, *'olām* designates the 'fullness' (totality) of the experience of time and space. . . . Within the world of human experience in the ancient Near East, this "transcendence" was extensively personalized and symbolized in the king."[541]

The King as the Mediator of Life to Others in the Old Testament

There are certain parts of the Old Testament that do seem to express the idea that life, fertility, and related themes are especially relevant to kings. Sometimes, these themes are expressed in a way that supports a "high" monarchical ideology. At others, these themes seem to challenge such "high" ideology. In both cases, these sections of the Old Testament seem to support the idea that these life and fertility motifs are, in some way, within the province of royal ideology.

Psalm 72 and Other Selected Passages

Commenting on some ANE and biblical texts—particularly, Psalm 72—Hamilton comments on the differing ways in which Psalm 72 may be read.

> The texts demonstrate how a trope of kingly self-presentation could serve either to explain actual practices and thus legitimate rule, as in many of the inscriptions under consideration, or to imagine an unreal but desirable situation and thus reorient legitimate rule, as in certain royal psalms of the Hebrew Bible. Such texts serve rulers' pursuit of fame, as well as the approbation of the divine realm, in that the display of care for subjects endorses a positive view of the ruler and of the elaborate network of

---

[540] Ibid., 509. Similarly, cf. Martin Rose, "Names of God in the OT," *AB* 4: 1004.

[541] Martin Rose, "Names of God in the OT," *AB* 4: 1004.

> deference and obedience of which the ruler is part, and which sustains the ruler's claims concerning royal largesse.[542]

There are several indicators in the Old Testament of a connection between royal ideology and fertility—or, more often it would seem, a lack of fertility. On the positive side of the ledger, Psalm 72 is perhaps the best illustration.[543] For the king—as well as for his son[544]—the prayer to God is that the king would command obedience from foreign powers,[545] administer justice to the poor and oppressed,[546] and be an instrument of abundance for both the country and the city.[547] As Tate has pointed out, this connection between the king and fertility is found in Israel, as well as throughout the ANE.[548] Broyles notes that, in Psalm 72, "The whole psalm then cycles around four topics: **the needy**, agricultural fertility, the king's longevity, and his influence among the **nations**."[549]

Virtually all scholars acknowledge that Psalm 72 is connected in some way with royal ideology. In fact, Tate notes that, "Ps 72 is universally

---

[542] Mark W. Hamilton, "Prosperity and Kingship in Psalms and Inscriptions," in *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*, edited by David S. Vanderhooft and Abraham Winitzer (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 186-187.

[543] For some helpful discussions, cf. Shalom M. Paul, "Psalm 72:5—A Traditional Blessing for the Long Life of the King," *JNES* 31/4 (1972): 351-355; Roland Boer, "National Allegory in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 74 (1997): 95-116; David Jobling, "Deconstruction and the Political Analysis of Biblical Texts: A Jamesonian Reading of Psalm 72," *Semeia* 59 (1992): 95-127. See also Jungbluth, *Im Himmel und auf Erden*, 82-85. Jungbluth has a brief summary of the ANE material which relates to the king as the guarantor of the land's fruitfulness. He specifically mentions Psalm 72 in this connection (83-84).

[544] Psalm 72:1.

[545] Psalm 72:9-11, 15.

[546] Psalm 72:12-14.

[547] Psalm 72:16.

[548] Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51-100*, WBC 20 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 224. Cf. also Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2*, Hermeneia, translated by Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 204-205.

[549] Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms*, NIBC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 295.

considered to be a royal psalm."[550] However, specific interpretations differ widely.[551]

Many scholars have taken the language of Psalm 72 as merely reflecting "court style." This seems to render the language devoid of any real content or power.[552] Others argue that the psalm is completely imbued with a "high" royal theology that is uncritically supportive of kingly pretensions. Thus, for example, Tate comments, "Psalm 72 offers a glimpse of the ideal relationship among ruler, God, and people. The people pray for the empowerment of the king, who uses the gifts God gives, not for his own benefit or even for the benefit of the powerful, but for the least of all among the people."[553] While Tate speaks of the portrait of Psalm 72 as "ideal," he also says that the psalm is not messianic, but speaks of an earthly king. However, the psalm reflects an idealism that may have contributed to the development of messianic expectations.[554]

Murray thinks of Psalm 72 as anything but a polemic against royal pretension. Along with Psalm 2, 45, 89, and 132, Psalm 72 portrays "enthusiastic support" for an attitude toward kingship that emphasizes ". . . the king's role as unique deferent of the divine will for his people in blessing and

---

[550] Marvin E. Tate, *Psalm 51-100*, WBC 20 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 222.

[551] Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2*, Hermeneia, translated by Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 205.

[552] Shalom M. Paul, "Psalm 72:5—A Traditional Blessing for the Long Life of the King," *JNES* 31/4 (1972): 351-355.

[553] Ibid., 225.

[554] Ibid., 226.

salvation . . . ."[555] Kessler thinks that the king who is portrayed in Psalm 72 is only a step removed from God.[556]

Still other scholars think of Psalm 72 as more a pattern for rulers, than a statement about actual royal performance.[557] The psalm would thus be, not an unqualified endorsement of the performance of kings, but would provide a challenge to royal pretensions, as well as providing benchmarks for the performance of kings.[558] For example, Hamilton thinks that Psalm 72 commends care for the poor, rather than conquest of neighboring countries, as being the proper goal of good rule.[559]

Concerning Psalm 72, Davis points out that "[t]he psalm shows what might be called an 'ecological' view of justice; it promotes a vision of *tsedeqah* ('right relationship, righteousness') and *shalom* ('well-being, peace') operative in both political and agricultural spheres."[560] However, as Davis notes, how these two matters are related in Psalm 72 is "[a] challenge for

---

[555] Murray, Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension, 312.

[556] Rainer Kessler, "Gott und König, Grundeigentum und Fruchtbarkeit," *ZAW* 108 (1996): 225-226.

[557] Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Power, Justice, and Peace: An Exegesis of Psalm 72," *FAM* 4 (1986): 65-70. Cf. also Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, ConBOT 8 (Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 100. Mettinger writes, "The observation may seem to be too trivial to be put on record but should nevertheless be emphasized: this material clearly depicts the king as a man in submission to and dependent on the God of Israel."

[558] Cf. Walter Houston, "The King's Preferential Option for the Poor: Rhetoric, Ideology and Ethics in Psalm 72," *BibInt* 7/4 (1999): 341-367, especially, page 351. Houston holds that, "[i]deology is never simply lies: it is a partial, and partisan, view of the truth, and it has to be plausible to its consumers. The consumers of ideology always extend beyond the class of its producers, unless society is held together by nothing but sheer force. And the plausibility of this ideology depends in large part on expectation. All our knowledge of the ancient Near East shows that kings were expected to do justice, to protect the poor and oppressed, and there is some substantial evidence to show that at least some of them tried to do so, consequently that the language of our text in this regard was likely to raise serious expectations."

[559] Ibid., 204.

[560] Ellen F. Davis, "Scriptural Texts: 3.1, Two Psalms," in *Justice and Rights: Christian and Muslim Perspectives* edited by Michael Ipgrave (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2009), 21.

interpreters . . . ."[561] She thinks of the connection between justice and abundant fertility as operating at two levels: the ". . . suprapolitical, or 'mythic,' and sociopolitical."[562] While Davis acknowledges the "mythic" aspect of royal ideology, the fact that she places double quotation marks around the word "mythic" seems to signal her difficulty with that approach to the connection. Furthermore, her discussion seems to focus on the logical connection between the king's exercise of justice and fertility.[563] "Multiple stories show that Israel's peasant farmers were acutely aware of the king's responsibility for justice and directly responsive to (*sic*) failures of justice. In an agrarian economy, when justice fails in high places peasants become highly vulnerable to land loss."[564]

Furthermore, Davis thinks of the Old Testament as largely demonstrating the breach of justice (and hence of fertility) perpetrated by kings. "The biblical narratives of kingship regularly show first early promise that a given monarch might fulfill that charge, then steady erosion of this hope."[565]

One of the dividing lines in interpreting Psalm 72 is concerned with whether the verbs are primarily (or *in toto*) to be taken as jussives or as futures. If they are taken primarily or entirely as jussives, then they are a wish or prayer for the king.[566] Some of the verbs are clearly jussive in form, and Hossfeld decides to translate all the verbs as jussives. If this is the case, then

---

[561] Ibid., 21.
[562] Ibid., 21.
[563] Ibid., 22-23.
[564] Ibid., 22.
[565] Ibid., 22.
[566] The verbs are analyzed in this way by Hans Ulrich Steymans, "Le psautier messianique—une approche sémantique," BLT 238, in *The Composition of the Psalms*, edited by Erich Zenger (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 173. See also Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2*, Hermeneia, translated by Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 202.

Psalm 72 would not be a blank check for royal pretensions.[567] However, if many of the verbs are imperfects (or futures), they may speak of what the king will, in fact, be and do.

Goldingay points out that each of the sections of Psalm 72 (vss. 1-7, 8-14, and 15-17) ". . . begin with an explicit volitive . . . ."[568] For example, the verbs in vss. 8 (וְיֵרְדְּ) and 15 (וְיִחִי), if taken as volitives, seem to introduce at least a bit of uncertainty. It is not a foregone conclusion that the king will exhibit these qualities or experience these outcomes.

Houston points out that, at the very least, the verbs in vss. 12-14 ought to be translated as futures. He notes the presence of the כִּי, in v. 12, and very properly asks, "But is there any parallel for *kî* being used in this way before volitive verbs?"[569]

There are especially two aspects of Psalm 72 that relate to the theme of this chapter. The first is the king's connection with life-giving fertility. The second is the prayer for a long life for the king.

---

[567] Ibid.

[568] John Goldingay, *Psalms, Volume 2: Psalms 42-89*, BCOT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 381.

[569] Walter J. Houston, Contending *for Justice: Ideologies and Theologies of Social Justice in the Old Testament*, LHB/OTS 428 (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 139, fn. 20.

Regarding the king's connection with fertility, Eaton writes,

> God's gift of life to his king brings life also to his people. Their saying "may the king live!" (I Kings 1.31 etc.) was more than a pleasantry; their interest was involved. Under his shade they lived; he was their breath of life (Lam 4.20). So his life was the sincere object of their prayers (61.6f., p. 48; 72:15). In Psalm 72 the theme of the eternal life of the righteous king (vv. 5, 17, p. 162) intertwines with that of the fertility of his land and people (vv. 3, 7, 16); he is like the life-bringing rain (v. 6).[570]

There are a number of other Old Testament passages that seem to suggest such a connection between kings and fertility—or a lack of fertility. Kapelrud points out that, no matter what motivated David to sacrifice the sons of Saul, a connection of the king (or the former king) with fertility or the lack thereof, is assumed in 2 Samuel 21:1-14.[571] Hanson, following Kapelrud, notes that, "[t]he connection of the king and restoration of fertility is fundamental here . . . ."[572] However, no matter what the particular approach to the structure or analysis of various scholarly approaches, Psalm 72 does contain royal language. No matter whether such language places the king in an exalted position right beside God, or in a humble position below God, the language of justice, world-wide rule, fruitfulness, and longevity probably reflects royal language and pretensions in ancient Israel. This is all the more likely since the

---

[570] Long ago, J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, SBT, second series 32 (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, [1976?]), 165-166, pointed out how both of these themes are intertwined in Psalm 72, as well as in other parts of the Old Testament.

[571] Arvid S. Kapelrud. "King and Fertility: A Discussion of II Sam 21:1-14," in *God and His Friends in the Old Testament,*" ([Oslo?]: Universitetsforlaget, 1979), 44-45. Similarly, cf. Jungbluth, *Im Himmel und auf Erden*, 82-85. See especially, 84-85. Cf. also Martin Arneth, *"Sonne der Gerechtigkeit": Studien zur Solarisierung der Jahwe-Religion im Lichte von Psalm 72*, BZABR 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 54. Arneth points out that the connection of the king with fertility in the ANE is ". . . keine neue Erkenntnis . . . ."
It is likely that the primary emphasis in 2 Samuel 21 is on the idea that it was not David, but Saul, who was responsible for the drought, even though the drought occurred during David's reign. At least, that seems to be the point of 21:1. However, Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), 336-338, reads David's actions as much more a matter of "*Realpolitik*" than as a matter of faithfulness.
This debate, as important as it is, tends to obscure an assumption which underlies both positive and negative readings of David—i.e., kings are associated with fertility, and sometimes, with a radical lack of fertility.

[572] K. C. Hanson, "When the King Crosses the Line: Royal Deviance and Restitution in Levantine Ideologies," *BTB* 26/1 (1996): 13.

language of Psalm 72 seems closely parallel to other ANE literature that deals with kings.[573]

This saying could, of course, simply refer to the king's favor as leading to life in a derivative fashion. This seems to be the way Toy takes the proverb. "*Life* is long and happy life,= prosperity."

While Toy may well be correct that the king's moral qualities are not in view, the proverb seems to contain loftier language than Toy acknowledges.[574] The use of the language about God's face shining seems to reflect language that is usually reserved for God. Dell comments on Proverbs 16:15 (in connection with Psalm 72:2, a verse that she had just cited), "In verse 15 it is usually God's face that is described as shining (cf. Num. 6:25), while here it is the king's another indication of a fluidity of role."[575] Fox notes that, "'Light of the face' signifies graciousness and friendliness. It is used of God (e.g., Pss 4:7; 44:4; 89:16) and man (Qoh 8:1b; Sir 7:24a [MS A]; 13:26a [MS A]; 32:11a)."[576] Van Leeuwen seems to be correct when he comments,

> [t]he section on the king concludes with another proverb pair, which follows naturally upon the preceding one. . . . Verse 15 portrays the life-giving favor of the king in terms of light from his face and the gracious clouds that bring spring rain, thus ensuring a fruitful summer harvest (see 19:12; 20:2; Jer 5:24; Hos 6:3). Once again the king's power to do good or ill reflects prerogatives of the heavenly king, Yahweh (negatively, see 2

---

[573] Cf. Alasdair Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea*, SAA 3.11 (pp. 26-27) (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1989), 26-27. Cf. also Arneth, *"Sonne der Gerechtigkeit"*, 78, 111. Arneth's arguments that there is a literary dependence upon the Coronation Hymn of Ashurbaniapal are not entirely convincing. However, it seems safe to say that both the Ashurbanipal material and Psalm 72 share a fundamentally common ANE view of kingship. Cf. also Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*, second edition (New York: Paulist, 1997), 165.

[574] Perhaps "the arbiter of fate" should be not be preceded by the word "simply". To be an arbiter of fate would place one in a very "pivotal" position in a society. Cf. Cristiano Grottanelli, "Kingship: An Overview," *ER* 8: 312-317.

[575] Katharine J. Dell, *The Book of Proverbs in Social and Theological Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 113.

[576] Michael V. Fox, Proverbs 10-31: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB 18B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 617.

Kgs 6:32-33; Ps 78:49-50; positively, see Num 6:25; Pss 4:6; 44:3; 89:15). . . . Once again the parallelism of God and king is reinforced.[577]

Although there are many positive connections between kings and life in the Old Testament, the connection between kings and life/fertility seems to be portrayed in an essentially negative way in a number of passages. Life, fertility, and rain are sometimes pictured as being given by the LORD God, quite apart from the king. For example, it is God who gives rain,[578] or who withholds rain.[579]

The themes and motifs of Psalm 72 that relate to life and fertility, and that reflect royal language and pretensions, are also be reflected in other parts of the Old Testament.

For example, Proverbs 16:15 should be considered.

[WTT]Proverbs 16:15

בְּאוֹר־פְּנֵי־מֶלֶךְ חַיִּים וּרְצוֹנוֹ כְּעַב מַלְקוֹשׁ

[NAU]Proverbs 16:15 "In the light of a king's face is life, And his favor is like a cloud with the spring rain."

Another passage that portrays the connection between life/fertility/rain and kings is 2 Samuel 23:4.

---

[577] Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, "The book of Proverbs: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *NIB* 5: 161. Cf. also Christopher B. Ansberry, *Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad: An Exploration of the Courtly Nature of the Book of Proverbs*, BZAW 422 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 106. Ansberry writes that, ". . . the favor of the king is compared with images of natural renewal (16:15; 19:12). As Yahweh's immediate agent, the king possesses the power to enforce order in society and bestow a full, abundant life on his subjects."

[578] Deuteronomy 11:14; 28:12; Job 5:10; Psalm 147:8; Amos 4:7 Zechariah 10:1. The Zechariah passage comes right after the prophecy of the coming restoration, which includes the arrival of the humble king (9:9).

[579] Deuteronomy 11:17; 28:24; 1 Samuel 12:17-18; 1 Kings 8:35-36; 17-18; Isaiah 5:6; Amos 4:7.

וְכְאוֹר בֹּקֶר יִזְרַח־שֶׁמֶשׁ בֹּקֶר לֹא עֲבוֹת מִנְּגַהּ מִמָּטָר דֶּשֶׁא מֵאָרֶץ

NAU2 Samuel 23:4 "he is as the light of the morning *when* the sun rises, A morning without clouds, *When* the tender grass *springs* out of the earth, Through sunshine after rain."

The second aspect of the king's relationship to life is the prayer (or wish) for long life for the king. These wishes are expressed in Psalm 72:5 and 17. Verse 5 has a number of problems that seem to frustrate understanding.[580] The MT has a plural verb form (יִרָאוּךָ) that has no obvious antecedent. Dahood takes the verb as singular, and translates, "May he revere you."[581] However, the *LXX* has συμπαραμενεῖ ("May he prolong/continue long"). This seems to indicate that the translators may have seen ויאריך.[582] Furthermore, Paul has proposed that the Hebrew words עם and לפני can sometimes have the meaning "like." This parallels other court language in the ANE.[583] Tate points out that Psalm 89:37-38 uses the same metaphor for the length of the Davidic dynasty.[584] In any case, Psalm 72:17 clearly expresses a prayer/wish for the king's long reign.

This association of the root עלם with kings is also present in the Old Testament, and is not an isolated phenomenon.[585] Other than references to

---

[580] Shalom M. Paul, "Psalm 72:5—A Traditional Blessing for the Long Life of the King," *JNES* 31/4 (1972): 351.

[581] Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms 51-100*, AB 17 (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1968), 180.

[582] This is noted by Marvin E. Tate, *Psalm 51-100*, WBC 20 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 220, note 5.a.

[583] Paul, "Psalm 72:5," 351. Paul cites Psalm 106:6; Job 9:26; Ecclesiastes 2:16; 1 Chronicles 25:8; and Ezekiel 31:8, as examples of these nuances.

[584] Tate, *Psalm 51-100*, 220, note 5.b.

[585] Martin Rose, "Names of God in the OT," *AB* 4: 1004.

God or to "everlasting" laws, covenants, and holy days, the root עלם ("everlasting?") is used primarily of kings.[586] In his chapter titled "Royal Qualities,"[587] Brettler lists long life[588] and wisdom[589] as the first two of six qualities that ". . . are typically applied to human kings and are projected on to God as king."[590]

This is especially true in Psalm 72. However, a very positive view of the connection of kings with life, fertility, and rain also may be seen in such passages as 2 Samuel 23:3-4 and Proverbs 16:15. Commenting on Proverbs 16:14-15, Ansberry writes, ". . . the favor of the king is compared with images of natural renewal (16:15; 19:12). As Yahweh's immediate agent, the king possesses the power to enforce order in society and bestow a full, abundant life on his subjects."[591]

In connection with the king, life is opposed to death here. It is interesting to note that the king's favor (רצונו) is linked with the spring rain. One aspect of royal ideology in Israel may be suggested in this simile, since righteous kings are mentioned elsewhere in connection with rains and fertility,[592] and wicked kings (or kings acting wickedly), with drought and famine.[593]

Crenshaw aptly comments, "Nowhere in these two collections of truth statements does Egyptian influence shape the expression more notably than in

---

[586] Cf., for example, 2 Sam. 22:51; 1 Ki. 1:31; 2:45; 1 Chr. 28:4; Neh. 2:3; Ps. 18:50; Prov. 29:14; Dan. 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:6,21. Several of these references (e.g., 2 Samuel 22:51; 1 Kings 2:45; and Psalm 18:50) clearly relate to the longevity of the dynasty.

[587] Brettler, *God is King*, 51-75.

[588] Ibid., 51-53.

[589] Ibid., 53-55.

[590] Ibid., 51. The six qualities Brettler lists are long life (51-53), wisdom (53-55), wealth (55-57), strength (57-68), majesty (68-72), and beauty (72-73).

[591] Ansberry, Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad, 107.

[592] Psalm 72:6-7, 16; 2 Samuel 23:3-5.

[593] 2 Samuel 21:1-6; 1 Kings 17-18. Cf. Jungbluth, *Im Himmel und auf Erden*, 84-85. Jungbluth notes the contrast between a king who rules justly and one who does not.

chap. 16, which goes so far as to assert that royal judgments cannot err because God directs the king's thinking Prov 16:10)."[594] Crenshaw goes on to note the lofty view of the king expressed in Proverbs 16:12-15. Whether or not there is "Egyptian influence" in this section of Proverbs, there does indeed appear to be a lofty view of kingship. This seems to mirror the rest of the ANE royal language, whether of Egypt or Mesopotamia. Hamilton thinks that the concern of ancient kings for the prosperity of their subjects ". . . appears only sporadically in surviving texts."[595] While this may indeed be true for prosperity as such, if one expands the search to royal concern for the well-being of subjects—including the ideology of mediated fruitfulness—the evidence is considerably more abundant.

The book of Proverbs is not universally positive in its portrayal of kings. For example, Brown holds that Proverbs 28:3 is a pointed contrast to Psalm 72:6.[596] Yoder points out that the sages were aware of the destructive use of power by kings. In her overview of chapter 28, she writes,

> Whereas the portrait of the king to this point in Proverbs is rather idealistic . . . , the sages shift in chapters 28-29 from wholesale admiration to caution about the reality of wicked rulers—who, like roaring lions or charging bears, trample the poor (28:15), callously and ignorantly extort from their people (28:16; 29:4b), and let transgressions go unchecked (29:16). The rulers' damage is far-reaching: the king who entertains lies emboldens wicked officials (29:12), and the whole communities cry out or go into hiding (28:28; 29:2; cf. 28:2). For many readers, the sages' warning is a much-needed corrective to their earlier veneration of government; it

---

[594] James L. Crenshaw, "The Sage in Proverbs," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient near East*, edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 214.
[595] Hamilton, "Prosperity and Kingship in Psalms and Inscriptions," 185.
[596] William P. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms: A Theology of Metaphor* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002), 127, notes the lovely water metaphor for kingship in Psalm 72:6, but also the contrast between what a king ought to be and do for his people, and the way kings frequently function, as reflected in Proverbs 28:3. However, Brown's observation depends on dubious emendations and interpretation of Proverbs 28:3, and thus must be considered suspect. Cf. Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 10-31: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 18B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 820.

wrests apart the king and god—who were previously conjoined (e.g., 16:10, 15; 19:12; 21:1; 24:21-22).[597]

Thus, while there are positive portrayals of this connection between kings and life, there are also others that either seem to downplay or even question such a connection. It is true that, in the Old Testament, as in other ANE literature and iconography, ultimately, the life-giving power of the king comes from the gods.

In the Old Testament, there are many passages that portray Yahweh as the exclusive giver of life and fertility, without any intermediary—including the king. Many of these passages that emphasize that Yahweh gives life and fertility to Yahweh's people directly occur in biblical books (or portions of books) that, at least in their final form, seem to "democratize" Yahweh's blessings.[598] These books may indeed allow for monarchy, but they do seem to limit its scope.

There are also passages in the Old Testament that seem to do more than limit monarchy. There may, in fact, be a hidden polemic. Such stories as Samuel calling for a rainstorm during a usually dry time (2 Samuel 12:16-18), in a passage that is suspicious of monarchy may be more than an arbitrary sign of God's power and displeasure. It may also be a criticism of royal pretensions about the king's ability to mediate God's life-giving and fructifying power. Similar polemics may be at least one element of the story of the drought in 2 Samuel 21:1-14, as well as in 1 Kings 17-18.

---

[597] Christine Roy Yoder, *Proverbs*, Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), 264-265.

[598] Deuteronomy is a parade example. Here, where kingship is severely limited, it is repeatedly emphasized that Yahweh is the one who gives life (32:39) and fertility (26:10) to the nation, and to those who obey him (4:4; 6:2; 30:6; 30:15, 19, 20; 32:47). There is no role for the king in mediating these blessings. By emphasizing the responsibility of all Israel, as well as by the obvious limitations expressed in 17:14-20, the author(s) of Deuteronomy both "democratize" the blessings of their God, and relativize the power of the monarchy. Exile, however, will be shared by both king and people, if they disobey (28:36).

On the other hand, even if these passages do polemicize against royal pretensions, this does not necessarily equate to a connection with Genesis 2-3. Such a hidden polemic would, however, suggest that the Old Testament does in fact contain such polemics. This would fulfill Amit's second criterion—that such a polemic exists in other places in the Old Testament. Thus, while the arguments made in this chapter do not prove that such a polemic exists in Genesis 2-3, these arguments do point toward that as a possibility.

In the Old Testament, the king is not only portrayed as receiving life from God, but also as mediating life to his people. While the king's connection to life may have been understood in a variety of ways,[599] the underlying royal ideology of life is apparent.

An example of a passage that portrays the connection between life/fertility/rain and kings is 2 Samuel 23:4. As Brueggemann points out, "[i]n its lyrical imagination, Israel likens the power of good public administration to the power for life in a well-ordered creation." However, Brueggemann goes on to state that such affirmations are not without conditions. "The psalm speaks of enemies of the king, but the words also contain a warning to the king. In such irresponsible people, there is neither sun nor rain nor life."[600] Hamilton similarly writes, "There is no blanket approval of kingship per se, and certainly no endorsement of tyranny, insensitivity, and self-preoccupation."[601] Hertzberg thinks that 2 Samuel 23:4 is, '. . . not a question of the relationship of the ruler to man and to God, but of

---

[599] For example, some may have taken the connection of life and the king as a statement of fact, while others interpreted such language as a statement of how kings ought to operate. A range of differing options between those extremes might be posited.

[600] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), 346.

[601] Victor P. Hamilton, *Handbook on the Historical Books* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 366.

God's dealings with him; the results of the covenant made between God and the house of David are life-giving, fructifying, producing blessings, like the beginning of the rains (Isa. 55.10)."[602] It may be open to interpretation—and therefore, to debate—as to the precise connection between Israelite kings and fruitfulness. However, on the most conditional interpretation, as on the most absolutistic interpretation, it is difficult not to observe some sort of connection between the king and the fructifying of the land.

In discussing Psalm 72, Hamilton writes ". . . that behind its elaborate pictures of tribute bearing and receiving lies a mental construct that allows the appropriation of political ideas more at home in the Assyrian empire (and, *mutatis mutandis*, successor realms) than in the tiny state of Judah."[603] "This structure elegantly creates a vision of reality in which king and deity act in consonance. The text weaves together the divine and royal levels as though there were no possible dissonance."[604]

Hamilton notes that, "[g]ood governance, sanctioned by the deity, consists of placing goods in the proper hands, here not the nobles and powerful supporters of the king, but destitute."[605]

Hamilton concludes that, even though slogans might vary from kingdom to kingdom, ". . . the evidence at hand suggests not merely a shared royal language, but a shared cultural assumption, namely, that the monarchy should aid in the prosperity of the people . . . ."[606]

---

[602] Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, OTL, translated by J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 401.
[603] Ibid., 198-199.
[604] Ibid., 200.
[605] Ibid., 201.
[606] Ibid., 204-205.

Although there are many positive connections between kings and life in the Old Testament, the connection between kings and life/fertility seems to be portrayed in an essentially negative way in a number of passages. Life, fertility, and rain are sometimes pictured as being given by the LORD God, quite apart from the king. For example, it is God who gives rain,[607] or who withholds rain.[608]

2 Samuel 21:1-14 speaks of a drought that occurred during David's reign, but is pictured as being the result of a breach of covenant by the previous king, Saul. It is important to note that there is an underlying assumption that the king is in some way connected with fertility, or its lack. In fact, several scholars have noted the connection between Psalm 72 and 2 Samuel 21:1-14.[609]

As Kim has pointed out, it is difficult to determine precisely who (if anyone) is the hero/heroine in 2 Samuel 21:1-14.[610] Kim acknowledges that the king is responsible for fertility.[611] However, as Kim also points out, it would seem that the ending of the story (and of the drought) comes primarily as a result of Gods action, rather than by Rizpah's or David's actions, even though both Rizpah and David do play a part in preparing for the return of the

---

[607] Deuteronomy 11:14; 28:12; Job 5:10; Psalm 147:8; Amos 4:7 Zechariah 10:1. The Zechariah passage comes right after the prophecy of the coming restoration, which includes the arrival of the humble king (9:9).

[608] Deuteronomy 11:17; 28:24; 1 Samuel 12:17-18; 1 Kings 8:35-36; 17-18; Isaiah 5:6; Amos 4:7.

[609] Yair Lorberbaum, *Disempowered King: Monarchy in Classical Jewish Literature*, KLJS 9 (London: Continuum, 2011), 12, fn. 38. "The king's righteousness brings benefit to the people (Psalms 72), while his sins are the sins of the people . . . (Lorberbaum here refers to 2 Samuel 21:24, but this is an error. He is likely intending 2 Samuel 24:21.) Cf. also Jungbluth, *Im Himmel und auf Erden*, 84-85; K. C. Hanson, "When the King Crosses the Line: Royal Deviance and Restitution in Levantine Ideologies," *BTB* 26/1 (1996): 15, 22.

[610] Jin-Soo Kim, *Bloodguilt, Atonement, and Mercy: An Exegetical and Theological Study of 2 Samuel 21:1-14*, European University Studies (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007). Cf. especially pages 74-75, where Kim refers to "the enigmatic action of Rizpah."

[611] Ibid., 127.

fructifying rain.[612] It may well be that the story is suggesting that a king (Saul, in this case) could be responsible for a drought, but the king is not able to produce fertility.[613]

Another passage that connects the lack of fruitfulness to the king is 1 Kings 17-18, the confrontation between Elijah and Yahweh on the one side, and King Ahab and the prophets of Baal on the other. The conflict between Yahweh and Baal in regard to who can provide rain has often been noted. Hauser, for example, begins his book with the rather straightforward assertion, "That the stories in 1 Kings 17-19 are anti-Baalistic is self-evident."[614] It has less often been observed that King Ahab plays a key role in the narrative. This "key role" serves, somewhat paradoxically, to marginalize Baal, the prophets of Baal, but also King Ahab.[615] If King Ahab is supposed to be involved in

---

[612] Ibid., 278. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, OTL, translated by J. S. Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 384, thinks that Rizpah's actions clearly impact David, making him more inclined to give the dead a decent burial.

[613] Concerning 2 Samuel 21:1-14, Mary J. Evans, *1 and 2 Samuel,* NIBC (Peabody, MA., 2000), 231, acknowledges that the story is "enigmatic", but does not think ". . . Hertzberg's suggestion that Rizpah's protection of the bodies of her sons involved 'rain-magic" . . . . Rizpah may have hoped that the sacrifice of her sons would be given meaning by the coming of rain, but the account presents us only with her grief." However the various actors in the story (or the narrator, for that matter) may have understood the action of David and Rizpah, the fact remains that a lack of fertility brought on by a lack of rain was connected with the previous king, Saul. Rain and consequent fertility could only return when the present king, David, acted to put things right. Ultimately, it is God who is "moved by entreaty for the land" (v. 14), but God only does so after the action of the king in giving the Saulides a proper burial. While Evans may be correct in speaking of ". . . David's lack of responsibility for these events" (230), David must still respond. This suggests that the king is, in some sense, responsible for the fertility of the land.
In a similar manner, Simeon Chavel, "Compositry and Creativity in 2 Samuel 21:1-14," *JBL* 122/1 (2003): , notes, "Indeed, the story of the famine takes it for granted that the responsibility for the nation's well-being has already devolved upon David's shoulders, for which reason it falls to him to deal with the Gibeonites, fulfill their demands, and bring blessing to Israel."
Cf. also Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Gibeon and Israel: The Role of Gibeon and the Gibeonites in the Political and Religious History of Early Israel*, SOTOS Monograph 2 (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University, 1972), 93-94. Blenkinsopp thinks that the story of 2 Samuel 21:1-14 may reflect the Canaanite myth of Baal, Anath, and Mot.

[614] Alan J. Hauser, *From Carmel to Horeb: Elijah in Crisis,* JSOTSup 85 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990), 11.

[615] Cf. Volkmar Fritz, *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*, translated by Anselm Hagedorn (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003), 190.

insuring the fertility of the land, then the king's role as a mere observer of the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal may itself be a significant comment on the impotence of the king in the sphere of the fructifying rains.[616]

Hauser argues that death is portrayed as posing repeated challenges to Yahweh, all of which Yahweh responds to by showing that Yahweh is in control of life and death.[617] "The structure of chapter 17 is carefully designed to present Yahweh as the God whose power enables him to feed or not to feed, to send water or drought, to grant life or cause death, as he wills."[618]

On the other hand, ". . . Ahab and Jezebel are agents not only of Baal but also of death."[619] Fretheim notes that, "The conflict between Baal and Yahweh takes on historical and bodily form in the figures of Ahab (and Jezebel) and Elijah . . . ."[620] This linking of the king and queen to death seems to strike at the very heart of both baalistic theology and royal ideology.

There are other examples from the Old Testament that seem to call into question any royal life and death power. Thus, King Jehoram, when approached by an emissary from Syria for healing, protests, "Am I God, to kill and to make alive?" This may be an example of Naaman of Syria (as well as the Syrian king) thinking that Israel operated with the same royal ideology as obtained in their own and other surrounding cultures. In this ideology, a king is the representative of his god and/or goddess, and thus responsible for "restoring life" in the form of healing.

---

[616] Cf. Walter Brueggemann, *1 & 2 Kings*, S & H BC (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2000), 209, 219-221.
[617] Hauser, From Carmel to Horeb, 12-22.
[618] Ibid., 12.
[619] Ibid., 29.
[620] Terence E. Fretheim, *1 & 2 Kings*, WBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 95.

On the other hand, Jehoram may have been confronted with his own royal ideology in such a direct way that he felt trapped. The denial of a person's capacity to act in a certain manner might well be taken as suggesting that someone expected that ability to be present. In any case, it is interesting that the king may have been expected by the king of a neighboring nation to be a mediator of healing and life.[621] However, it was the prophet Elisha who was God's mediator in healing Naaman. This may be an ironic comment on where the real power in Israel lay.[622]

Lamentations 4:20 pictures the king as the people's breath. However, the contrast between the people's expectation ("we said") and the reality is palpable. Lamentations, whether or not it has ironic intent,[623] certainly seems to ". . . contrast between their hopes in the king and the bitter actuality."[624] A connection with ANE royal ideology has often been noted, especially with Egyptian royal ideology.[625]

There are texts in the Old Testament that clearly regard kings in a very negative light. A few of the more obvious examples are listed below.

WTT Hosea 13:11

אֶתֵּן־לְךָ מֶלֶךְ בְּאַפִּי וְאֶקַּח בְּעֶבְרָתִי

---

[621] It is also possible that, even though the king of Syria does not mention the prophet, he may have expected the prophet to be associated with the royal court. Certainly, whatever Naaman may have thought, it is arresting that the letter from the Syrian king is to the Israelite king, and does not mention the prophet at all.

[622] This ironic point may have been made even more pointed by the fact that Elisha does not even show his face to Naaman. One thinks of those ANE writings (particularly, letters to the king) in which the writer speaks of "seeing the kings face and living." However, the emphasis in the story in 2 Kings 5 is upon the God of Israel, rather than on either the king or the prophet.

[623] Delbert R Hillers, *Lamentations*, second edition, AB 7A (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 152.

[624] Ibid., 151.

[625] J. de Savignac, "Theologie Pharaonique et Messianisme D'Israel," *VT* 7 (1957): 82.

NAU **Hosea 13:11** "I gave you a king in My anger And took him away in My wrath."

WTT **Deuteronomy 28:36**

יוֹלֵךְ יְהוָה אֹתְךָ וְאֶת־מַלְכְּךָ
אֲשֶׁר תָּקִים עָלֶיךָ אֶל־גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַעְתָּ אַתָּה וַאֲבֹתֶיךָ
וְעָבַדְתָּ שָׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עֵץ וְאָבֶן

NAU **Deuteronomy 28:36** "The LORD will bring you and your king, whom you set over you, to a nation which neither you nor your fathers have known, and there you shall serve other gods, wood and stone."

1 Samuel 8, as discussed in the chapter on methodology in this thesis, is a strong warning against the excesses in royal practice. Such excesses are portrayed as the rule, rather than the exception. Such a negative portrayal is at least close to being worthy of the designation "polemic."

These passages seem to suggest a not-so-hidden polemic, and would fulfill Amit's second criterion—that such a polemic exists in other places in the Old Testament. Such open polemic passages make it reasonable to look for polemics in passages that are less openly confrontational. However, it must be acknowledged that hidden polemic is more difficult to detect. Even to its original audience, it would have been difficult to detect, and that, by design.

In Israel and Judah, life, along with related concepts of fertility, rain, and gardens, is a divine gift, as it is in the rest of the ANE. The king is frequently associated with such concepts, both as the primary receiver of life, and as the mediator of life to his people and even his land. A very positive view of the connection of kings with life, fertility, and rain also may be seen in such passages as 2 Samuel 23:3-4 and Proverbs 16:15.

Frequently, the wish (or statement) that a king should (or would) "live forever" is not taken by modern scholars as an important statement. There are

good reasons for this. First, as Jenni has pointed out, it is not appropriate to import Greek or later ecclesiastical concepts into the Hebrew and ANE world-views, a mistake that has often been made in the past.[626] Secondly, as scholars have correctly pointed out, the wishes for the king to "live forever" are often parallel to words and phrases that suggest long life, rather than unending life. Thirdly, wishes for the kings "everlasting" life are often part of courtly protocol. Fourthly, the wish is often for a long dynasty, rather than for an individual king to live forever. Nevertheless, it is arresting that such expressions are frequently used of kings. Thus, the language (however it may have been understood) does seem to be frequently connected with kings and with royal ideology, or, at the very least, with courtly language.

However, in the Old Testament, there are many passages that portray Yahweh as the exclusive giver of life and fertility, without any intermediary—including the king. Many of these passages that emphasize that Yahweh gives life and fertility to Yahweh's people directly occur in books that, at least in their final form, seem to "democratize" Yahweh's blessings. These books may indeed allow for monarchy, but they seem to try to clip its wings.

Ecclesiastes 2:5-6 supports such a reading of Genesis 2:10-14. Solomon boasts that he made ponds of water for himself, in order to water "a forest of growing trees" (Ecclesiastes 2:6).[627] The possibility of an echo between

---

[626] Ernst Jenni, "Das Wort 'ōlām im Alten Testament." (Part 1.) *ZAW* 64 (1952): 197-248. Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms 51-100*, AB 17 (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1968) xxvi-xxvii; and John F. Healey, "The Immortality of the King: Ugarit and the Psalms," *Or* 53 (1984): 245-254, are two of the few scholars who argue that the Hebrew root can sometimes mean what is frequently meant in modern, popular parlance as "eternity."

[627] Cf. C. L. Seow, "Qohelet's Autobiography," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in honor of David Noel Freedman*, edited by A. Beck (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,1995), 275-287.

Genesis and Ecclesiastes might be suggested by Solomon's words.[628] Verheij notes the multiple connections between Genesis 1-3 and Ecclesiastes 2:4-6.[629] Verheij thinks that ". . . 'Qohelet' not only poses as a king, but even—for a moment—as God."[630] This may be worded a bit too strongly. However, it is clear that God is not mentioned in these verses, and that the king is emphasizing his own activity, as demonstrated by the repeated use of (לי) in verses 4 (twice), 5, and 6. Verheij writes concerning Qoheleth's words about laying out his garden as follows: "Now his mention of this certainly sounds like the well-known language of an ancient king, boasting that he has done what in fact his workmen have accomplished. However, in its actual wording this passage is a paraphrase of the planting of the Garden of Eden, with indeed Qohelet himself as subject, instead of God . . . ."[631]

Verheij points out a number of words that Genesis 2-3 and Qoheleth 2:4-6 share: "to plant", "garden", "tree/all/fruit", "to drench", "to sprout", and "to work, make". "Taken separately, these words are not remarkable; for the most part they are indeed very common in Biblical Hebrew. It is their combined occurrence here and in Genesis that establishes a firm link between the texts."[632]

Verheij is, of course, assuming that Ecclesiastes was written after Genesis 1-3. Whether or not the date of Old Testament documents can be established with confidence, the connection between the LORD God, the planting of the

---

[628] David M. Clemens, "The Law of sin and death: Ecclesiastes and Genesis 1-3," *Themelios* 19 (1994): 6.
[629] Arian Verheij, "Paradise Retried: On Qohelet 2.4-6." *JSOT* 50 (1991): 113-115.
[630] Ibid., 113.
[631] Ibid., 114.
[632] Ibid., 114.

garden, and the king's planting of the garden is worth noting. However, whereas in Ecclesiastes, it is the king who plants the garden, in Genesis 2-3, the emphasis is upon the LORD God as the planter of the garden and provider of water. "The LORD God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to cultivate it and keep it."[633]

The connection of life and kings is also found in the book of Proverbs. The book of Proverbs, at least in its final form, is connected with kings, no matter how the connection is understood. The royal connection meets us in the first words of the book: ("The proverbs of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel.") Regarding Solomonic "authorship" of Proverbs, Longman seems very skeptical.[634] He seems reluctant even to attribute much importance to the Solomonic references. After noting that, apart from the superscriptions themselves, ". . . we cannot say anything with great confidence." However, Longman acknowledges that this royal connection does affect how the proverbs function in their present context.[635]

Even the so-called "court sayings" may not have originated in the court, as Golka has pointed out.[636] However, whether they originated in the royal court or among the peasants, the language is associated with royalty. The argument here is not for a particular social setting for the origin of these proverbs, but merely for the fact that they speak of kings in radically different

---

[633] Genesis 2:16.

[634] Longman III, *Proverbs*, 23-26.

[635] Ibid., 26.

[636] Friedemann W. Golka, *The Leopard's Spots: Biblical and African Wisdom in Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993). Cf. especially pp. 16-17. While Golka's basic point seems to be well taken, he reaches conclusions which are, perhaps, too confident. Certainly, proverbs concerning the royal court could have originated among peasants. However, is it really certain that this is where they originated? Even Golka acknowledges that ". . . one could be tempted . . ." to see Proverbs 16:14-15 as having their source in the royal court, though Golka himself does not yield to the temptation.

ways: sometimes positively, and at other times in a decidedly negative fashion.

While some scholars have held that Proverbs 3:18 is a direct reference to the tree of life in Genesis 2-3,[637] more often the references to the tree of life in Proverbs have been taken as being "a faded metaphor".[638] Ringgren thinks that the phrase "tree of life" in Proverbs is used ". . . in a weakened sense that has nothing to do with the tree of life in Paradise . . . . In short, 'tree of life' has here become simply a symbol of happiness."[639]

However, Hurowitz holds that Proverbs 3:13-20 is Wisdom literature's response to the story in Gen. 2-3.[640] Hurowitz acknowledges that the last three references to the tree of life in Proverbs (11:30; 13:12; and 15:4) may be metaphorical.[641] However, the reference in Proverbs 3:18 may be more intimately connected with the tree of life in Genesis 2-3.[642] There seem to be

---

[637] Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon*, volume 1, translated by M. G. Easton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 94. (Cf. also Delitzsch's comments on 13:12 (278). Richard J. Clifford, *Proverbs: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 55, seems to imply the same, since he writes that "Proverbs reverses Genesis . . . ."
Paul E. Koptak, *Proverbs*, NIVAC (Grand Raids: Zondervan, 2003), 123, tries to keep in tension the different meanings of the phrase "the tree of life" in Genesis 2-3 and Proverbs 3:18, with the idea that, ". . . readers of long ago may have been reminded of the account of Genesis and noted that now they are encouraged to take hold of the tree of life—here in Proverbs a metaphor for acquiring and following wisdom . . . ."

[638] Ralph Marcus, "The Tree of Life in Proverbs," *JBL* 62 (1943): 119-120. Cf. also Crawford H. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), 69-70. Toy speaks of the tree of life in Proverbs as ". . . a figurative expression (probably a commonplace of the poetical vocabulary) . . . ." See also P. Joseph Titus, *The Second Story of Creation (Gen 2:4-3:24: A Prologue to the Concept of Enneateuch?* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011).

[639] Ringgren, "חַיִּים," *TDOT* 4:335.

[640] Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, "Paradise Regained: Proverbs 3:13-20 Reconsidered," in Sefer Moshe: the Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, an Post-Biblical Judaism (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 49. In a similar vein, albeit more cautiously, cf. Stordalen, Echoes of Eden, 373-374.

[641] Ibid., 50.

[642] Ibid.

several connections between Proverbs 3:13-20 and Genesis 2-3.[643] Hurowitz points out several points of contact between Proverbs 3:18 and Genesis 2-3.

> The most obvious allusion to the Garden of Eden story is the Tree of Life itself. No other location on earth hosted such a tree. To be sure, some scholars suggest that the tree of life here is only a metaphor, but its nonmetaphorical status can be established by finding other allusions to Genesis 2-3 in adjoining verses. Thus, we must now investigate whether the tree stands alone as an isolated motif or is an integral part of a broader array of intertextual connections.[644]

Hurowitz argues for the double use of אדם in vs. 13 as ". . . intentional and motivated by literary considerations."[645] While Hurowitz does not explicitly argue for this use of אדם as a proper noun in Proverbs, he does argue that in Genesis 3:17, 21; and 4:25, this Hebrew word is used as a proper noun.[646]

Hurowitz thinks of the initial words of Prov. 3:17 and the initial words of v. 18 would naturally coalesce in a reader's mind.

> But the most unique and significant allusion to Genesis 3 occurs in the initial words of Prov. 3:17 and 18. . . . Combining these words yields . . . "Her ways are the ways of/toward the Tree of Life", echoing loudly . . . "the way of the Tree of Life", which is the final locution, concluding the Garden of Eden story. Only a reader so absent-minded that he would forget the content of one verse immediately upon reading the next would be deaf to the combination of the words and obtuse to what they echo.[647]

Hurowitz's argument is somewhat weaker than it might seem at first blush. After all, the roots אדם and דרך are exceedingly common in the Old Testament. Is it really certain that an ancient reader/hearer would have naturally made the connections that Hurowitz assumes? However, general associations with royal ideology may have been awakened by such language.

---

643 In a similar vein, see R. S. Hendel, "Getting Back to the Garden of Eden," *BR* 14/6 (December, 1998): 17, 47. He writes (47), "Wisdom, it seems, offers a perfect existence in a more than metaphorical fashion."

644 Ibid., 56.

645 Ibid., 57.

646 Ibid., 57, fn. 18.

647 Ibid., 60.

This association would have been even more likely, given the general connection between the book of Proverbs and King Solomon.[648] The fact that, in its final form, Proverbs is associated with King Solomon suggests that individual proverbs and instructions would naturally have been read as somehow connected to royal ideology, either as supporting or challenging that ideology, or perhaps, universalizing that ideology. However, to universalize is, at the same time, to challenge royal hegemony in the mediation of life. This conventional linking might be another subtle hint that the phrase "the tree of life" is to be connected with the royal court.[649] Also, as Malamat has pointed out, Solomon's vision and prayer, and God's response (1 Kings 3) seem ". . . to be cast in the mold of wisdom literature, as witness its close similarity to Proverbs 3 . . . ."[650] Furthermore, as Ansberry has pointed out, some contextual clues in Proverbs 3:13-18 suggest a royal setting for this discourse. Thus, Ansberry points out that עֹשֶׁר וְכָבוֹד ("riches and honor") is ". . . an expression used primarily in reference to royal figures."[651]

Marx has seen Proverbs 3:18 as a kind of "democratization" of the promise to Solomon in 1 Kings 3:4-15.[652] In Proverbs, the "father" promises

---

[648] Whether there is a factual connection between Solomonic ascription and reality, it is sufficient for the argument which is here presented that references to the tree of life might, very naturally, be connected in the minds of hearers/readers with royal ideology in Proverbs.

[649] For the connection between wisdom, the royal court, and Genesis 2-3, cf. Mendenhall, "Shady Side of Wisdom," 319-334; H. A. J. Kruger, "Myth, ideology, and wisdom," 47-75; Ansberry, *Be Wise, My Son,* 58. Ansberry notes (page 58) the frequent connection of "riches and honor" in v. 16 with royalty (58, 69). He also makes an argument for connecting Proverbs 3:18 with royalty.

[650] Abraham Malamat. "Longevity: Biblical Concepts and Some Ancient Near Eastern Parallels." *AfOB* 19 (1982): 215-224, reprinted in *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues*, CHANE (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 400.

[651] Christopher B. Ansberry, *Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad: An Exploration of the Courtly Nature of the Book of Proverbs*, BZAW 422 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 58. Ansberry is referring to Proverbs 3:16.

[652] Alfred Marx, "Solomon, ou le modèle de l'homme heureux," *VT* 58/3 (2008): 420-423. Marx's basic point is this: Proverbs 3:13-18 refers to 1 Kings 3:14-15, and offers to every wise person the chance to receive the same promise as Solomon did.

to his "son" that, if he behaves in a wise way, the same promises given to Solomon will also obtain for the son. Such democratization may also a kind of subtle criticism of Solomon. Perhaps this section of Proverbs is quietly challenging the supposed royal monopoly of wisdom.[653] Proverbs 3 (and perhaps much else in the book of Proverbs) also challenges the connection between the king and life. Dell concludes that, in Proverbs, kings were not accorded ". . . uncritical attribution of righteousness and justice . . . . Many proverbs concern the wise use of power and in reference to the monarch this is even more important. This motif is not so much criticism of the king as realization of the importance of the maintenance of the ideal. Contrasts are made in usual wisdom style to show that kings are not infallible and often fail to satisfy the ideal."[654]

---

[653] Similarly, cf. Johnny E. Miles, *Wise King-Royal Fool*, JSOTSUP 399 (London: T & T Clark, 2004). While Miles may over-read (if not misread) his texts, there is, at the very least, a measured reappraisal of Solomon in Proverbs 1-9. Even in a somewhat negative review of the book by Miles, E. C. Lucas, "Review of *Wise King-Royal Fool* by Johnny E. Miles," *JSOT* 29/5 (2005): 77, acknowledges that the book ". . . does, though, challenge the reader to consider whether there is an implicit criticism of Solomon in Proverbs 1-9 . . . ."
Cf. also James L. Crenshaw, "The Sage in Proverbs," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient near East*, edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 214. Crenshaw notes how the ". . . intermingling of popular aphorisms and language from Egyptian courtiers illustrates the complexity of Israelite wisdom literature. No single sociological group was responsible for the sapiential corpus, whether family or royal court." Crenshaw does not, however, speak in terms of "democratization", nor does he argue for any sort of polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology.

[654] Katharine J. Dell, "The King in the Wisdom Literature," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 185.

CHAPTER 5: KNOWLEDGE AND LIFE IN GENESIS 2-3 AS CLUES TO A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY

In the previous two chapters, it has been argued (and evidence has been presented) that the themes of knowledge and life are frequently connected with kings and with royal ideology in the ANE. This is true across time, from the third millennium to the Hellenistic era.[655] Knowledge and life are connected with kings across geography, as well as across time. These two themes are central to royal ideology from Egypt to Mesopotamia, and from the Hittite Empire to Ugarit. The royal connection with life and knowledge is reflected in widely various genres, usually in a very positive light. At other times, life and knowledge are related to kings in a much more problematic fashion.

It has also been argued that life and knowledge are connected with kings in the Old Testament. Often, these connections are very positive. However, even within particular texts, the relationship of kings to life is sometimes presented in a problematic or even a negative light. This is true in specific texts as a whole, even when parts of the same text seem to present royal life and knowledge very positively.

In this chapter, it will be argued, by examining the theme of knowledge (and related ideas) and life (and related ideas) in Genesis 2-3, that there are crucial clues within the Eden Narrative that suggest a polemic involving life

---

[655] While these themes and connections with royalty could be fruitfully pursued up to the very present, this thesis is limited to the period which is covered in the Old Testament.

and knowledge as critical aspects of royal ideology.[656] Some of these clues appear to be connected with other biblical materials in which pro-royal ideology and/or anti-royal polemic occurs. Furthermore, other ANE materials to which the Eden Narrative seems to be closely connected also seem to be engaging in a polemic against important aspects of ANE royal ideology—particularly knowledge and life.

The chapter will be subdivided as follows:

A. KNOWLEDGE IN GENESIS 2-3 AS A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY

1. *The Importance of Knowledge and Related Ideas in Genesis 2-3.*
2. *The Centrality and Meaning of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in Genesis 2-3.*
3. *Knowledge in Genesis 2-3 as a Clue to a Hidden Polemic against Excesses in Royal Ideology.*

B. LIFE IN GENESIS 2-3 AS A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY.

1. *The Importance of Life and Related Ideas in Genesis 2-3.*
2. *The Centrality of the Tree of Life in Genesis 2-3.*
3. *Life in Genesis 2-3 as a Clue to a Hidden Polemic against Excesses in Royal Ideology.*

C. OTHER CLUES IN GENESIS 2-3 FOR A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY.

D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: HOW THE CLUES IN GENESIS 2-3 POINT TOWARD A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY AND PRACTICE.

A. KNOWLEDGE IN GENESIS 2-3 AS A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY

The following subsection on knowledge will be organized as follows. First, the importance of knowledge and related ideas will be set forth. Second,

---

[656] Cf. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions": 241-265; Berger, "Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion": 253-272; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*; Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 479-89.

the centrality and possible meanings of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil will be presented. Third, it will be argued that the theme of knowledge should be considered a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology.

The Importance of Knowledge and Related Ideas in Genesis 2-3.

The importance of knowledge in Genesis 2-3 has been frequently noted by scholars.[657] A perusal of many bibliographies on Genesis 2-3, or scanning the footnotes or endnotes of commentaries and monographs will substantiate this claim. In particular, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil has been recognized by many scholars as having a great significance.

However, there are other indicators of the importance of knowledge in Genesis 2-3, in addition to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Thus, references to knowledge and related concepts other than the tree of the knowledge of good and evil will be discussed, before turning to the tree itself. These related concepts would include:

a. Uses of the root ידע outside its usage in the phrase which connects it with good and evil.

b. Uses of other roots which are definitely related to knowledge, including:

   i. ערם.

   ii. שכל.

---

[657] Here is a partial listing for those who recognize knowledge (variously understood) as an important theme in Genesis 2-3: Lasine, *Knowing Kings*; Sawyer, "The Image of God"; Ivan Engnell, "'Knowledge' and 'Life' in the Creation Story," in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East, Essays Presented to Professor H. H. Rowley*, VTSSup 3 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 103-109; Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 88-89; Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 101; Stratton, *Out of Eden*, 67-108; and York, "Maturation Theme", 393- 410. (Cf. especially page 406.) Cf. also John Goldingay, "Postmodernizing Eve and Adam (Can I Have My Apricot as Well as Eating It?)," in *The World of Genesis: Persons, Places, Perspectives*, edited by Philip R. Davies and David J. A. Clines, JSOTSup 257 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 50.

iii. Roots which may also be related to knowledge are ראה ("to see"—2:19;[658] 3:16) and שמע ("to hear"—3:8, 10, 17).[659]

iv. Other Motifs which Suggest Knowledge in Genesis 2-3.

1. Adam naming the animals and Eve.[660]

2. Eve's dialogue with the serpent (3:1-5) and her evaluating of the tree (3:6).

a. Uses of the root ידע outside its usage in the phrase which connects it with good and evil.

The root ידע occurs 6 times in Genesis 2-3. The infinitive construct with the article (הַדַּעַת) occurs two times, in 2:9 and 17. The infinitive construct with the preposition (ל) is found in 3:22. The participle occurs in 3:5 of God (יֹדֵעַ) and of the man and woman, if they should partake of the fruit (יֹדְעֵי). The finite imperfect verb occurs in 3:7, after the man and woman have partaken of the fruit (וַיֵּדְעוּ).

The root ידע occurs 6 times in Genesis 2-3. The infinitive construct with the article (הַדַּעַת) occurs two times, in 2:9 and 17. The infinitive construct with the preposition (ל) is found in 3:22. The participle occurs in 3:5 of God (יֹדֵעַ) and of the man and woman, if they should partake of the fruit (יֹדְעֵי). The finite imperfect verb occurs in 3:7, after the man and woman have partaken of the fruit (וַיֵּדְעוּ).

There are other indicators of the importance of the root ידע in Genesis 2-3, in addition to the frequent occurrence of the root ידע. The root is used as

---

[658] In Genesis 2:19, the root ראה is a virtual synonym for ידע.

[659] Cf., for example, Proverbs 1:2-7. See also Terrence E. Fretheim, "ידע," *NIDOTTE* 2: 410.

[660] Cf. 1 Kings 4:29-34. While "naming" is not mentioned in 1 Kings 4, "speaking of" animals and plants may suggest that wisdom is generally connected with an expansive knowledge of nature.

one of the main descriptors for one of the two named trees in 2:9, and in 2:17. The root ידע is also used by the serpent to describe God as a knower of what will happen to the man and woman when they have partaken of the forbidden fruit, and to describe the effect of this fruit on the man and woman (3:5). In 3:7, the root is used to describe the fact that the man and woman "knew that they were naked," after they had partaken of the forbidden fruit (3:7, 10).

[WTT]Genesis 3:5

כִּי יֹדֵעַ אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְּיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם
וִהְיִיתֶם כֵּאלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע

[NAU]Genesis 3:5

"For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."

Three observations are in order. First, the same basic form and stem (*qal* participle) is used in this verse for God's knowing and for the knowing of the man and woman that the serpent predicts. This may be the serpent's (and the narrator's) attempt to forge a close link between God as knower with the woman and man as knowers.

Second (and at the same time), the serpent seeks to drive a wedge between what God knows and what the woman and man can know. The implications of the serpent's words might be paraphrased somewhat as follows: "What God knows," the serpent suggests, "is not what he said, nor what you will come to know. You will come to know good and evil. God is holding out on you!" Thus, the serpent suggests the possibility of God-likeness, even as the serpent also suggests God's distance.

Third, it is often argued that the serpent must be a reliable speaker, since at least two of the things he says are true.[661] The man and woman do not "die on that day", and they do—according to the LORD God—become "like gods (or "like God") knowing (or "knowers of") good and evil". On the contrary, some scholars argue that the serpent is not a reliable speaker, or (at the very least) not entirely reliable.[662] This will be discussed later in this chapter, when the phrase טוֹב וָרָע in Genesis 3:22 is examined in more detail.

The findings concerning knowing and knowledge thus far may be summarized in the following manner. Knowledge is an important—if not the crucial—concern of this narrative. This is shown by the prominence of three key roots for knowledge and knowing: ידע, ערם, and שׂכל, and perhaps also by the roots ראה and שׁמע[663] as well as by other indicators of the humans' knowledge. The woman and man are portrayed as knowing both before and after partaking of the forbidden fruit. However, their knowledge after partaking of the fruit is portrayed in a somewhat ambiguous light.[664]

a. Uses of other Hebrew roots related to knowledge.

i. The use of ערם.

---

[661] This is a crucial, if often unacknowledged, watershed in approaches to the Eden Narrative, and will be discussed later in this chapter. Cf. Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 8, 12, 14. Barr is perhaps the most direct and vehement of the many scholars who hold that the serpent told the truth. Cf. also Bernard F. Batto, *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 59.

[662] Cf., for example, Gordon, "Ethics of Eden, 26.

[663] The word "perhaps" is an important word here. Certainly, the roots ראה and שׁמע can be used of means of cognition. However, the words are so common and multidimensional that not too much weight should be given to their occurrence in Genesis 2-3.

[664] Cf. Saler, "Transformation of Reason in Genesis 2-3," 275-286. Saler seeks to set forth two interpretive options, he sees both as having validity. The two options which he sets forth are what he calls the "classical fall tradition" and the Enlightenment position, which tends to regard the knowledge acquired in the garden more positively (275). In fact, Saler seems to set forth a third interpretative option. He seems to identify this third option with a "post-Enlightenment" approach (275), which regards the knowledge acquired in Eden as "ambiguous" (284-285).

It is not only the repeated use of the root ידע that signals a concern with knowledge and knowing in Genesis 2-3. The words עָרוּם (3:1) and לְהַשְׂכִּיל (3:6) deserve attention in any discussion concerning the meaning of knowledge in Genesis 2-3.

WTT Genesis 3:1

וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם מִכֹּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים . . .

NAU Genesis 3:1

"Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. . . ."

The word play with the word עֲרוּמִּים ("naked") in 2:25 has frequently been noted.[665] The purpose of the word play, however, is not clear.[666] Stratton thinks that ". . . the couple's covering suggests they have been transformed from naked to shrewd."[667] However, when God comes into the garden, the man explains his hiding by saying, "I was naked" (3:10). How shrewd are the man and woman, when the man, at least, still feels naked after he has made a garment for himself? Edwin Good notes the irony that the shrewd (עָרוּם) serpent promises these two naked (עֲרוּמִּים) people that their eyes will be opened, and they will be like God, knowing good and evil. However, instead, when they partake of the fruit, their eyes are opened, and they know that they

---

[665] Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 187. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC (Waco: Word, 1987), 72. Wenham speaks of this as ". . . one of the more obvious plays on words in the text . . . ." Wenham (45) attempts to retain the word play in translation by using the word "nude" for the man and woman (2:25), and the word "shrewd" for the serpent (3:1).

[666] Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 69-70. Cf. especially, the article by Bechtel, "Rethinking the Interpretation of Genesis 2.vb-3.24," 81. Bechtel helpfully notes, "An emphasis on language through wordplays is typical of symbolic communication. Wordplays function as flashing signposts indicating the emphasis of the narrative and relatedness between separate items."

[667] Stratton, *Out of Eden*, 162, fn. 1.

are . . . naked (עֵירֻמִּם).[668] Good's contention that "nakedness" in Hebrew primarily suggests "helplessness" seems basically on target.[669] The man and woman, then, have their eyes opened, not to their god-likeness, nor likely to their sexuality, but to their helplessness.

The serpent is described as ". . . more crafty than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made." Perhaps the fact that this serpent was a creature that God had made indicates something about the source of its shrewdness. On the contrary, perhaps the author wishes the readers/hearers to note the fact that the serpent was one of the LORD God's creatures, thus relativizing the shrewdness of the serpent. Rosenberg[670] and Kass[671] have suggested that the serpent's own motivation may have been revenge for having been passed over by Adam when Adam was looking for a partner. However, while the serpent claims to know God's motives, neither the narrator nor the serpent reveals the serpent's motives.

Another play on words involving the serpent may occur in 3:14. God pronounces a curse (אָרוּר) upon the serpent. This word recalls the earlier statement about the serpent's shrewdness (עָרוּם). The similarity of the phraseology in 3:1 and 14 can be seen by placing the relevant phrases in juxtaposition.

עָרוּם מִכֹּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

---

668 Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 83-84.

669 Ibid., 84. See also Magonet, " Themes of Genesis 2-3," 43. See also H. Niehr, "ערה,"*TDOT*, 11:343-349. Niehr identifies many different connotations of nakedness, but it would seem that, in most of them, there is the element of shame, humiliation, helplessness, or vulnerability.

670 Rosenberg, *King and Kin*, 54.

671 Leon R. Kass, *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 80-81.

אָרוּר אַתָּה מִכָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּמִכֹּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

". . . more crafty than any beast of the field . . ."
"Cursed are you more than any animal and more than any beast of the field . . ."[672]

Thus, the shrewdness of the serpent seems to be called into question and relativized by clues that the narrator gives us in his description of that shrewdness, as well as by God's words to the serpent at the trial of the three leading characters in Genesis 3. The reader/hearer might be inclined initially to think well of the serpent, or at least to give him the benefit of the doubt. However, when the readers/hearers hear that he is אָרוּר, this becomes more difficult.

i. The use of שׂכל.

שׂכל is another root which is important for the theme of knowing. In 3:6, the narrator takes the readers/hearers into the inner reasoning of the woman.

WTT Genesis 3:6

וַתֵּרֶא הָאִשָּׁה כִּי טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמַאֲכָל וְכִי
תַאֲוָה־הוּא לָעֵינַיִם וְנֶחְמָד הָעֵץ לְהַשְׂכִּיל וַתִּקַּח מִפִּרְיוֹ וַתֹּאכַל
וַתִּתֵּן גַּם־לְאִישָׁהּ עִמָּהּ וַיֹּאכַל

[672] This translation is my own.

NAU **Genesis 3:6**

"When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was desirable to make one wise, she took from its fruit and ate; and she gave also to her husband with her, and he ate."

The root שכל occurs some 77 times in the Old Testament, with approximately 25% (19 occurrences) in the book of Proverbs. It is significant that this word is associated with a book that is explicitly associated with the names of kings, and has some sayings that expressly address matters concerned with kings. This same root, שכל, occurs in the programmatic prologue to Proverbs (1:3), as part of the overriding purpose of the entire book.

The woman demonstrates discernment even before she has partaken of the fruit that gives knowledge.[673] To be sure, the root used here (שכל) is different from that used to describe the fruit of the tree or its effects (ידע) and different again from the root used to describe the serpent (ערם). However, these three roots are sometimes used in parallel, or in close proximity in the Old Testament.[674]

2. The Centrality and Meaning of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in Genesis 2-3.

One component that contributes to this plethora of interpretations of the Eden Narrative is "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." While the importance of this tree in Genesis 2-3 is generally acknowledged, the precise meaning of the knowledge of good and evil in the Eden Narrative remains

---

[673] It should be noted that the *LXX* does not have a word comparable to the Hebrew להשכיל. Cf. John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 39.

[674] Cf., for example, the use of the roots ידע (Prov. 1:2), שכל (Prov. 1:3), and ערם (Prov. 1:4).

elusive. Agreement on the importance of a theme does not equate with agreement as to the understanding of the meaning of that theme. Barth comments, "To the tree of knowledge there are no parallels either in the Old Testament or in the general history of religion. The result has been an even greater variety of attempts to explain it."[675]

The individual words in the phrase הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע are themselves common and fairly well understood.[676] However, the phrase itself remains difficult, particularly in the context of the Eden Narrative. Interpretations of this phrase may be classified in many ways.[677] While, for the purpose of this survey, the major approaches to the phrase are categorized as six in number, several of them could be combined, or could be further subdivided. Furthermore, it should be remembered that at least some of the approaches are not mutually exclusive, and that two or more of the approaches may be held by the same scholar. Finally, as will be noted, many of these approaches appear to be connected in some way with royal ideology in other biblical texts.

The Knowledge of Good and Evil as Moral Discernment.[678]

To a reader untouched by modern scholarship, the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" might seem simple: The phrase refers to moral discernment, ethics, or conscience. The man and woman were unable to know right from wrong before they partook of the tree, and able to do so afterwards.

---

[675] Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Volume III, Part 1, translated by J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey, and Harold Knight (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), 284. Cf. also R. W. L. Moberly, "Did the Serpent Get It Right?" *JTS* 39 (1988): 21. See also Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 122.

[676] Cf., for example, Jack P. Lewis, "יָדַע," *TWOT*, 366.

[677] For some of the many classification schemes, see Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 242-245; Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 163-166.

[678] Cf. Budde, *Die biblisch Urgeschichte*, 69. S. Fischer, "טוֹב וָרָע," in der Erzählung von Paradies und Sündenfall," *BZ* 22 (1934): 323-331.

Support for this position is the fact that, before partaking of the forbidden fruit, the man and woman were naked, yet unashamed. After partaking, they were morally awakened, so that they became ashamed and hid from God. This suggests a guilty conscience, and the possession of moral awareness.

However, Wellhausen noted several problems with this view.[679] How could conscience—which Wellhausen defines as ". . . the faculty of moral distinction . . ."—be a bad thing?[680] Furthermore, "conscience" would be a specifically human quality, rather than a divine one (Genesis 3:22). Wellhausen also pointed out that the expression "good and evil" really means what is "beneficial or harmful", not moral right or wrong.[681] Moreover, Wallace points out a logical problem: How could the couple have been guilty of disobedience unless they already knew right from wrong?[682]

However, perhaps this "moral conscience" approach has been dismissed too facilely. It is possible to think of moral discernment on a gradient. Perhaps the man and woman had some level of moral discernment before they partook of the forbidden fruit, but more discernment afterwards.[683]

---

[679] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin: G. Romer, 1886), 314-316. Cf. also R. Norman Whybray, *The Good Life in the Old Testament* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 22-23.

[680] Cf. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, 301.

[681] This is not to say that the words cannot carry those connotations at times.

[682] Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 116.
Of course, the question which could be asked, "Did they need to know? Was not just obeying enough?"
Cf. Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Chicago: Illinois, 1967), 63. This seems to be Kidner's basic point. "In the context, however, the emphasis falls on the prohibition rather than the properties of the tree. It is shown to us as forbidden. It is idle to ask what it might mean in itself; this was Eve's error. As it stood, prohibited, it presented the alternative to discipleship: to be self-made, wresting one's knowledge, satisfactions and values from the created world in defiance of the Creator (*cf.* 3:6). Even more instructive is the outcome of the experiment: see on 3:7. In all this the tree plays its part in the opportunity it offers, rather than the qualities it possesses; like a door whose name announces only what lies beyond it."

[683] Gerhard Charles Aalders, *Genesis* vol. I, Bible Student's Commentary, translated by William Heynen (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 9.

1. The Knowledge of Good and Evil as Moral Autonomy[684]

One basic definition of autonomy runs as follows: "[p]utting moral weight on an individual's ability to govern herself, independent of her place in a metaphysical order or her role in social structures and political institutions . . ."[685] Thus, moral autonomy is a self-motivated approach to human choice, whereas moral discernment implies a standard of good and evil that is outside of the individual, whether this "individual" is a person or a societal grouping of whatever size.

The moral autonomy approach to the knowledge of good and evil has much to recommend it. This approach seems intelligible to modern westerners, since it portrays the tendency of individuals and societies to value free choice—a tendency that seems to be both good and bad. In the text NET Lamentations 3:40 Let us carefully examine our ways, and let us return to the LORD.

Furthermore, after the eating of the fruit, the man and woman make both coverings and excuses for themselves and explain things to the LORD God. The man decides that he should (re)name the woman "Eve". The woman gives birth to children, and chooses their names (4:1, 2, 25). Cain defends his "autonomy" when he asks if he is his brother's keeper (4:9). The descendants of Cain develop a human culture, complete with metal, music, and murder (4:16-24). Since there is no mention of the Lord/God in connection with these

---

[684] For various permutations of this interpretation, cf. John Baker, "The Myth of Man's ' 'Fall' '—A Reappraisal," *ET* 92 (1980/81): 235-237; Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Volume III, Part 1, 284, 286-288; Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis*, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982): 40-54; Martin Buber, *Good and Evil*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952,1953), 73-79; Hamilton, *Genesis, Chapters 1-17*, 165-166. See also Donald E. Gowan, *From Eden to Babel: A Commentary on Genesis 1-11*, ITC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 54-61; Moberly, "Did the Serpent Get It Right?": 24.

[685] http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/autonomy-moral/#ConAut, accessed 4-20-2016.

enterprises, it seems possible to call these developments "autonomy". Brueggemann, for example, writes, "Knowledge leads to freedom to act and the capacity to control. This text may be a reflection on the role of wisdom, perhaps in an aggressive royal context. It probes the question: Are there modes of knowledge that come at too high a cost? (cf. Prov. 25:2-3.) It asks if there are boundaries before which one must bow, even if one could know more."[686]

However, the concept of autonomy seems to have become a common topic in literature only during the Enlightenment Period.[687] Thus, speaking of "moral autonomy" in connection with the ancient world seems anachronistic. Furthermore, the question must be raised as to whether the ability to make moral decisions on one's own is ever portrayed positively in the Old Testament as being located in the individual.[688]

It should also be noted that the grammar does not naturally incline one toward this position. The words טוֹב and רָע do sometimes suggest the ability to discern/decide between what is good and what is bad,[689] but when this is so, there are other markers in the text in addition to the presence of the words טוֹב and רָע. For example, in Genesis 24:50, in the phrase רַע אוֹ־טוֹב, the word אוֹ

---

[686] Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 51. Similarly, cf. Hamilton, *Genesis Chapters 1-17*, 165-166. Hamilton, building on the work of W. Malcolm Clark, "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3," *JBL*, 88 (1969): 266-278, also argues his case by citing uses of the words "good" and "evil," which seem to him best understood as autonomy.

[687] Cf. "Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy" in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/autonomy-moral/, accessed 08-26-2010).

[688] Cf. Proverbs 3:5-7 and Claus Westermann, *Elements of Old Testament Theology*, translated by Douglas W. Stott (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 153-216. Cf. also Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, volume 2, translated by J. A. Baker, 2 volumes (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 181, 329.
Deuteronomy might be considered an example of the people's ability to choose between good and evil, and thus to make autonomous choices. Deuteronomy 30:19 is the classic example. However, this call to choose is set in the context of God's command (Deuteronomy 30:11). Thus, it does not suggest the ability of the people to decide autonomously what is right and wrong for them.

[689] Cf. 2 Samuel 14:17 and 1 Kings 3:9.

stands between the crucial words רע and טוב.[690] The word "or" in this context implies an exclusive choice—i.e., it is an either/or decision, not a both/and situation. Often prepositions suggesting division are used with the words טוֹב and רָע. For example, in 1 Kings 3:9 (בין־טוֹב לְרָע), the prepositions בין and לְ, suggest being able to judge between good and evil, rather than the joining of the words טוֹב and רָע. Furthermore, the verbs that govern the objects רע and טוֹב in other biblical texts do not support the idea that moral autonomy is in view in these texts. For example, in 1 Kings 3:9, the verbal root is בין. If the idea being conveyed were "establishing what is רע and טוֹב on one's own," the root שים or קום in the *hiphîl* might have been expected.

Kissling notes the similar construction in Deuteronomy 1:39.

> The phrase "good and evil" occurs elsewhere in the Pentateuch in Deuteronomy 1:39 where Moses uses it of the innocence of children, who do not "know good and evil." I would argue that the tree prohibits personal, intimate knowledge of evil. Human beings are not created to be god or even gods. God can know everything there is to know about evil and yet not be tempted by it nor tainted by it. Human beings are not so constituted. We have to choose to avoid certain types of knowledge of evil things because we will be tempted by it and then tainted by it. One need only contemplate the trivialized violence in the modern media and the relatively cavalier way in which we participate in state-sanctioned violence to see the connection. Humanity cannot know everything, especially evil, and remain untouched by it. Even comprehensive knowledge of good things can be twisted into pride. Sometimes when we gain knowledge, we are tempted to think that we have no need of God.[691]

Furthermore, the moral autonomy view falls prey to the same argument that is often used to dismiss the moral discernment approach.[692] Although the serpent seems to influence the woman's thinking about the tree, it is the woman herself who sees the good qualities of the tree (3:6, 13), and (autonomously) decides to eat, as does the man (3:6, 12). Surely this is an

---

[690] The only biblical locations where good and evil are joined by a *waw* are in Deuteronomy 1:39 and 2 Samuel 14:17.

[691] Paul Kissling, *Genesis*, 161.

[692] See above.

expression of the humans' autonomy, even before the man and woman partake of the fruit. How could Adam and Eve have been held responsible for (or made) an autonomous choice, if they did not already possess some degree of autonomy? If they already possessed moral autonomy, how did eating of the forbidden fruit change their situation?

On the other hand, the same counter-argument that was suggested above to reinstate the ethical theory of the knowledge of good and evil might be used to argue for different levels of autonomy. Adam and Eve might have had enough autonomy to be able to make a free choice to obey or disobey God's command, but a greater degree of autonomy afterwards.

2. The Knowledge of Good and Evil as a Test[693]

Although Mettinger comments that approaching ". . . the Eden Narrative as dealing with a divine test does not seem to play any role in the history of exegesis," this assessment seems exaggerated.[694] Testing may not seem to play a role in interpretive approaches because the idea of testing is often blended with other interpretive aspects.

Mettinger argues for a linkage of Genesis 2-3 with Genesis 22 and Job, but especially with the Deuteronomic tradition. He notes the importance of the Hebrew root צוה in Deuteronomy, and the presence of that same root in Genesis 2:16-17 and 3:11, 17. ". . . [T]he whole central passage, 3:1-7, turns on the divine commandment, although neither the noun nor the verb from the root *ṣwh* occurs in this passage."[695] Mettinger also notes the significant Deuteronomistic phrase "to listen to the voice of YHWH", as contrasted with the man listening to his wife's voice (Genesis 3:17). There is also the matter of the choice between blessings and curses in both Deuteronomy and Genesis 2-3.[696]

While Mettinger may be correct in broad terms, there seems to be a different emphasis in Deuteronomy when compared to Genesis 2-3. In Deuteronomy, life and good are linked with blessing, whereas death and evil

---

[693] Cf. Aalders, *Genesis*: 93; Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (Chicago: Illinois, 1967); Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3*, 49-60.

[694] Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 23. Cf., for example, Walton, *Genesis*, 213-216. Walton argues against the Eden Narrative as an arbitrary test. He seems to push that approach out the front door, only to quietly bring it back in through the back door.
Walton (page 216) argues that the prohibition was temporary, and that if the man and woman had obeyed, they would have eventually been allowed to eat of the temporarily prohibited tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Thus, while Walton primarily thinks of Genesis 2-3 as being about a premature grab for maturity.

[695] Ibid., 26.

[696] Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 49-60. Cf. also Moshe Soller, "A Latch and Clasp Connecting Deuteronomy 33:27-29 with Genesis 3:22-24: A Proposed Interpretation," *JBQ*, 133 (2006): 12-15.

are linked with curse. This is true in Deuteronomy 11:26-28 and 30:5-20, both of which Mettinger quotes. However, the only place where good and evil are linked with the *waw* in Deuteronomy is 1:39, and there, it is precisely those who did not know good and evil, who would enter the land of Canaan.

Furthermore, the Eden Narrative contains no explicit word for testing, a point that Mettinger acknowledges.[697] In the cases of Abraham and Deuteronomy, the testing aspect is made explicit.[698] In the case of Job, Mettinger is using a story that may suggest a test in order to support his argument that another story (Genesis 2-3) is also be a test. This seems to be a questionable interpretive move.[699] There may indeed be an aspect of testing in Genesis 2-3, but this approach does not seem to exhaust the meaning of the phrase טוֹב וָרָע.

---

[697] Ibid., 23.

[698] Cf. Genesis 22:1; Deuteronomy 8:2, 16.

[699] For a critique of the "testing" approach to the knowledge of good and evil, cf. Walton, *Genesis*, 214.

"The most common interpretation in traditional theology is one that sees the tree as a probationary test. In this view neither the tree nor its fruit have any particular qualities. Instead, one gains knowledge of good by passing the test and resisting the temptation. In contrast, one gains knowledge of evil by succumbing to the temptation and eating of the fruit. As we consider the merits of this view, it appears to have trouble with each of the four criteria listed above. [Walton had just listed these four criteria].

1. It separates the knowledge of good from the knowledge of evil as is done nowhere else in the use of the phrase (ignoring the merism as it does so). It cannot easily be reconciled with the record of Eve's statement that the fruit was desirable to make one wise.
2. It ignores the nakedness issue altogether---why should their nakedness become evident to them just because they disobeyed and failed the test?
3. It devalues the significance of the fruit and tree in that God could have just as easily made the test a river that they weren't to swim in or a mountain they shouldn't climb. In contrast to this, the report of Eve's statement focuses on the fruit's capacity to make one wise. One might object that Eve's assessment is not normative, but she is closer to it than anyone else. The text gives every indication that there is a property in the fruit itself (just as there was in the tree of life) that would lead to the knowledge of good and evil.
4. It is difficult to reconcile this view with 3:22, because it portrays Adam and Eve as gaining knowledge of evil (instead of good) through their experience of evil. There is no way that this can be construed as being like God in his knowledge of good and evil."

3. The Knowledge of Good and Evil as a Test[700]

The sexual interpretation of הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע appears to have much to recommend it. The evidence is of three principal varieties: that from the Old Testament, evidence from other ANE material (particularly *The Gilgamesh Epic)*, and evidence based on logic.

The biblical evidence may be summarized as follows. First, the verbal forms of the Hebrew root ידע sometimes express sexual intercourse.[701] The root is used of Adam "knowing" his wife, outside the garden.[702] Other biblical clues that the knowledge of good and evil might have sexual overtones are the nakedness of the man and woman,[703] and the fact that some of the terminology of the punishment section may relate to sexual desire,[704] and certainly relates to child-bearing.[705] Furthermore, Veenker notes that gardens are sometimes associated with sex,[706] and that eating—especially, eating fruit—is often a metaphor for sex.[707]

---

[700] Cf. Aalders, *Genesis*: 93; Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (Chicago: Illinois, 1967); Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3*, 49-60.

[701] Cf., for example, Genesis 4:1; 19:5, 8. However, none of the 90 occurrences of the noun form of the root appears to have a sexual nuance. This weakens the argument for the sexual connotation, at least in Genesis 2:9 and 2:17.

[702] Genesis 4:1.

[703] Genesis 2:25; 3:7, 10, and 11.

[704] In Genesis 3:16, the word תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ is encountered. Cf. Genesis 4:7; Song of Songs 7:11. In Song of Songs, it has a definite sexual connotation.

[705] Genesis 3:16.

[706] Veenker, "Forbidden Fruit": 60-62.

[707] Ibid., 57-73. Veenker, 65, cites Proverbs 30:20 as an example of eating as a metaphor for sex. Also, in fn. 34 on the same page, Veenker gives Genesis 39:5-6 as an example, though this is a more ambiguous example. Proverbs 9:16-17 and Song of Songs 5:1might also be cited as possible examples of this usage.

However, the sexual meaning of the Hebrew root ידע is not common.[708] While Gordis and others have argued that the roots טוב and רע are associated with ידע in a sexual context in 2 Samuel 19:35 (36, Hebrew), this is by no means certain.[709] Nakedness is rarely associated with sexuality,[710] but more often suggests vulnerability.[711] Wallace seems to be correct that some of the main elements of the story in Genesis 2-3 might suggest sexuality, but that this does not apply to the story's present form.[712]

A second line of evidence for the sexual interpretation comes from ANE materials. For example, it has been noted by Charlesworth that, in the ANE, the snake has various symbolic connotations, including the sexual connotation.[713] However, unless Genesis 3 is an example, one would be hard pressed to find a clear example of a sexual valence for serpents in the Old Testament.[714]

---

[708] There are approximately 17 of some 954 occurrences of verbal uses of the root ידע, having a definite sexual connotation. Cf., for example, Judges 11:39 19:22, 25; 1 Samuel 1:19; 1 Kings 1:4; Genesis 19:5, 8. Most significantly, cf. Genesis 4:1, 17, 25, which not only follows closely Genesis 2-3, but also (at least, in 4:1-16) mirrors Genesis 3 very closely.

[709] Robert Gordis, "Significance of the Paradise Myth," 90, fn. 16, writes, "On our interpretation, this verse would contain the earliest reference to the triad of 'Wine, Women, and Song!'"
However, the phrase הַאֵדַע בֵּין־טוֹב לָרָע in 2 Samuel 19:36 is not syntactically parallel to the following phrases which begin with אם. It might, therefore, be preferable to take the first phrase הַאֵדַע בֵּין־טוֹב לָרָע as a general statement which summarizes the clauses which begin with אם. These two אם clauses would then give examples to illustrate the general statement.

[710] Cf. Bailey, "Initiation," 146. Even in passages where a sexual aspect is present (e.g., Ezekiel 16:7; 23:29) the idea of vulnerability is still present.

[711] Engnell, "Knowledge" and "Life" in the Creation Story," 115; Gordis, " Significance of the Paradise Myth," 86-94 (cf. especially page 92); Bailey, "Initiation," 145-147.

[712] Wallace, Eden Narrative, 118-119. See also David Damrosch, *The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Literature* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 94-95.

[713] James H. Charlesworth, *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol Became Christianized,* AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 217-218.

[714] Cf. Bailey, "Initiation," 145-147, contra W. S. McCullough, "Serpent," *IDB* 4:290. McCullough thinks that the bronze serpent mentioned in 2 Kings 18:4 may have been the symbol of a remnant of an ancient fertility cult, but this is by no means certain. Even McCullough has to admit that his interpretation is "more probable" than that the bronze serpent was made by Moses.

A better argument may be made from the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. After Enkidu has sex with the prostitute Shamhat, she says to him, "You have become [profound] Enkidu, you have become like a god."[715] While the crucial word that Dalley translates "profound" is broken and must be tentatively reconstructed,[716] the other words ". . . you have become like a god," are clear, and may be connected with the serpent's words in Genesis 3, "You shall be like god/s." The fact that the woman clothes Enkidu also makes us think of the man and woman clothing themselves.[717] This would seem to support the sexual interpretation of "knowing good and evil", although it is important to note that, in *Gilgamesh*, "the knowledge of good and evil" *per se* makes no appearance.

Moreover, Bailey may be correct in stating that Genesis 2-3 does echo phrases and motifs in *The Gilgamesh Epic*, but that this indicates the direction that the author of the Eden Narrative chose not to take.[718] Bailey's argument against the sexual interpretation for the knowledge of good and evil quoted here at some length.[719]

---

[715] Stephanie Dalley, translator, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 56. For discussions of points of contact between the Eden Narrative and *Gilgamesh*, see Thomas L. Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue: A Literary, Historical, & Theological Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 67-68. Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, 2nd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), 260; Bailey, "Initiation," 137; Conrad E. L'Heureux, *In and Out of Paradise: The Book of Genesis from Adam and Eve to the Tower of Babel* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 43-44; Bernard F. Batto, "The Yahwist's Primeval Myth," in *Gilgamesh: A Reader*, edited by John Maier, (Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1997), 245-259.

[716] Shlomo Izr'el, *The Adapa Myth: Language has the Power of Life and Death* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 129, suggests "you are [go]od, Enkidu . . . ".

[717] Keith Dickson, "The Wall of Uruk: Iconicities in *Gilgamesh*." *JANER* 9/1 (2009): 32-34; Blenkinsopp, "Gilgamesh and Adam," 93-95, 103. See also Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 219. However, for both Blenkinsopp and Jacobsen, *Gilgamesh* and Genesis 2-3 are about sexuality as the introduction into the admittedly ambiguous business of growing up.

[718] Bailey, "Initiation," 147. See also Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 119.

[719] Bailey's formatting is preserved in these quotes.

1) Nakedness in the OT usually refers to the loss of human and social dignity . . . .[720]

2) The cry of the man when the woman is brought to him (2 23), and his giving her a name which is used of sexually mature females, imply that the man and woman were created sexually mature; J took for granted sexual intercourse on their part from the beginning . . . .[721]

3) Concerning the serpent as a symbol of sexuality (argument # 3), Bailey points out that the snake has no such connotation in the OT, and that even in other Near Eastern literature, the serpent does not always have this connotation.[722]. . .

4) Only in certain clearly recognizably (sic) cases does in the OT have a sexual meaning, and always there is a clear sexual object. Here there is no sexual object; "good and evil" are not that.[723]

5) Most of the parallel OT passages in which "good and evil" occur point to its meaning "everything possible," the two opposites good and evil being employed not for their own sake but to express a totality (what lies between the two)---a case of merism.[724]

. . .

6) The evidence against the sexual interpretation is thus so strong as to be conclusive. This means that the Gilgamesh parallel is of significance not because it indicates the path which J followed, but rather the path which he knew but from which he departed. Within the context of Mesopotamian fertility religion it is understandable that sexual experience would be considered the means of initiation into civilization. But in the context of the religion of Israel, which does not see fertility as the ground of all being human and divine, there was no place for such an initiation. J therefore altered the tradition he knew at this point.[725]

7) Therewith the seventh argument loses its force. The garden milieu provides an excellent setting for a sexual initiation, to be sure---and maybe, at an earlier stage, in one of the traditions upon which J drew, it actually did so. For J, who understood Yahweh in nonsexual terms and did not see sexuality as the key to man's development, this could no longer be the case. The woman in Gen 3 is, therefore, not to be understood like the harlot, as a sexual temptress who seduces the man.[726]

The "logical" argument for the sexual interpretation runs something like this: As long as the man and woman were content to be without sexual awareness, there was no need for them to die. However, when they came to such awareness, death became inevitable, since children would be their

---

[720] Bailey, Initiation," 145.

[721] Ibid., 145-146.

[722] Ibid., 145-146.

[723] Ibid., 146.

[724] Ibid.

[725] Ibid., 147.

[726] Ibid.

"immortality", and they had to make room for the new generation.[727] However, while this argument may seem logical, there is no evidence for it in the text.

Beyond the problems already mentioned, Hamilton points out two others. First, in line with 3:22, this theory must apply sexuality to God.[728] Second, Genesis 2:24 seems to suggest that sexuality preceded the fall.[729]

---

[727] Cf. Gordis, "Significance of the Paradise Myth," 93-94.

[728] Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 164. Milgrom, "Sex and Wisdom," 21, 52, argues for the sexual interpretation, but immediately qualifies sexuality as "creativity." Cf. also John Day, *From Creation to Babel*, 43.

[729] Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 164. Hamilton also suggests that 4:1 can legitimately be translated as a pluperfect. See also Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 66-70. See also Bailey, "Initiation," 145-147.

4. The Knowledge of Good and Evil as a Test[730]

Many scholars have taken the knowledge of good and evil as growing into maturity of the originally child-like Adam and Eve. For example, Bechtel thinks that the image of nakedness-without-shame suggests early childhood, and that shame indicates the onset of adolescence.[731] What happens in Genesis 2-3 is ". . . not a 'fall', but movement toward the emergence of human consciousness, freedom, maturity, socialization, and the realization of identity in relation to the group."[732] As with the "moral autonomy" approach, the maturity approach is appealing to modern western habits of thought. Modern westerners generally regard obedience to external authority as a sign of immaturity.

However, despite its appeal, Bechtel's interesting and creative exposition founders on the larger linguistic and contextual rocks.[733] She refers to the expulsion of 3:24 in positive tones, but this is a stretch. The root גרש is a strong word meaning "to drive out", and often implies some force. Cain uses the same word in 4:14, and hardly in a positive sense. Indeed, most scholars recognize that Genesis 3 and 4 are by the same author. If Gen. 3 is a fall upward, what is Gen. 4? The seriousness of the fall (for such it may be, even if the word "fall" does not occur in Genesis 3) is seen clearly in the light of Genesis 4 ff. As Gordon points out, while the words "sin" and "disobedience"

---

[730] Cf. Aalders, *Genesis*: 93; Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (Chicago: Illinois, 1967); Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3*, 49-60.

[731] Bechtel, "Interpretation of Genesis 2.4b-3," 84-85. Cf. also Walton, *Genesis*, 215.

[732] Ibid., 85.

[733] Bechtel, 103, deals in a rather cursory manner with God's prohibition in 2:16-17. In a very brief paragraph she fails to discuss the word לֹא, the most common nuance of which is as a permanent prohibition.

do not occur in Genesis 3, the concept can hardly be better described than the story of Genesis 3 describes it.[734]

If, as Bechtel suggests, the serpent is actually helping the man and the woman to grow up, why does God curse the snake? It does not help to translate אָרוּר as "shamed", as Bechtel does, since shame is such a serious matter in the ancient Near East.[735]

Stordalen also argues for an increased mental maturity for the man and woman after they had partaken of the forbidden fruit. He thinks that their intention to remedy their nakedness was correct as shown by Genesis 3:21, and that their expanded verbal abilities are shown in their defense of themselves to God.[736] However, God's clothing of the man and woman seems to indicate the inadequacy of their own efforts, even if it does signal that their intention was basically correct. Furthermore, the idea that excuse-making and blaming of others is a sign of maturity must be questioned.

Sawyer has argued that Genesis 2-3 needs to be read in close connection with Genesis 1. Indeed, he thinks that Genesis 2-3 is an "expansion" of Genesis 1.[737] Thus, Genesis 3 becomes not a fall, but a fulfillment.

Sawyer's reasons may be summarized as follows:

1. 2:4a, while written in the style of the preceding narrative, is ". . . a kind of title or introductory formula for what follows . . . ."[738]

---

[734] Gordon, " Ethics of Eden," 14-15. See also Terence E. Fretheim, "Is Genesis 3 a Fall Story?" *WW* 14/2 (1994): 146.

[735] Cf. Saul M. Olyan, "Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and its Environment," *JBL* 115/2 (1996): 201-218. Olyan notes how common are the concepts of honor and shame in Israel and West Asia, and how these concepts permeate all social relationships. They even extend into the afterlife. See also Zeba Crook, "Honor, Shame, and Social Status Revisited," *JBL* 128/3 (2009): 591-611. Crook, 591, refers to the concept as "pivotal."

[736] Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 236-237.

[737] Sawyer, "The Image of God," 64-73(especially page 64).

2. The overlap in subject matter between Gen. 1 and 2-3 is more substantial than is usually admitted.[739]
3. The idea of humankind being in the image of God persists even after the Garden narrative.[740]

Concerning number 3 above, Sawyer comments:

> The recurrence of the 'image of God,' motif after the story proves that the two stories are not intended to be understood as sequential, the creation of Adam followed by his 'Fall', as is often supposed, but in parallel, the one elaborating and explaining the other. The 'image of God' story in ch. 1 is complete in itself, telling how human beings were created, male and female, with some divine resemblance in them. Chapters 2-3 tell the same story in much greater detail, explaining how it came about that a man made out of the dust of the earth came to resemble God.[741]

However, it should be noted that the language that is used in Genesis 1:26-27 for man being created in the image (בְּצַלְמֵנוּ) and likeness (כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ) of God, is nowhere used in Genesis 2-3. If the author had intended such a positive linkage, the same Hebrew roots might have been expected. True, Genesis 2-3 is indeed to be linked with chapter 1, at least in its final form, and Sawyer may well be correct in noting that the image of God remains even after Genesis 2-3.[742] However, is this linkage positive or negative?

Furthermore, it is difficult to see how an ancient author (or an ancient audience) would have thought that "maturity" came about as the result of disobeying a command from God. Although the book of Ecclesiastes—at least in its final form—counsels its readers not to be overly righteous, wise, wicked, or foolish,[743] the book also tells its readers to obey God's commands.[744]

---

[738] Ibid., 64.
[739] Ibid., 65.
[740] Ibid., 65-66.
[741] Ibid., 67.
[742] Ibid., 65-66.
[743] Cf. Ecclesiastes 7:15-18.
[744] Ecclesiastes 12:13-14. See also Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 117.

No word for "maturity" occurs in Genesis 2-3. Often, those who adopt the maturity interpretation of the Eden Narrative—as well as those who adopt other approaches—point out that the word "fall" does not occur in Genesis 2-3. However, these same interpreters frequently fail to acknowledge that the word that would clearly support their own interpretation (such as the word "maturity") is also absent.

6. The Knowledge of Good and Evil as Omniscience

Another common way to approach the phrase "good and evil" is to regard it as a "merism"—i.e., two polar opposites to express everything between.[745] Those who take the meristic approach to the phrase טוֹב וָרָע frequently refer to the seminal work of A. M. Honeyman.[746] Honeyman does not list טוֹב וָרָע as it occurs in Gen. 2-3, as an example of merism, although Krasovec does list the phrase as one of the "*meristische Wortpaare.*"[747] Von Rad expresses the thought in the most sweeping terms, using the word "omniscience".[748] Westermann takes this approach as being beyond question.[749]

One of the main arguments for this approach is the similar wording in 2 Samuel 14:17, 20. However, three cautions are in order concerning using 2 Samuel 14 to elucidate the meaning of the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" in the Eden Narrative. First, the wording of this passage differs significantly from the wording in Genesis 2-3. Second, although at the lexical level, 2 Samuel 14 does seem to suggest wide-ranging knowledge (if not

---

[745] Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 63-64. Walter Vogels, "'Like One of Us, Knowing *TÔB* and *RA*'," *Semeia* 81 (1988): 150.

[746] A.M. Honeyman, "*Merismus* in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 71/1 (1952): 11-18.

[747] Joze Krasovec, *Der Merismus*, BO 33 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 102.

[748] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 78, 81.

[749] Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 243. Cf. also Brodie, *Genesis*, 139.

omniscience), the emphasis is upon David's ability to handle a judicial case correctly, rather than all-embracing knowledge.[750] Third, the larger literary context seems to call the words spoken about David's knowledge—even taken in the judicial sense—into serious question.

Wallace has argued for a meristic understanding of the phrase טוֹב וְרָע in Genesis 2-3,[751] although he does not deny that other nuances may have been emphasized in various tellings and retellings of the story.[752] Wallace's subtle analysis acknowledges that many of the verses in the Old Testament that use the words טוֹב and רָע are disjunctive, ". . . representing two mutually exclusive extremes . . . ."[753] However, he thinks he can identify several possible,[754] and a few clear cases of merism.[755]

Wallace's argument is weakened significantly by the fact that some of his "clear" instances of merism are virtually identical to cases that he identifies as non-meristic or unclear. Thus, although he thinks that the case for merism is "less certain" in Genesis 31:24, 29,[756] Wallace thinks that Genesis 24:50 is a clear case of merism.[757] He holds (although with differing degrees of probability), that in these cases, the best understanding is that Abraham's servant (Genesis 24) and Laban (Genesis 31) are not to say anything at all. However, this ignores the fact that both men do say something in the very act

---

[750] Cf. W. Malcolm Clark, "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3," *JBL* 88 (1969): 266-278. (See especially page 270.)
[751] Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 121-129.
[752] Ibid., 131.
[753] Ibid., 122. For the larger discussion of non-meristic uses of the words, see pp. 122-123.
[754] Ibid., 123-124.
[755] Ibid., 124-128.
[756] Ibid., 123.
[757] Ibid., 124.

of reporting that they can speak neither טוֹב nor רָע.[758] Similarly, Wallace lists 1 Kings 3:9 as less clearly meristic,[759] but 2 Samuel 14:17 as clearly meristic.[760] Yet the wording of the two passages is very similar.[761]

Also, as with the "maturity" approach to the meaning of the phrase "knowing good and evil," the omniscience interpretation may be entirely too modern to think that an ancient story posited all-encompassing knowledge for humans. While both the *Gilgamesh Epic* and the *Adapa Myth* suggest great knowledge for their protagonists, the stories as a whole seem to suggest definite limits for their knowledge. Gilgamesh must learn (the hard way) that death is the lot of humankind, even for one who is two-thirds divine. Neither Adapa's great knowledge nor that of his god, Ea, can prevent death from being Adapa's final fate. Whether in Israel elsewhere in the ANE, all human knowledge has its limits. Barr correctly contends that Adam and Eve never knew everything at any stage in their career. Indeed, he thinks that the meristic interpretation is ". . . the abandonment of an explanation." [762]

---

[758] The differing phrases should also be noted. In Genesis 24:50, the wording is לֹא נוּכַל דַּבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ רַע אוֹ־טוֹב . . . (". . . [W]e cannot speak to you bad or good"). In Genesis 31:24, 29), the wording is הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ מִדַּבֵּר עִם־יַעֲקֹב מִטּוֹב עַד־רָע. ("Be careful that you do not speak to Jacob either good or bad"). If anything, it would be preferable to take the phraseology in Genesis 31:24, 29 as indicating a merism, rather than that of Genesis 24:50.

[759] Ibid., 123.

[760] Ibid., 125-126.

[761] 2 Samuel 14:17 has לִשְׁמַע הַטּוֹב וְהָרָע, and 1 Kings 3:9 has לְהָבִין בֵּין־טוֹב לְרָע. It may be that to "hear the good and the evil" is a prelude to "discerning between good, with reference to evil." Wallace does not explain why he classifies these two passages differently. It may be that he is basing his taxonomy on the fact that in 2 Samuel the crucial phrase (וְהָרָע הַטּוֹב) is joined by a *waw*

However, in the larger context of the story in 2 Samuel 14, this semantic argument would not carry as much weight. After all, the "hearing of good and bad" in the Tekoaite's story is for the purpose of making a judicial decision, involving the choice of the good and the rejection of the bad. Therefore, although the phrasing of the two passages is different, the context suggests a similar meaning for the two usages.

[762] Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 62. Cf. also Clark, "Legal Background,"266-278.

Tentative Conclusions on the Meaning of Good and Evil in Genesis 2-3

In each of the approaches that have been sketched, there are certain clues in the text that lend credibility to that approach. On the other hand, there seem to be significant problems with each approach. This may be because of our lack of competence as readers of this ancient document,[763] or these seemingly conflicting clues (and their consequent interpretive approaches) may result from diachronic layering of various accounts.[764]

On the other hand, these apparently disparate clues may signal a deliberate strategy on the part of the author. If the author/redactor was trying to be deliberately cryptic, for whatever reason, then a trail of clues leading in several different directions might be part of his strategy. If the Eden Narrative was designed to function as a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology and behavior, the need for the author to create a smokescreen would be entirely understandable.

It is important now to analyze the specific phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" and related phrases as they occur in Genesis 2-3. As Westermann points out, the phrase "to know good and evil" and related phrases are a "*leitmotif*" in this story that colors the whole narrative in its final form.[765]

The verses in Genesis 2-3 that involve some variation of the phrase "the knowledge/knowing/knowers (of) good and evil" are listed below. It is important to discuss their morphology, lexical form, and meaning in their context.

וַיַּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה כָּל־עֵץ נֶחְמָד לְמַרְאֶה וְטוֹב
לְמַאֲכָל וְעֵץ הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע

---

[763] John Barton, Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study, 11-12.
[764] Carr, Reading the Fractures of Genesis, 11.
[765] Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 242.

Genesis 2:9 And out of the ground the LORD God caused to grow every tree that is pleasing to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

There are two grammatical problems with the phrase וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע.

No really satisfactory solution has yet been proposed for the first problem.[766] The word הַדַּעַת (usually translated "the knowledge of") appears to be, in both form and function, an infinitive construct. However, it has the prefixed article. Although it is possible to emend the text, there are no manuscripts that support such emendation.[767]

Wenham regards the word הַדַּעַת as a "substantivized infinitive", and says ". . . it may still take a direct object." However, the only other biblical example of such a phenomenon that he gives is Jeremiah 22:16.[768]

The other important syntactic issue in Genesis 2:9 is the location of the trees: Are both the named trees "in the midst of the garden", or does only the tree of life hold that position? It might strike the modern reader of Hebrew as awkward when he/she encounters the Hebrew.

Genesis 2:9 וְעֵץ הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע

Genesis 2:9: . . . the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

This last phrase seems to be awkwardly tacked on. One possible explanation is that, if one assumes that Genesis 2-3 is a composite narrative, the redactor left some inexactitudes in order to preserve exact wording of originally separate stories. However, it may be that this grammatical anomaly may function as an intentionally somber, discordant note in an otherwise

---

[766] See for example, Wallace, *Eden Narrative*, 116; Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 160-161, fn. 2.

[767] Wallace *Eden Narrative*, 115-116.

[768] Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 46.

idyllic portrait of Eden. If so, it announces to the reader that trouble is coming in connection with this tree.[769]

However, Michel has discussed this matter at length, and has made a strong argument for this "*gespaltene koordination*" (as he calls it) being the normal way of presenting Hebrew coordinate clauses.[770] While Wyatt dismisses Michel's analysis as "special pleading,"[771] Michel cites many instances of this phenomenon of "split coordination." Even if some of his examples are questioned, there is still strong evidence for his contention.

It is significant that these two trees "in the midst of the garden" are named. Do they both fall under the same description as the other trees that were mentioned earlier in the verse ("every tree that is pleasing to the sight and good for food")? On the other hand, is the reader/hearer to understand that these two trees are named, precisely because they do not fall under the preceding description? Are the trees signalled out because they are especially delectable, or because they are particularly problematic? At this point, the readers/hearers are not told.

WTT Genesis 2:17

וּמֵעֵ֗ץ הַדַּ֙עַת֙ טֹ֣וב וָרָ֔ע לֹ֥א תֹאכַ֖ל מִמֶּ֑נּוּ כִּ֗י בְּיֹום֙ אֲכָלְךָ֣ מִמֶּ֔נּוּ
מֹ֥ות תָּמֽוּת׃

NAU Genesis 2:17

". . . but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you shall surely die."

---

[769] Similarly, cf. Coats, *Genesis*, 52. Concerning the two trees being mentioned in 2:9, and then dropped for the time being, Coats thinks of them as "foreshadowing motifs." They are left ". . . unintegrated, but nonetheless tantalizing."

[770] Andreas Michel, Theologie Aus Der Peripherie: Die Gespaltene Koordination Im Biblischen Hebraisch (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 1-22.

[771] Nicolas Wyatt, "A Garden for the Living: Cultic and Ideological Aspects of Paradise." Forthcoming.

In 2:16, the LORD God gives to the human God's first recorded command,[772] using the root צוה. Yet the first "command" seems strange: "Eating, you shall eat of all the trees of the garden . . . ." Where is the command in this? Surely the command is found in verse 17. Indeed, some scholars think that this emphatic permissive of v. 16 merely sets up the antithesis in v. 17, thus emphasizing the negative restriction.[773]

On the other hand, Hamilton speaks of God's "ample provision".[774] It is striking that the same grammatical construction that is used for the permission to eat in v. 16 (the infinitive absolute with the finite verb) is also used for the effect of disobeying the LORD God's command in v. 17. The phrase "eating, you shall eat" is contrasted with "dying, you shall die." In both verses, these words are emphatic.

Walton thinks of the prohibition of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as being temporary.[775] However, the sternness of the threat seems to tell against such an interpretation. The Hebrew word לא most naturally suggests a permanent prohibition.[776]

What of the threat that, if the man eats the forbidden fruit he will surely die "on that day" (Genesis 2:17)? Clearly, this does not happen. Various approaches have been made to try to explain (or to explain away) this threat.

---

[772] By this, canonical order is meant.

[773] *GKC* §113. Cf. also John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 66.

[774] Hamilton, Genesis: Chapters 1-17, 172.

[775] Walton, *Genesis*, 205-206.

[776] Cf. *GKC*, §152.c. *GKC* contrasts this with the conditional negation of אַל in §152.f. However, Allan Harman, "Particles," *NIDOTTE*, 4:1036, argues that לא is used for "legislation," while אַל is used for "an urgent situation." In either case, the giving of the first command in Genesis 2:17 suggests that this a very solemn and serious usage of the word לא. Furthermore, the use of the infinitive absolute and the cognate imperfect verb (מוֹת תָּמוּת="you shall surely die") is emphatic, whatever its particular meaning may be.

The *NIV* translation blurs the issue by translating ביום "when". However, Wenham rightly states that, while the Hebrew expression can sometimes have the rather generic meaning "when", it more often ". . . tends to emphasize the promptness of action . . . especially in the closely similar passage (1 Kgs 2:37, 42)."[777] Wenham takes the death as metaphorical. He uses the analogy of the expulsion of lepers from the camp of Israel as a kind of death.[778]

Wenham goes on to note that although the serpent told no outright lies, what God had said was still true. Certainly, for the ancient Hebrews, death was not simply viewed as occurring when a person drew his last breath.[779] However, one wonders if the more metaphorical sense of "death" works well in Genesis 2-3.

Perhaps the most straightforward approach to the fact that the death sentence is not carried out immediately is that of Barr, who holds that the serpent got it right.[780] Similarly, Dershowitz has a chapter on the Eden story, "God Threatens—and Backs Down".[781] In a similar (though more positive)

---

[777] Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 68.

[778] Ibid., 74.

[779] Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 1974), 99-118, especially, page 111-112. In order to substantiate his argument, Wolff cites such biblical texts as Psalm 88:15, 4f.; 38:13f.; 55:4; and Job 33:29f. See also Gordon, "Ethics of Eden," 26.

[780] Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 8.

[781] Alan M. Dershowitz, The Genesis of Justice: Ten Stories of Biblical Injustice that Led to the Ten Commandments and Modern Law (New York: Warner Books, 2000), 27-47. Cf. Skinner, Genesis, 67; Hamilton, Genesis, Chapters 1-17, 172-174. Hamilton cites 1 Kings 2:37, 42 as an example of the idiom מוֹת תָּמוּת (Genesis 3:17) meaning "you shall surely die." He goes on to say that the expression "in the day" is ". . . underscoring the certainty of death, not its chronology" (172). See also Hamilton's examples of other cases where the death penalty is threatened, but clemency is shown (173-174). Hamilton points out that of the twelve occurrences of the phrase outside of Genesis 2:17 and 3:4 (Genesis 20:7; 1 Samuel 14:44; 22:16; 1 Kings 2:37, 42; 2 Kings 1:4, 6, 16; Jeremiah 26:8; Ezekiel 3:18; 33:8, 14), in two of the cases (Jeremiah 26:8; 1 Samuel 14:44), a reprieve is granted.

vein, some scholars speak of the "mitigation" of the LORD God's initial threat of punishment.[782]

Despite all that is unknown (and perhaps unknowable) about this prohibition, the most important aspect is perhaps the easiest to ignore: It is a prohibition.

WTT Genesis 3:5

כִּי יֹדֵעַ אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם
וִהְיִיתֶם כֵּאלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע

[782] Skinner, *Genesis*, 67.

NAU **Genesis 3:5**

"For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."

Here, the phrase טוֹב וָרָע is connected with a participial form of the root ידע. The participial form could here be taken in apposition with God ("you shall be as God who knows good and evil"), or in a predicative sense ("you shall be as God, that is, you shall know good and evil").[783] ". . . [T]he serpent intends to place before her the possibility of being more than she is and more than God intended her to be."[784] If Hamilton is correct, then the knowing of good and evil would be tantamount to being like God (or like gods).

Another uncertainty is what the serpent intends (or what the humans hear) by the word אלהים. Does the serpent mean that the humans will become like the LORD God? It is striking that the expression יהוה אֱלֹהִים ("the LORD God"), which was so prominent in chapter 2, and reappears as soon as the LORD God returns to the garden, is completely absent during the dialogue between the serpent, the woman, and her apparently silent male partner.[785] The word אֱלֹהִים certainly can refer to the LORD God of Israel, but can also refer to the gods of the nations,[786] or to divine beings who are conceived as making up some sort of heavenly council. Perhaps the serpent is promising (or the humans are hearing?) that the knowledge that the tree offers will make

---

[783] Hamilton, Genesis, Chapters 1-17, 189.

[784] Ibid., 190.

[785] Cf. Cassuto, *Genesis, Part I*, 88.

[786] Cf., for example, Genesis 35:2, 4; Exodus 20:3.

the humans like the בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים ("the sons of God—or sons of the gods") mentioned in Genesis 6:2, 4.[787]

WTT Genesis 3:22

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים הֵן הָאָדָם הָיָה כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ
לָדַעַת טוֹב וָרָע וְעַתָּה פֶּן־יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וְלָקַח גַּם מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים
וְאָכַל וָחַי לְעֹלָם

NAU Genesis 3:22

"Then the LORD God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil; and now, lest he stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever . . .'"

Based on Genesis 3:7, the hearers and readers of this story may have decided that the woman and man had not attained the knowledge of good and evil after all. All that they "knew" was that they were naked. They knew enough to make coverings for themselves. However, in 3:22, the LORD God appears to confirm the serpent's statement about the effect of eating from the forbidden fruit. The words seem straightforward.

Many scholars take these words as indeed being straightforward.[788] With regard to the serpent's speech in Genesis 3:5, Stratton writes, "As the narrative

---

[787] For a recent treatment of the Old Testament concept of "the council of God", cf. David E. Bokovoy, "שמעו והעידו בבית יעקב: Invoking the Council as Witnesses in Amos 3:13," *JBL* 127/1 (2008): 37-51. Especially, note Bokovoy's reference to Genesis 1:26 and 3:22 on page 42. However, Bokovoy acknowledges that these references are "ambiguous". Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 85, also thinks of Genesis 3:22 speaks of the humans becoming ". . . like the heavenly beings, including God and the angels . . ., insofar as man now knows good and evil." (See also Wenham's discussion of Genesis 1:26 on pages 27-28, where he lists six different interpretations of the plural "Let us".) E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, AB, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 24, commenting on the phrase "like one of us" says, "A reference to the heavenly company which remains obscure." Similarly, see Waltke, *Genesis*, 95. Cassuto, *Genesis*, 172, comments on 3:22 ("like one of us") "—like one of my entourage, like one of the Divine entities, which are of a higher order than man, for example, the cherubim and their kind." Cassuto goes on to cite 2 Samuel 14:17 as a reference to the same sort of idea. Cf. also Rainer Albertz, „Ihr werdet sein wie Gott: Gen 3, 1-7 auf dem Hintergrund des alttestamentlichen und des sumerisch-babylonischen Menschenbildes." *Welt des Orients* 24 (1993): 89-111.

will bear out in 3.7 and 3.22, it is inappropriate to refer to the serpent's remarks at this point as lying."[789]

However, it is possible that God is speaking ironically.[790] Good, while he does not explicitly refer to Genesis 3:22 as an example of irony, does think of Genesis 1-11 as shot through with irony.[791] The fact that God acts, rather than merely speaks, the conclusion of the clause that begins ". . . and now, lest he stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever ". . .") demonstrates that the LORD God is still God, and Adam is but a man. The man and woman are not ushered into the divine council. Instead, they are driven out of the garden.

---

[788] Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 57; John E. Hartley, *Genesis*, NIBC (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson,2000), 72; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 272. Walton, *Genesis*, 214, also seems to take Genesis 3:22 in a very straightforward manner. Cf. also Skinner, *Genesis*, 87.

[789] Stratton, *Out of Eden*, 45, fn. 1.

[790] Cf. Ephrem the Syrian holds the view that God was mocking Adam. Cf. *Genesis 1-11*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, 100. John Calvin, *A Commentary on Genesis*, translated by John King, (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1947, first published in Latin in 1554), 182-183; Hamilton, *Genesis, Chapters 1-17*, 208.

[791] Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 81-89 (especially, 81-84). Cf. also McConville, *God and Earthly Power*, 24, who thinks that both 3:5 and 3:22 are ironic echoes of 1:26.

Radday and Brenner have pointed out that much humor (including ironic humor) is very subtle and relies on the ". . . the reader's sensitivity to see through the camouflage . . . . It goes without saying that this kind of writing runs the risk of being misunderstood." See Yehuda T. Radday and Athalya Brenner, *On Humour and the Comic in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup, Bible and Literature Series 23 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990), 33. See also Harold Bloom, "From J to K, or the Uncanniness of the Yahwist," in *The Bible and the Narrative Tradition*, edited by Frank McConnell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 23-24. "J *sounds* rather matter-of-fact, but that is part of J's unique mode of irony."

iv. Other Motifs which Suggest Knowledge in Genesis 2-3.

a. Adam naming the animals and Eve.[792]

b. Eve's dialogue with the serpent (3:1-5) and her evaluating of the tree (3:6).

There are other indications besides individual words and phrases in the Eden Narrative that portray the woman and man as knowing individuals, both before and after they partake of the fruit. In 3:1-3, the woman is able to understand and correct the serpent's reasoning. After she has eaten of the forbidden fruit, she seeks to shift the blame to the serpent, reevaluating her own choice, as well as the serpent's words. The narrator tells us that the woman is able to see before her eyes had been opened by consuming the fruit (3:6). He also tells us that she is able to see that the fruit was good (טוב) —at least in her eyes—even before she had partaken of the fruit. Furthermore, the woman uses the same language to describe this tree as the narrator had used to describe God's view of all the trees of the garden in 2:9. Her language also may reflect God's evaluation of God's creation in Genesis 1.[793]

The man is also portrayed as having some degree of knowledge before he partakes of the forbidden fruit. As Gordis and Bledstein have pointed out, the act of naming demonstrated the man's knowledge.[794] The man's ability to name animals is perhaps parallel to King Solomon's knowledge of plants and

---

[792] Cf. 1 Kings 4:29-34. While "naming" is not mentioned in 1 Kings 4, "speaking of" animals and plants may suggest that wisdom is generally connected with an expansive knowledge of nature.

[793] Cf. Carol M. Kaminski, "Beautiful Women or 'False Judgment'? Interpreting Genesis 6.2 in the Context of the Primaeval History," *JSOT* 32/4 (2008): 470; and, for a different evaluation of what Eve is doing, Stratton, *Out of Eden*, 45-47.

[794] Gordis, "Knowledge of Good and Evil in Old Testament and Qumran Scrolls,": 127; Adrien Janis Bledstein, "The Genesis of Humans: The Garden of Eden Revisited," *Judaism* 26/2 (1977): 191. See also Anthony Tharekadavil, "Is Genesis a Confusion?" *Bible Bhashyam* 28 (2002): 627. Note also the references to Solomon's encyclopedic knowledge (including speaking of animals and plants) in 1 Kings 5:9-14 [EB, 1 Kings 4:29-34].

animals.[795] After he had partaken of the forbidden fruit, he knew enough to answer (or evade?) the questions that the LORD God asks. Thus, it would seem that the man is portrayed as having some degree of knowledge, both before and after partaking of the forbidden fruit.

However, the knowledge of the man and the woman, both before and after eating of the forbidden fruit, seems to be problematic. The man's knowledge before partaking of the forbidden fruit is demonstrated to have been insufficient to keep the man from transgressing the command of the LORD God. Kings in the ANE and in many parts of the Old Testament are portrayed as being obedient to the command of their god/gods.[796] Since, as already noted, kings are routinely associated with knowledge and related concepts, the readers and hearers of the Eden Narrative would likely have associated such words and concepts with royal ideology. The readers and hearers would also likely have noted the problematic nature of knowledge, as portrayed in Genesis 2-3.

What would be the purpose a polemic against an uncritical linkage of kings and knowledge? Such a hidden polemic would not likely have been designed to incite the toppling of a particular king. It is even less likely that the Eden Narrative, if it contains a hidden polemic against excesses in royal ideology, advocates the complete repudiation of kingship. However, at the very least, the evidence suggests that the story calls into question a complete or uncritical ratification of royal ideology concerning knowledge.

---

[795] 1 Kings 4:33 [Hebrew, 5:13].

[796] Cf. the quote attributed to Queen Hatshepsut above, page 107, fn. 343, and the comments on the connection between Solomon's long life and his obedience to God, page 149. See also the comments by Mark Hamilton on pages 155-156 and fn. 535.

The precise purpose of a hidden polemic against the linking of kings with knowledge may not be recoverable. However, at the very least, the polemic would suggest a critical questioning of one of the central qualities of kings in the ANE and in the Old Testament itself.[797] Such a questioning would not likely topple the throne, but it might make it more difficult for the king to make extravagant claims concerning his knowledge.

iv. Other Motifs which Suggest Knowledge in Genesis 2-3.

a. Adam naming the animals and Eve.[798]

b. Eve's dialogue with the serpent (3:1-5) and her evaluating of the tree (3:6).

It has been argued that knowledge is a very important theme in Genesis 2-3. The evidence upon which this argument is based is the frequency with which the roots ידע, ערם, and שכל are used. Other roots such as ראה and שמע may also be relevant to the discussion, since they also often indicate the means of perception. Other indicators that the man and woman had some degree of knowledge before and after partaking of the forbidden fruit were also briefly noted. The fact that knowledge occurs in certain crucial locations in the narrative has also been pointed out.

However, while this serves to indicate the importance of the knowledge theme in the Eden Narrative, it does not prove that the narrative has anything to do with kings. Much less does it prove that there is a polemic (hidden or otherwise) in Genesis 2-3. However, it must be continually remembered that a

---

[797] Cf. the previous discussion on pages 106-116.

[798] Cf. 1 Kings 5:13 [EB, 4:29-34]. While "naming" is not mentioned in 1 Kings 4, "speaking of" animals and plants may suggest that wisdom is generally connected with an expansive knowledge of nature.

hidden polemic, by definition, will be difficult to detect. Therefore, the fact that a political interpretation of the Eden Narrative does not lie on the surface of the story does not rule out the possibility.

One of the clues that points toward a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology is the fact that knowledge is closely and commonly associated with kings in the ANE.[799] This is true of the Old Testament as well.[800] Because this is so, it might bias us in favor of such an approach to Genesis 2-3, even though kings and kingship is not made explicit.

There is another line of argument that is accompanied by some evidence and would also point in the general direction of royal ideology. Many of the words and phrases connected with knowledge and associated terms are linked with kings in other parts of the Old Testament. This is true of the roots ידע, ערם, and שׂכל. As has been pointed out, these roots are used in Proverbs 1:2-7, a passage that is programmatic for understanding the book of Proverbs—a book that is intimately connected with kings, however that connection is analyzed.

Furthermore, several of the biblical texts that are used to elucidate the meaning of the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" are connected in one way or another with passages with royal connections. In particular, it has been noted in a previous chapter that 2 Samuel 14:1-20 is connected with David's ability (or inability) to discern between good and evil. 1 Kings 3:1-15 is another instance in which knowledge is connected with good and evil, and with royal ideology. Scholars have used these texts to argue for various nuances to the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" in Genesis 2-3.

---

[799] See the discussion on pages 80ff.

[800] See the discussion on pages 82ff.

However, even if the precise meaning of the phrase itself is not clear, it is clear that the phrase in these texts from 1 Samuel and 2 Kings are connected with kings. This more general association has, perhaps, been too seldom noted.

The closest parallel to the phrase "the knowledge of good and evil" and "knowing good and evil" occurs in Deuteronomy 1:39. It is not without significance that, in a book that very significantly limits monarchy and challenges royal pretensions, 1:39 points out that it is those who did not know good and evil who were going to enter the land of promise.

It is not being suggested here that all references to knowledge or the knowledge good and evil in the Old Testament are associated with kings. This would certainly not be the case. However, there are enough clear associations to suggest that Genesis 2-3 triggered such associations in the minds of many of the early readers/hearers. While knowledge itself does not make the case, another key theme in Genesis 2-3—life—makes the cumulative case somewhat more cogent, if not compelling.

1. LIFE IN GENESIS 2-3 AS A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY.

After a brief introduction that notes the importance of life and related ideas in the Eden Narrative, this subsection of the thesis will be subdivided into three parts.

1. Uses of the Root חיה in Genesis 2-3, besides the Tree of Life

2. The Tree of Life in Genesis 2-3

3. Related Concepts: Gardens, Abundant Water, and Fruitfulness

The Importance of Life and Related Ideas in Genesis 2-3.

Life abounds in Genesis 2-3, and not simply in the phrase "the tree of life." Despite the importance of the tree of life in Genesis 2-3, it is important to acknowledge other indicators of this important theme, and to discuss their significance. In order to avoid neglecting these other aspects of life (and related concepts), these other references to life and related aspects will be discussed first. The following aspects will be discussed:

Uses of the Root חיה in Genesis 2-3, besides the Tree of Life

The root חיה occurs some 777 times in the Old Testament. The greatest number of occurrences are in Genesis (125 times), Ezekiel (107 times), and Psalms (81 times). After these Old Testament books, the number of occurrences falls off significantly. In Deuteronomy, the root is found a total of 39 times, and in Proverbs 38 times.[801] The frequency with that the root חיה occurs in Genesis suggests the importance of the life theme in the book. Indeed, in the Eden Narrative, words built off the root חיה occur 14 times.[802] Two verses in particular should be noted: Genesis 2:7 and 3:22.

WTT Genesis 2:7

וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר
מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

NAU Genesis 2:7

Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.

One key verse in the Eden Narrative that uses the root חיה is Genesis 2:7. Since this usage occurs in the verse that relates to the creation of the man, it is

---

[801] G. Gerleman, "חיה." *TLOT* 1:411Ibid., 412-413.

[802] Genesis 2:7 (twice); 2:9, 19 (twice); 2:20; 3:1; 3:14 (twice); 3:17, 20, 22 (twice); and 3:24.

especially important. It seems to suggest two primary aspects of the creation of the man. First, there is the man's origin is humble (עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה). Second, it is the LORD God who gave the man life (וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה).

Hamilton notes that it was especially the kings in Israel and the ANE, who were said to have (or to be) "the breath of life."[803] Hamilton argues that the reference to the LORD God breathing breath into Adam (or humanity?) suggests that the way the story is told in Genesis 2 (as in 1:26, with the image of God) may ". . . be a demythologizing of royal mythology and a democratization of society in Israel."[804] While Hamilton himself does not make this interpretive move, such demythologization and democratization would be a challenge to royal ideology. To broaden the concept of God's breath is, simultaneously, to challenge any sort of monopoly on God's breath—including a royal monopoly.

However, while the importance of Genesis 2:7 should be acknowledged, there is no mention here of eternal life in 2:7, but simply of life. Indeed, there is no mention of eternal life initially when the tree of life is mentioned in 2:9. Barr may be correct in saying that humans were not created immortal, nor that they lost their immortality when they sinned.[805] On the other hand, as Gordon has pointed out, death was not, as in *Gilgamesh*, divinely ordained for humans. On the contrary, in Genesis 2-3, death is connected only with disobedience.[806]

---

[803] Ibid., 158-159. However, as Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 158, concedes the word in Lamentations 4:20—which he cites is רוּחַ, rather than נְשָׁמָה. Cf. also Brettler, *God is King*, 46; Mowinckel, *He that Cometh*, 68-69.

[804] Cf. Günther Wittenberg, "The Image of God," 12-23.

[805] Barr, Garden of Eden, 14.

[806] Gordon, " Ethics of Eden, 18-19.

Perhaps rather than speaking of the man and woman as either "mortal" or "immortal" in the garden, one should speak of the man or woman as being "amortal". Neither mortality nor immortality were issues for them, as long as they stayed in the garden and obeyed the LORD God.

While Genesis 2:7 does not suggest eternal life, 3:22 does have the expression וְחַי לְעֹלָם. Scholars have often seemed content with discussing what the phrase does not mean. Thus, Jenni notes that "[t]he Eng. translation 'eternity' . . . is inappropriate for a number of OT passages with *ʿôlām*, and, even when it seems appropriate, it may not be permitted to introduce a preconceived concept of eternity, burdened with all manner of later philosophical or theological content . . . ."[807] This is an important caveat. Jenni comments that, the meaning ". . . 'most distant time,' either with a view to the past . . ., to the future, or to both . . . ." covers most of the instances of the use of the word.[808]

However, it may be that discussions of the translation of the Hebrew expression חַי לְעֹלָם have obscured the fact that this and similar phrases are frequently used in connection with kings. Indeed, although Jenni notes that, "[a] few OT texts express a wish for 'eternal' life for the king, to which extrabibl. courtly terminology has pars., e.g., in the Amarna correspondence,"[809] Jenni seems to acknowledge a significant number of texts that link kings with life in some way.[810]

---

[807] E. Jenni, "עוֹלָם ʿôlām eternity," *TLOT* 2:853.

[808] Ibid., 853.

[809] Ibid., 858.

[810] Ibid. For the expression "May the king live!" he lists 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 16:16; 1 Kings 1:25, 34, 39; 2 Kings 11:12; 2 Chronicles 23:11. Jenni also speaks of "an intensification with *l^eʿôlām*" in 1 Kings 1:31; 2 Samuel 14:21; and in Nehemiah 2:3.

Jenni regards the wish for "eternal" life for the king "an intensification" of the more common expression "May the king live!"[811] He notes the presence of the concept of eternity in 1 Kings 1:31 and Nehemiah 2:3, as well as the similar expressions in Aramaic in Daniel 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7, and 22. About these instances, as well as those in the Psalms, Jenni regards them ". . . as an exuberant wish for the king's long life and for the continuation of the dynasty . . . ."[812] Jenni points out that,

> Even if the formula may have originally once implied the deification of the king, it has already become a hyperbole of courtly speech in pre-Israelite usage (cf. EA 21:22f., 39 "and may my brother live in eternity . . . for 100,000 years"; cf. 149:24ff. of the life of the servant), and certainly so in Israel, where the longing for eternity is canceled by statements concerning the God-ordained finitude of all human life (Gen 3:22; 6:3; Job 7:16).[813]

Jenni's cautious comments may well be warranted. However, whatever the precise meaning of the expression חי לעלם may be, it would likely have been suggestive of royal ideology in the minds of hearers/readers of the Eden Narrative.

Life, even apart from the tree of life, is a major theme in Genesis 2-3. This life is said to be a gift from God. This is stated in a way that would have likely evoked royal claims in the minds of hearers/readers. However, this gift of life is compromised by the man and woman who are given life by the LORD God when they disobey the command of the LORD God.

The Tree of Life in Genesis 2-3

WTT Genesis 2:9

וַיַּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה כָּל־עֵץ
נֶחְמָד לְמַרְאֶה וְטוֹב לְמַאֲכָל וְעֵץ הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן וְעֵץ

---

[811] Ibid., 858-859.

[812] Ibid., 859.

[813] Ibid., 858-859.

NAU Genesis 2:9

Out of the ground the LORD God caused to grow every tree that is pleasing to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

WTT Genesis 3:22

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים הֵן הָאָדָם הָיָה
כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ לָדַעַת טוֹב וָרָע וְעַתָּה פֶּן־יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וְלָקַח גַּם
מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים וְאָכַל וָחַי לְעֹלָם

NAU Genesis 3:22

Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever—"

WTT Genesis 3:24

וַיְגָרֶשׁ אֶת־הָאָדָם וַיַּשְׁכֵּן מִקֶּדֶם לְגַן־עֵדֶן אֶת־הַכְּרֻבִים וְאֵת
לַהַט הַחֶרֶב הַמִּתְהַפֶּכֶת לִשְׁמֹר אֶת־דֶּרֶךְ עֵץ הַחַיִּים

NAU **Genesis 3:24**

So He drove the man out; and at the east of the garden of Eden He stationed the cherubim and the flaming sword which turned every direction to guard the way to the tree of life."

Many scholars have focused on the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and virtually ignored the tree of life.[814] This is true of Westermann, who has an in-depth discussion of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and a very short paragraph on the tree of life, even though Westermann speaks of the author's skill in combining disparate materials such as the tree of knowledge and the tree of life.[815]

However, the fact that the tree of life is one of the two named trees in the garden suggests the importance this tree in Genesis 2-3. The position of the tree in the middle of the garden,[816] and its function as an inclusio in 2:9 and 3:22, 24, also suggest the importance of the tree. Furthermore, as Barr has argued, no matter what the prehistory of the present form of Genesis 2-3, in its present form the text gives the possible access to the tree of life as ". . . the sole express motivation for the expulsion from the garden."[817] Thus, Mettinger seems to be correct when he writes,

> The Eden Narrative in Genesis 2-3, in the form that we now have it, is a story about divine commandment, human disobedience, and the consequences of insurrection. This span of events has as its focal point the

---

[814] Ellen van Wolde, Words Become Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1-11 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 32.
There are a few scholars who argue that the tree of life was the original and/or more important tree. Cf. Eduard Nielsen, "Creation and the Fall of Man: A Cross-Disciplinary Investigation," *HUCA* 43 (1972): 13-22. (See especially pp. 20-22.) See also Jutta Krispenz, "Wie Viele Bäume Braucht das Paradies? Erwägungen zu Gen II 4b-III 24," *VT* 54 (2004): 301-318.

[815] Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 212.

[816] Brodie, *Genesis as Dialogue*, 139.

[817] Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 59. Cf. also W. Lee Humphreys, *The Tragic Vision and the Hebrew Tradition*, Overtures to Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 75, 79. However, Humphreys emphasizes not so much the expulsion, as the motivation of the LORD God, who is worried about the man violating the deity's realm.

> two special trees in the garden of Eden, which are the most prominent symbols of the narrative.[818]

It is somewhat surprising that even scholars who recognize a connection between the tree of life and kings do not think of this connection as a crucial indicator as to the theme and purpose of the Eden Narrative. Wallace, for example, notes that there is "especially" a connection between 'the plant of life" and kings in the ANE, but does not seem to recognize this connection as important for understanding the Eden Narrative.[819] Similarly, Stordalen notes the following:

> There is no explicit biblical reference to the king as gardener. On the other hand, passages like Ps 72:16 portray the ruler as pivotal for the distribution of blessing upon the nation. As demonstrated by Arvid Kapelrud, the idea of royalty as responsible for fertility (and *eo inverso* famine) lies at the core of 2 Sam 21:1014. Given the symbolism of royal gardens in neighbouring cultures, it seems reasonable to assume a similar symbolic Hebrew royal ideology. Positive evidence for this assumption remains weak.[820]

However, it is the contention of this thesis that the connection of life with kings is particularly suggestive when it comes to the tree of life. While the actual "tree of life" does not appear to be common in the ANE, the plant of life is a common phrase that is associated almost exclusively with kings.[821] Again, the thesis here presented is not arguing for precise verbal connections between texts. Such connections would be difficult to prove.

On the other hand, the "tree of life" and the "plant of life" are sufficiently similar to suggest a connection between the tree and the plant. The tree of life may in fact be an intensification of the plant of life that is commonly

---

[818] Mettinger, *Eden Narrative*, 5.

[819] Wallace, *Eden Narrative,* 105. Wallace encapsulates this observation in one sentence.

[820] Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 102.

[821] Cf. pages 106-110 of this thesis.

associated with kings throughout the ANE and in the Old Testament.[822] Certainly, kings and kingdoms are frequently linked with trees.[823]

It is important to note carefully what is not explicitly said concerning the tree of life.[824] The tree was created before the man and woman were created. Presumably, since the man is placed in the garden that the LORD God had planted,[825] to serve and guard the garden,[826] this divine purpose would have applied to the tree of life. The woman is created in order to help the man, likely in order to aid the man in caring for the garden.[827]

It is arresting that God makes no mention of the tree of life to the man or the woman. Did they even know of its existence? While the readers are told of the tree's existence by the narrator in Genesis 2:9, and the readers are allowed to overhear the speech of the LORD God concerning the tree in 3:22, there is no evidence that the man and the woman are aware of it. Boer notes that, "Genesis 1-3 is not merely a narrative of origins; it is also one of loss."[828]

---

[822] Sandra Scham, "The Days of the Judges: When Men and Women Were Animals and Trees Were Kings," *JSOT* 97 (2002): 37-64. Cf. also this thesis, p. 132 and fn. 436, and p 133, fn. 441.
In the research involved in this thesis, no scholar who was consulted has proposed the term "intensification" for the expression עֵץ הַחַיִּים. The idea would merit more study.

[823] Cf., for example, Ezekiel 31:8-9, 16; 17:23; 2 Kings 14:9=2 Chronicles 25:18; and Judges 9:7-21. One problem with some of the works that connect kings with trees is that they strive for a specificity that may be impossible. For this thesis, only a widespread connection between kings and kingdoms is being argued.

[824] Cf. C. John Collins, *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P & R Publishing, 2006), 115. "There are a host of proposals to explain the two trees. For our purposes, the key thing to note is that the author of Genesis does not explain at all the natures of these two trees." However, Collins immediately goes on to give a brief explanation of the trees.

[825] Genesis 2:8-9.

[826] Genesis 2:15.

[827] Genesis 2:18.

[828] Roland Boer, "The Fantasy of Genesis 1-3," *BI* 14:4 (2006): 320.

He thinks of the tree of life as "lost" at the very moment when it comes into human awareness.[829]

If they were aware of the tree of life, why did they not eat of its fruit? Or did they? Barr has argued for the idea that the story does not envision that they had eaten from the tree of life. The primary evidence that he adduces is the word פֶּן, in Genesis 3:22.[830] Barr thinks that the word (usually translated as "lest") cannot easily mean "lest the man continue to do something he has already been doing".

However, as Stordalen notes, in Ex. 1:9 f., the word פֶּן is used quite clearly to express "lest the Hebrew slaves continue to multiply."[831] Stordalen also refers to II Sam. 12:27 f. as a possible example of the use of פֶּן to indicate "lest someone continues to do something which they had already begun doing." Stordalen holds that it is not possible to tell whether they had been eating the fruit of the tree of life, but that, in any case, the point is that they are not allowed to eat of it now that they have eaten from the forbidden tree.[832]

Still, it seems that the preponderance of the evidence is that the word פֶּן is used most commonly in connection with preventing something from happening at all, rather than preventing something from continuing to happen. The man and woman in Genesis 2-3 apparently forfeited something crucial—the tree of life—even if they were not aware of the tree.

How might the tree of life be polemicizing against aspects of royal ideology? The following comments suggest some tentative conclusions.

---

[829] Ibid., 321.

[830] Barr, 58, 135, fn. 2.

[831] Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 230-231. See also Walton, *Genesis*, 170, 183-185, 230; H. Th. Obbink, "The Tree of Life in Eden," *ZAW* 46 (1928): 106.

[832] Ibid., 231.

The fact that the man and woman are portrayed as unaware of the tree of life could be a criticism of royal pretensions to life. As has been pointed out, particularly in chapter 4 of this thesis, kings throughout the ANE and in the Old Testament are explicitly connected with life, and especially with the plant of life. Kings receive life from the gods/God, and they mediate life to their subjects. Despite the position of the tree of life in the middle of the garden, the man and woman seem to be unaware of the tree of life. How could the man and the woman not be aware of the tree of life, when the tree is in the middle? To use royal language concerning the tree of life in connection with the man and woman, and yet to portray them as oblivious to that tree is evidence for a hidden polemic against a crucial aspect of royal ideology.

Furthermore, the man and woman are explicitly said to be driven away from the garden and from the tree of life. Since they no longer have access to the tree, they can neither enjoy its fruit for themselves, nor pass it along to anyone else. As has been argued, one of the most crucial and pervasive elements in royal ideology in the ANE and in the Old Testament was the king's possession and mediation of life. Thus, to call into question such a connection would likely have caused ancient hearers and readers to detect a polemic in the Eden Narrative, albeit a muted one.

The connection of the king with abundance, and the compromising of abundance in the Eden Narrative is also worthy of note. In the ANE, kings were often connected (or connected themselves) with abundance.[833]

However, in Genesis 2, it is God who establishes the garden, plants the trees, and provides water, not the man and the woman. The man—and later the woman, presumably, as the man's עזר—is to " serve and guard" (ולשמרה לעבדה) the Garden, but they are not given credit for planting the garden or for providing water for it.

The Eden Narrative begins with a negation. There were no shrubs because there was no rain. Furthermore, there was no man to cultivate the ground.

WTT Genesis 2:5

וְכֹל שִׂיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה טֶרֶם יִהְיֶה בָאָרֶץ וְכָל־עֵשֶׂב
הַשָּׂדֶה טֶרֶם יִצְמָח כִּי לֹא הִמְטִיר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָרֶץ
וְאָדָם אַיִן לַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה

NAU Genesis 2:5

"Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth; and there was no man to cultivate the ground."

This contrast between "before and after" may be reminiscent of the ANE literature that portrays the world as a chaotic wasteland, especially, before the creation of the king.[834] However, in the Eden Narrative, it is not the man who

---

[833] Shalom E. Holtz, "The Thematic Unity of Psalm cxliv in Light of Mesopotamian Royal Ideology," *VT* 58 (2008): 367-380. See especially 373-378. See also Lambert, "Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia," 54-70.

[834] See especially the references in the chapter on scholarship, as well as Carlo Zaccagnini, "An Urartean Royal Inscription in the Report of Sargon's Eighth Campaign," in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis (Papers of*

primarily resolves this problem of the lack of life-giving conditions on the earth. Rather, it is the LORD God who does so, although part of God's solution is the creation of the man.[835]

As has been pointed out in this thesis, the planting of gardens is considered a royal act, both in the ANE in general and in the Old Testament.[836] However, the planting of the trees in the garden is pointedly said to be the work of the LORD God. Thus, while the man and woman are in the garden, they are portrayed as servants of the garden, rather than as the garden's founder or sustainer.

When the LORD God pronounces the curse on the ground, he states that the ground will no longer yield its abundance to the man.[837] This lack of fruitfulness is further exacerbated in Genesis 4, a chapter that mirrors chapter 3 in many ways, but also intensifies chapter 3.[838]

Genesis 2-3 portrays Adam and Eve as made by the LORD God and given the task of caring for the garden by the LORD God. In the ANE in general, as

---

a Symposium held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980, OAC 17 (Roma: Instituto Per L'Oriente, 1981), 259-295. As Zaccagnini points out, kings boast about how they have brought about order and fruitfulness, in contradistinction with the kings over whom they have triumphed. Cf. also Batto, "Paradise Reexamined," 33-66; Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," *JBL* 100/4 (198): 513-529.

[835] Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis: Chapters 1-17*, 153-154. Hamilton points out that there are two problems. First, God is not doing what God customarily does—i.e., sending rain. Second, there is no man to till the ground. Both are essential. Cf. also Terje Stordalen, "Man, Soil, Garden: Basic Plot in Genesis 2-3 Reconsidered," *JSOT* 53 (1992): 13, 15.

[836] Cf. the discussion of gardens and the provision of water in the ANE above, pages 135-136, and footnotes 451-458. For the discussion of the provision of water by kings in the Old Testament, cf. pages 177-180, and footnotes 626-629.

[837] Genesis 3:17-19.

[838] Genesis 4: 12. Cf. John O. Oswalt, "כּוֹחַ," *TWOT* 1:437. Oswalt comments concerning the word כּוֹחַ, that ". . . more commonly it expresses potency, capacity to produce. This may be expressed in sexual terms (Job 40:16; Gen 49:3), or it may express the product of the earth's potency (Gen 4:12; Job 31:39; etc.) . . . ." While the same root is not used in other ANE documents, the general tenor of royal boasts seems to be very similar.
Cf. also Matthew Richard Schlimm, "At Sin's Entryway (Gen 4,7): A Reply to C. L. Crouch," *ZAW* 124/3 (2012): 414, in which Schlimm notes the many similarities between chapters 3 and 4. Whether the two chapters are designed to compare (as Schlimm argues) or to contrast (as Crouch contends), they agree that the two chapters are somehow linked.

well as in Ecclesiastes 2:4-9, it is the king who boasts of planting elaborate gardens with fruit trees and providing abundant water.

One crucial aspect of gardens (encountered in both the rest of the ANE and in the Old Testament) is the provision of abundant water for the garden. Genesis 2:10-14 is often taken as an insertion,[839] contributing nothing to the main story line. However, in light of the often encountered claims of ANE rulers to provide water for their people, these verses might be emphasizing that it was not the man who provided water. One might think of the "mist" that the LORD God caused to water the earth,"[840] and the river that went forth from Eden, as being a critique of royal pretensions to supply the necessary water for the people.[841] In the Eden Narrative, it was the LORD God who did so. On this reading, Genesis 2:10-14 may be regarded as an integral part of the story.

Summary: Life in Genesis 2-3 as a Polemic against Excesses in Royal Ideology.

As with knowledge, life is a common theme throughout the Old Testament. However, the particular way in which the theme of life is treated in Genesis 2-3 would likely have awakened royal associations in ancient readers and hearers. As with knowledge, there are indications of such "royal resonances" in Genesis 2-3 in ANE literature in general and also in the Old Testament.

Perhaps individually none of these lines of evidence is conclusive. However, taken together, these various aspects of life and related themes point

---

[839] For example, Westermann, *Genesis1-11*, 216, speaks of the ". . . deliberately parenthetic nature" of Genesis 2:10-14.
[840] Genesis 2:6.
[841] Genesis 2:10-14.

hearers/readers toward a hidden polemic against the life aspect of royal ideology.

As has been pointed out, kings in the ANE were often said to be endowed with the breath of life by their god(s). They are also portrayed as being the breath of life to their subjects, and at times, to be the breath of life even to foreign peoples. In the Old Testament as well, the king is frequently associated with life—or with its opposite.

However, in the Eden Narrative, the emphasis is upon the LORD God's gift of the breath of life, rather than upon the man's (or woman's) mediation of life to others. The planting of the garden, the planting of the trees (including the tree of life), and the provision of water are likewise attributed to God.

Finally, when it comes to giving life, two things should be noted concerning the Eden Narrative. First, it is the LORD God who gives life. Second, the actions of Adam do not lead to life. On the contrary, they lead to death. In view of the close connection between kings and the giving of life in the ANE and in the Old Testament, the original readers/hearers likely might have felt these resonances much more than moderns do.

C. OTHER CLUES IN GENESIS 2-3 FOR A HIDDEN POLEMIC AGAINST EXCESSES IN ROYAL IDEOLOGY.

There are other possible indicators of a connection —indeed, indicators of a negative connection—with royal ideology in Genesis 2-3. Many of these have been indicated by previous scholars, but bear repeating in connection with the argument that is presented here. These are presented in tabular form. In the left-hand column various words, phrases, or motifs are mentioned. In column two, other biblical texts that connect these words, phrases, or motifs to royal ideology or action are listed. Footnotes refer to scholars who have

argued for connecting these elements from Genesis 2-3 (as well as from other biblical texts) with royal ideology and practice.

GENESIS 2-3: WORDS, PHRASES, AND MOTIFS	OTHER POSSIBLE BIBLICAL CONNECTIONS
"formed from the dust" (Genesis 2:7)[842]	1 Samuel 2:8; 1 Kings 16:2; Psalm 72:9
The Garden of Eden[843] as a (Royal) Sanctuary[844]	Ecclesiastes 2:5-8; Ezekiel 28:11-19.[845]
The Cherubim[846]	1 Kings 6.
The River Gihon (Gen. 2:13)[847]	Gihon is the place where King Solomon was coronated (1 Ki. 1:33, 38, 45).[848]
The image of God and the mandate to rule over the earth (Genesis 1-3)[849]	While kings are never said to be in the image or likeness of God in the Old Testament, this is a

[842] Walter Brueggemann, "From Dust to Kingship," *ZAW* 84 (1972): 1-18.

[843] The garden as a symbol of the life-giving aspect of royal ideology has already been discussed. The idea that the garden may also be related to sanctuaries is listed separately, although this idea may also be related to the life-giving aspect. One might think, for example, of Ezekiel 47:1-12. While there is no reference to the king in the Ezekiel text, the text does closely connect the temple and life.

[844] Gordon J. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," in *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 9 (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986), 19-25. This article also appears under the same title in *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399-404. John Strange, "The Idea of Afterlife in Ancient Israel: Some Remarks on the Iconography in Solomon's Temple," *PEQ* 117 (1985): 35-40; Omer Sergi, "The Composition of Nathan's Oracle to David (2 Samuel 7:1–17) as a Reflection of Royal Judahite Ideology," *JBL* 129/2 (2009): 261-279.

[845] Cf. the discussion above, page of Van Seter's comments on royal motifs.

[846] Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, " 'Who is the King of Glory?' Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism," in *Scripture and Other Artifacts*, edited by Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994); Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 459.

[847] Amit, "Biblical Utopianism," 11-17.

[848] Whether or not the Gihon of Genesis 2:13 is associated with the Gihon of 1 Kings 1, it is possible that the mere sound of the name may have awakened thoughts of Israel's wisest king, Solomon.

[849] Cf. Middleton, *The Liberating Image*. One fruitful area for further research is the pursuit of the connections between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2-3, in tandem with *Enuma Elish* and *Gilgamesh*. Possible—indeed, likely—connections have long been noted between the biblical texts and these two ANE works.
some possible connections between royal ideology and the stories of *Enuma Elish* and *Gilgamesh* have been noted in this thesis. However, further exploration might reveal ways in which one story or account polemicizes the other in speaking of kingship. For example, is it not possible that *Enuma Elish* is seeking to ideologically validate not only Marduk and

	common way of speaking of kings in the ANE.
Being driven out of the Garden (Genesis 3:24)[850]	(Exile)
Primeval creation of humanity.[851]	Ezekiel 28:11-19.[852]
The clothing of the man and woman as a royal (or anti-royal?) act.[853]	

The fact that the garden seems to be linked in some way with temples, which are frequently linked with kings in both the ANE and in the Old Testament, also lends credence to a royal connection in the Eden Narrative. Sergi points out that

---

Babylon, but also the king of Babylon, whereas *Gilgamesh*, though set in ancient Ur, might be seeking to undermine an uncritical pro-royal ideology in some other time and geographical setting?

It is also possible that Genesis 1 is presenting God (and the humans as his co-regents, as in vss. 26-28) in terms similar to *Enuma Elish* in order to make a pro-royal statement. Perhaps Genesis 2-3 may not only use motifs from *Gilgamesh*, but may also be calling into question the pro-royal ideology of Genesis 1, in a similar way that *Gilgamesh* may call into question the pro-royal assumptions of *Enuma Elish*.

These are, however, only possibilities, and are not developed in this thesis.

[850] Cf. Brueggemann, *David and His Theologian*, 9. "It is not, I think, forcing the narrative to see a parallel in Gen 3:23-24 in which the man is expelled from his garden. The loss of garden and loss of kingdom come to mean the same thing, exile."

Admittedly the root גרש is never unambiguously used for "exile," although the root may suggest this in Hosea 9:15. However, the root גרש is used in contexts which connote violent expulsion, whether of individuals (Leviticus 21:7ff.) or groups (Joshua 24:18). The more common word for exile is גָּלוּת.

[851] For example, cf. Mary R. Bachvarova, "From 'Kingship in Heaven' to King Lists: Syro-Anatolian Courts and the History of the World," *JANES* 12 (2012): 97-118. Bachvarova, 97, notes that Hittite-Hurrian kings connected their reigns with ". . . a variety of kings from far-off lands . . . ." This served to allow ". . . them access to the distant past and connecting them to world events." Thus, the ancient creation of humankind may be linked to royal ideology in the ANE and in Israel.

Cf. also Aage Bentzen, "King Ideology—'Urmensch'—'Troonsbestijgingsfeest'," *ST* 1 (1950): 143-157.

[852] Cf. the discussion above (pages 80-81) of Van Seters' approach to Ezekiel 28, and its possible connection with Genesis 2-3.

[853] William N. Wilder, "Illumination and Investiture: The Royal Significance of the Tree of Wisdom in Genesis 3," *WTJ* 68 (2006): 51-69. Wilder makes the intriguing suggestion that the man and woman were designed to be royalty, as symbolized by investiture. However, they took a shortcut, which Wilder regards as premature, self-motivated, and disobedient.

> . . . setting the royal dynasty and the temple at the heart of royal ideology was common practice in ancient Near Eastern kingdoms. In light of this and since the temple and the Davidic monarchy seem to occupy a major role in biblical historiography, as well as the prophetic literature and in biblical poetry, we may assume that role of the temple and the dynasty in the royal Judahite ideology was not only a Deuteronomistic issue but was addressed also by pre-and even post-Deuteronomistic scribes.[854]

However, if Genesis 2-3 does indeed portray the Garden of Eden as a sanctuary, the relationship between the man and woman and this sanctuary is quite problematic. At the end of the story, the man and woman are driven out of the garden. This is hardly a positive outcome in terms of the Garden-Sanctuary. The cherubim now guard (לִשְׁמֹר) the way to the tree of life. As Walton puts it, ". . . [T]he warden is off to jail."[855]

---

[854] Sergi, "The Composition of Nathan's Oracle to David," 262.

[855] Walton, *Genesis*, 230.

CHAPTER SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It has been argued that one of the rhetorical uses of the Eden Narrative—if not the author's rhetorical purpose for it—is to provide a hidden polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology, as well as the behavior based on such ideology. The individual pieces of evidence presented from Genesis 2-3 are not convincing, when each clue is considered in isolation. However, there is a cumulative weight to it, even if each individual piece of evidence is inconclusive. The association of life and related concepts with kings, and above all the portrait of the woman and man attaining "the knowledge of good and evil" and "becoming like gods seem to provide evidence for such a reading.

Can the precise target of the hidden polemic of the Eden Narrative be identified? Such attempts have been made.[856] One line of scholarly argument is based on evidence that suggests a composition during the time of the early Israelite monarchy. If this is correct, the targets of polemic may be early Davidic kings.

Despite the scholarly reaction against the notion of a "Solomonic Enlightenment" as proposed by von Rad, the existence of such a literary flowering is still plausible, unless one holds that "the united kingdom of Israel" was a complete fabrication.[857] A transitional time that is characterized by relative peace and prosperity can indeed be a time for the flowering of

---

[856] Cf., e.g., Rendsburg, *Redaction of Genesis*, 107-120. See also Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, revised edition, translated by John H. Marks, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 16; Brueggemann, *David and His Theologian*, 1-27.

[857] Cf. the balanced (albeit, conservative) discussion in Jens Bruun Kofoed, *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 41-58, and his references to various scholars on both sides of the debate. Cf. also the careful statements in Walter Dietrich, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, translated by Joachim Vette (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 259-262 (especially, 262).

culture and literature. Furthermore, Israel was surrounded by monarchies, or (as in the case of Canaan areas which had been dominated by monarchies). Most of these monarchies had existed for hundreds of years. Israel did not need to create its own institutions or the ideologies that undergirded them *ab novo*. Rather, Israel could pattern its own institutions on the models provided by other ancient monarchies.[858]

There is indeed evidence that that suggests connections between the Eden Narrative and the account of the early kings in Samuel and Kings.[859] These have been noted by many scholars.[860] For example, there is the mention of Gihon, which is associated with the coronation of Solomon.[861] The boundaries of the land of Israel, as recorded in Genesis also appear to correspond with those mentioned in the Court Narrative. People groups and names of individuals that are encountered in Genesis reappear in the Court Narrative. A somewhat more positive viewpoint toward foreigners seems to permeate both Genesis and the Court Narrative.[862]

Do the many connections with the Davidic and Solomonic reigns prove that Genesis 2-3 was composed during or shortly after that time? If this is

---

[858] Cf. Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy," 72.

[859] For a classic presentation of the evidence which seems to point toward an early monarchic date for Genesis, cf. Benjamin Mazar, "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," *JNES* 28 (1969): 73-83. Some of the major lines of evidence and argument which Mazar presents are as follows. The extent of the promised territory in Genesis corresponds to the boundaries of the United Kingdom of David and Solomon (p. 74; cf. Genesis 15:18), references to Judah's ascendancy (p. 74; cf. Genesis 49), and references to place names, such as Moriah (p. 74f.; Genesis 22:14; cp. 2 Chronicles 3:1).

[860] Cf., for example, Otto Kaiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*, translated by John Sturdy (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg, 1975), 78-91; Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1986), 107-120; B. Mazar, "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," *JNES* 28 (1969): 73-83.

[861] Cf. 2 Kings 1:33, 38, 45; 2 Chr. 32:30; 33:14.

[862] In particular, John Day, *From Creation to Babel*, 48, notes a more positive attitude toward Edom in Genesis—especially in Genesis 33.

true, then David and/or Solomon may well be the polemical target for the Eden Narrative.[863]

However, if the argument made in this thesis is correct, such a precise determination may be impossible. The actual time of the composition of a story may be very different from the in which the story is set. If the Eden Narrative assumed its final form in the Persian or Greek period,[864] it would have been wise for the redactor or author to present a protest against certain aspects of monarchical pretensions in terms of Israel's earlier history.[865] In this manner, whatever royal "establishment" was the immediate target of a hidden polemic might have read the polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology, without recognizing that they were its target. Its author/redactor might be able to deflect royal wrath by pointing out that this story was directed against certain aspects of Israel's own royal ideology and practice. A foreign overlord—whether Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, or Greek—might well have been mollified, or even pleased, by this explanation. It was up to the Jewish reader to read between the lines, and conclude that the Eden Narrative might have something to say about present royal arrangements.

However, no matter the time of the composition or redaction of Genesis 2-3, there are many references to people groups, places and names in the Eden Narrative, in the Primeval Narrative, and Genesis as a whole, that seem to

---

[863] Cf., e.g., Rendsburg, *Redaction of Genesis*, 107-120. See also Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, revised edition, translated by John H. Marks, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 16.
[864] Indeed, the presence of the story of the tower in Babylon might argue, not for a Neo-Babylonian date, but rather for a Persian date. The Persian overlords of Judah might well smile at the story, without perceiving that, *mutatis mutandis*, the story was about them as well. Kingly pretensions seem to be amazingly intercultural and unchanged across time.
[865] This is one case in which the maximalism/minimalism debate does not materially affect the argument. Whether such literature was practically an eye-witness account, or was entirely fabricated, its status as a hidden polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology of kings would still be valid.

connect Genesis with the Court Narrative.[866] These references would likely have awakened associations with royal ideology in the mind of the readers/hearers of Genesis. While pinpointing the precise nature of these connections may be difficult, or even impossible, for the purpose of arguing for a more general reference to an ANE worldview concerning kings and kingship, precision may not be required. Indeed, precision may have been precisely what the author was striving to avoid, if the author was indeed engaging in a hidden polemic.

Furthermore, the reading of the rhetorical purpose of Eden Narrative that is here proposed is in line with other portions of the Old Testament. Some of these other texts are frequently used to elucidate the meaning of the phrase "the knowledge/knowing/ knowers of good and evil," although often only at the lexical level. While the meaning of these similar phrases may indeed help us to understand the phrase at that level, in the larger literary context, these other occurrences may paint a more negative portrait of the knowledge of good and evil,[867] and of life.[868]

This approach to Genesis 2-3 as a hidden polemic against certain excesses in royal ideology might help to account for some of the details of the story that seem to pull the reader/hearer of the story in various, and often contrary, directions. If the story—at least in something like its final form—was a hidden polemic against certain aspects of royal ideology, then it ought not to be surprising that there are so many different, diverse (and even contradictory)

---

[866] Cf. fn. 859 below for references.

[867] Cf. the discussion on some of the less than flattering references to the knowledge of good and evil in connection with kings in this thesis in fn. 361, 362, 508, and 754.

[868] Cf. the discussion in chapter 4 and the evidence from Genesis 2-3 that was presented in the preceding chapter.

interpretations of what might seem on the surface to be a simple story. This may have been intended by the original redactor who is responsible for something like the final form of the Eden Narrative. If the king's security forces knock on the door at midnight, it is a very good idea to be able to say, "Oh, but your Majesty, this was but a trifling story about . . . ." A certain degree of indirection may be the soul of discretion when polemicizing against kingly pretensions.

CONCLUSION AND POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Certainly further research could be done on individual aspects that point toward a hidden polemic against royal ideology in Genesis 2-3. Some of these have been mentioned in tabular form above.

However, another fruitful avenue was recently proposed in the form of a question from one of the readers of this thesis: What evidence is there (if any) for an elite's ability to criticize it? This is an excellent question, and merits further study.[869]

It would be very interesting to examine the ways in which modern scholars approach the royal aspects of ancient literature. Is there a tendency to minimize or ignore aspects of ancient literature? If so, why might this be so? What are the advantages of such modern approaches? What might be the drawbacks of such approaches?

What conclusions can be drawn from this study? If the text of Genesis 2-3 is indeed capable of very different readings, this alone would suggest that all conclusions about the meaning of the text are tentative. If the Eden Narrative is a hidden polemic, all conclusions are rendered even more precarious.[870] At the very least, the following observations are in order.

First, since royal ideology is obviously a very important and controversial topic in the ANE and in the Old Testament, it is not a leap to assume that royal

---

[869] Several days of fruitless searching for bibliographic resources on this important matter suggest that the literature on this important matter is not plentiful. However, that may suggest more about the searcher than about the quest itself.

[870] Edwin M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 22. As Good has pointed out, if one cannot misunderstand irony, it probably is not particularly effective irony. "Is not a source of irony's attraction and repellence alike that it may plausibly be taken literally, invites us to take it literally, makes a certain sense when taken literally? Yet a nagging doubt hints at a meaning hidden behind the mask." The same may be said of hidden polemic.

ideology may be connected in some way with the Eden Narrative. In the ANE and in the Old Testament it is not only important to decide who is king. It is also vital to decide how a king is to rule. This does not prove that Genesis 2-3 is concerned with royal ideology. It does, however, suggest the possibility of such a connection.

Second, as has been pointed out in chapter 2 of this thesis, a number of scholars have noted certain royal motifs and/or royal words and phrases in Genesis 2-3. This, in and of itself, should predispose modern readers to recognize the possibility of a royal connection.

Third, clues that have often been used to date may be part of the disguise of the hidden polemic. If this is true, then the time in which the story seems to be set may be intentionally misleading. Thus the dating of the Eden Narrative may actually be rendered even more problematic than has been assumed in the past.

Fourth, the extreme differences in scholarly interpretations of Genesis 2-3 may actually be a function of various clues sprinkled throughout the Eden Narrative. This would have been an unintended consequence of the fact that the writers and the hearer/readers of the Eden Narrative intended to protect themselves from royal retaliation. Such a rhetorical move would have served not only to help keep alive the writer or redactor of something like the final form, but would have also aided in the preservation of the story.[871] Thus, the Eden Narrative has become a confusing and rich text that seduces and baffles

---

[871] A later redactor or scribe may have been more inclined to preserve the story if it could be read in several different ways. Thus, the Eden Narrative may have been preserved, not in spite of its apparent contradictions, but because of them. This idea, though intriguing, would be exceedingly difficult to substantiate regarding ancient literature, and is not developed in this paper.

the hearer and reader, even as it invites reflection and debate on political power, obedience to God, and the importance of human choices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED[872]

_____. "balāṭu." *CAD* 2:46-70.

_____. "dārū." *CAD* 3: 115-118.

_____. "napištu." *CAD* 11: 296-305.

_____. "šarru." *CAD* 17, part 2: 76-114.

_____. "šarrūtu." *CAD* 17, part 2: 114-123.

Aalders, Gerhard Charles. *Genesis*, Vol. 1. Bible Student's Commentary. Translated by William Heynen. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.

Abusch, Tzvi. "The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay." *JAOS* 121/4 (2001): 614-622.

Ackerman, James S. "Knowing Good and Evil: A Literary Analysis of the Court History in 2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2." *JBL*109/1 (1990): 41-60.

Ackerman, Susan. "E-Dan." *JANER* 13 (2013): 153-187.

Adams, James Luther. "Ideology and Religion." [No further information available.]

Aitken, Kenneth T. *Proverbs*. DSB. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Albertz, Rainer. „Ihr werdet sein wie Gott": Gen 3, 1-7 auf dem Hintergrund des alttestamentlichen und des sumerisch-babylonischen Menschenbildes." *WO* 24 (1993): 89-111.

Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. OTL. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.

Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* SBLStBL 3. Translated by David Green. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Alexander, T. Desmond. "The Old Testament View of after Death." *Themilios* 11/2 (1986): 41-46.

Alexander, T. Desmond. *From Paradise to the Promised Land*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1988.

Allen, James P. "From Papyrus Leiden I 350 (1.16)." In *COS* 1:23-26.

Alonso-Schökel, L. "Sapiential and Covenant Themes in Genesis 2-3." In *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*. Edited by J. Crenshaw, 468-480. New York: Ktav, 1976.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Alter, Robert. *Genesis*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996.

---

[872] Resources which are not credited to particular authors are listed first, and indicated by a straight line, in accordance with Chicago Style.

Alter, Robert. *The Story of David.* New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.

Altes, Liesbeth Korhals. "Gilgamesh and the Power of Narration." *JAOS* 127/2 (2007): 183-193.

Amit, Yairah. "Biblical Utopianism: A Mapmakers Guide to Eden." *USQR* 44/1 (1990): 11-17.

Amit, Yairah. "Endings—Especially Reversal Endings." *Scriptura* 87 (2004): 213-226.

Amit, Yairah. "Epoch and Genre: The Sixth Century and the Growth of Hidden Polemics." In *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period.*" Edited by Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp , 135-151. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Amit, Yairah. "Hidden Polemics in the Story of Judah and Tamar." In *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum.* Edited by David J.A. Clines and Ellen van Wolde, 1-20. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.

Amit, Yairah. "Narrative Analysis: Meaning, Context and Origins of Genesis 38." In *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David l. Petersen.* Edited by J. M. LeMon and K. H. Richards, 271-291. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

Amit, Yairah. "The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive or Change His Mind": On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative." *Proof* 12/3 (1992): 201-212.

Amit, Yairah. *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative.* BIS 25. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Amit, Yairah. *History and Ideology: An Introduction to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible.* Translated by Yael Lotan. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Amit, Yairah. *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in Retrospect.* HBM 39. Translated by Betty Sigler Rozen. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.

Amit, Yairah. Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible. Translated by Yael Lotan. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

Andersen, Frances I. "On Reading Genesis 1-3." In *Backgrounds for the Bible.* Edited by Michael Patrick O'Connor and David Noel Freedman, 137-150. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

Andersen, Kirsten M. "Imago Dei and Desire in Genesis 1-3. To Eat or Not to Eat; or Rather to Eat or What to Eat." *Literature and Theology* 6/3 (1992): 254-67.

Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel.* WBC 11. Waco, Texas: Word, 1989.

Anderson, A. A. *The Book of Psalms, Volume I: Psalms 1-72.* NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Anderson, Gary A. *The Genesis of Perfection : Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Andreasen, N. E. "Adam and Adapa: Two Anthropological Characters." *AUSS* 19/3 (1981): 179-194.

Annus, Amar. *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia*. SAAS 14. [Helsinki]: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002.

Ansberry, Christopher B. *Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad: An Exploration of the Courtly Nature of the Book of Proverbs*. BZAW 422. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

Ansell, Nicholas J. "The Call of Wisdom/the Voice of the Serpent: A Canonical Approach to the Tree of Knowledge." *CSR* 31/1 (2001): 31-57.

Arbel, Daphna. "Questions about Eve's Iniquity, Beauty, and Fall: The 'Primal Figure' in Ezekiel 28:11-19 and *Genesis Rabbah* Traditions of Eve." *JBL* 124/4 (2005): 641-655.

Arneth, Martin. *Durch Adams Fall is ganz verderbt . . . : Studient zur Entstehung der alttestamentlichen Urgeschchte*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

Arneth, Martin. *Sonne der Gerechtigkeit": Studien zur Solarisierung der Jahwe-Religion im Lichte von Psalm 72*. BZAR 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.

Arnold, Bill T. *Genesis*. NCBC. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Arnold, Bill T. *Encountering the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998.

Ashby, G.W.E.C. "Reflections of the Language of Genesis 1 & 2." *Semitics* 6 (1978): 58-69.

Assman, Jan. *Ägypten: Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur*. U-T 366. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984.

Aster, Shawn Zelig. "On the Place of Psalm 21 in Israelite Royal Ideology." In *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*. Edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael J. Williams, 307-320. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Auwers, J.-M. "Les Psaumes 70-72 : Essai de Lecture Canonique." *RB* 101/2 (1994) : 242-257.

Averbeck, Richard E. "Ancient Near Eastern Mythography as It Relates to Historiography in the Old Testament: Genesis 3 and the Cosmic Battle." In *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*. Edited by James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard, 328-356. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Averbeck, Richard E. "The Sumerian Historiographic Tradition and Its Implications for Genesis 1-11." In *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*. Edited by A. R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker, 79-102. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Bachmann, Veronika. "Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the 'Tree of Life' in *1 Enoch* 24-25 Reconsidered." *JSP* 19 (2009): 83-107.

Bachvarova, Mary R. "From 'Kingship in Heaven' to King Lists: Syro-Anatolian Courts and the History of the World." *JANES* 12 (2012): 97-118.

Bailey, John A. "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3." *JBL*89 (1970): 137-150.

Bailey, Lloyd R. *Biblical Perspectives on Death*. OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Baines, John. "Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context." In *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day, 16-53. JSOTSup 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 16-53.

Baines, John. "Kingship, Definition of Culture, and Legitimation." In *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*. Edited by David O'Connor and David P. Silverman, 3-47. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Baker, David W. "רעע." *NIDOTTE*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997, 3:1154-1158.

Baker, J. "The Myth of Man's 'Fall'--a Reappraisal." *ET* 92 (1981): 235-37.

Barr, James. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of a Millennium*. The Hensley Henson Lectures for 1997. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Barr, James. "Is God a Liar? (Genesis 2-3)—and Related Matters." *JTS* 57/1 (2006): 1-22.

Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Barr, James. "The Synchronic, the Diachronic and the Historical: A Triangular Relationship?" In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 1-14. Leiden – Boston – Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Barton, John. "Intertextuality and the 'Final Form' Of the Text." In *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*. Edited by A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø, 33-37. Leiden – Boston – Köln: E. J. Brill, 2000.

Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.

Barton, John. *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature, and Theology: Collected Essays of John Barton*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Batto, Bernard F. "Paradise Reexamined." In *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective*, SiC 4, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies. Lewiston, New York: Mellen Press, 1991.

Batto, Bernard F. "The Yahwist's Primeval Myth." In *Gilgamesh: A Reader*, edited by John Maier, 245-259. Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1997.

Bauckham, Richard. *The Bible in Politics: How to Read the Bible Politically*. Third Way Books. London: SPCK, 1989.

Bauer, Uwe F.W. "Judges 18 as an Anti-Spy Story in the Context of an Anti-Conquest Story: The Creative Usage of Literary Genres." *JSOT* 88 (2000): 37-47.

Beal, T.K. and D.M. Gunn. *Reading Bibles, Reading Bodies*. London: Routledge, 1997

Beal, Timothy K. "Intertextuality." *Handbook of Postmodern Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by A. K. M. Adam. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000, 128-130.

Beal, Timothy K. "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell, 27-39. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Beal, Timothy K. and Tod Linafelt. "Sifting for Cinders: Strange Fires in Leviticus 10:1-5." *Semeia* 69-70 (1995): 19-32.

Beattie, D. R. G. "What Is Gen. 2-3 About?" *ET* 92/1 (1980): 8-10.

Bechtel, Lyn M. "Genesis 2.4b-3.24: A Myth about Human Maturation." *JSOT* 67 (1995): 3-26.

Bechtel, Lyn M. "Rethinking the Interpretation of Genesis 2.4b-3.24." In *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. FCB. Edited by A. Brenner, 77-117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Bechtel, Lyn M. "Shame as a Sanction of Social Control in Biblical Israel: Judicial, Political, and Social Shaming." *JSOT* 16/49 (1991): 47-76.

Beckman, Gary. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Hittite Anatolia." In *The Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jack Sasson, 1:529-543. New York: Scribner, 2000.

Benner, Athalya and Frank H. Polak, editors. *Words, Ideas, Worlds: Biblical Essays in Honour of Yairah Amit*. HBM 40. ASBR 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.

Ben-Porat, Ziva. "The Poetics of Literary Allusion." *PTL* 1 (1976): 105-128.

Ben-Shlomo, David. *Philistine Iconography: A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*. OBO. Göttingen: Academic Press Fribourg, 2010.

Bentzen, Aage. "King Ideology—'Urmensch'—Troonsbestijgingsfeest'." *ST* 1 (1950): 143-157.

Berg, Werner. "Israels Land, der Garten Gottes: Der Garten als bild des Heiles in Alten Testament." *ZT* 32 (1988): 35-51.

Berge, Kåre. "National Identity and Popular Sentiment in Genesis and Exodus." In *Enigmas and Images: Studies in Honor of Tryggve N. D.*

Mettinger. Edited by Göran Eidevall and Blaženka Scheuer, 37-52. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Bergen, Robert D. *2 Samuel. The New American Commentary* 7. n.p.: Broadman & Holman, 1996.

Berger, Yitzhak "Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Case of 1 Samuel 25." *JBL* 128/2 (2009): 253-272.

Bergey, Ronald. "The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?" *JSOT* 28/1 (2003): 33-54.

Berlin, Adele. "Introduction." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin, 1-6. Bethesda, MD.: University Press of Maryland, 1996.

Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Bible and Literature Series 9. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.

Berman, Joshua A. *Created Equal: How the Bible Broke with Ancient Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Besnier, Marie-Françoise. "Vegetation in Mesopotamian Temple Precincts: Gardens, 'Sacred Groves' or Potted Plants?" *JAC* 19 (2004): 59-87.

Bickert, R. *Die List Joabs und der Sinneswandel Davids*. VTS 20: 30-51. VTSUP 30 (1979).

Biddle, Mark E. "Sin, Shame and Self-Esteem." *Review & Expositor* 103/2 (2006): 359-370.

Bing, J. D. "Adapa and Immortality." *UF* 16 (1984): 53-56.

Bing, J. D. "On the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh." *JANES* 7 (1975): 1-10.

Bird, Phyllis A. "Genesis 3 in der gegenwärtigen biblicschen Forschung." *JBT* 9(1994): 3-24.

Black, Jeremy and Anthony Green. "Stylised Tree and it 'Rituals'." *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.

Bledstein, Adrien Janis. "The Genesis of Humans: The Garden of Eden Revisited." *Judaism* 26/2 (1977): 187-200.

Bleiberg, E. "Historical Texts as Political Propaganda During the New Kingdom." *BES* 7 (1985-86): 5-13.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Another Contribution to the Succession Narrative Debate (2 Samuel 11-20; 1 Kings 1-2)." *JSOT* 38/1 (2013): 35-58.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Creation, Un-Creation, and Re-Creation: A Discursive Commentary on Genesis 1-11*. London: T & T Clark International, 2011.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Gilgamesh and Adam: Wisdom through Experience in *Gilgamesh* and in the Biblical Story of the Man, the Woman, and the Snake." In *Treasures Old and New: Essays in the Theology of the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004, 85-101.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The Social Context of the 'Outsider Woman' in Proverbs 1-9." *Biblica* 72/4 (1991): 457-473.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Theme and Motif in the Succession Narrative (2 Sam. XI 2ff) and the Yahwist Corpus." In *Volume du Congrès 1965*, VTSup 15. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966. (Reprinted in Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Treasures Old and New*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, 102-119.)

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. Gibeon and Israel: The Role of Gibeon and the Gibeonites in the Political and Religious History of Early Israel. SOTOS Monograph 2. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University, 1972.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*, revised edition. Oxford Bible Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. " 'Who is the King of Glory?' Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism." In *Scripture and Other Artifacts*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Bloom, Harold and David Rosenberg. *The Book of J*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1990.

Bloom, Harold. "From J to K, or The Uncanniness of the Yahwist." In *The Bible and the Narrative Tradition*. Edited by Frank Mc Connell, 19-35. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Blumenthal, Elke. Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches I: die Phraseologie. ASAW, p.-h. 61/1. Berlin (East): Academie-Verlag, 1970.

Boer, Roland. "The Fantasy of Genesis 1-3." *BI* 14/4 (2006): 309-331.

Boer, Roland. *Political Myth: On the Use and Abuse of Biblical Themes*. New Slant. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.

Bolle, Kees W. "Myth." *ER* 10: 261-273.

Bonhême, Marie-Ange. "Kingship." Translated by Elizabeth Schwaiger. *OEAE*. 2: 238-245.

Booij, Th. "Psalm 144: Hope of Davidic Welfare." *VT* 59/2 (2009): 173-180.

Bosworth, David A. "Evaluating David: Old Problems and Recent Scholarship." *CBQ* 68/2 (2006): 191-210.

Botterweck, G. J. and Helmer Ringgren, eds. "ידע." *TDOT* 5: 448-481.

Bowling, Andrew. "טוב." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament 1:345-6.

Bratcher, Dennis R. "Looking at Ourselves: The 'Fall' in a Wesleyan Model." In *Biblical Resources for Holiness Preaching: From Text to Sermon*, Volume 2. Edited by H. Ray Dunning, 317-332. Kansas City, MO.: Beacon Hill Press, 1993.

Brenner, Athalya. "The Tree of Life as a Female Symbol?" In *Genesis*. Edited by Athalya Brenner, Archie Ch-Chun Lee, and Gale A. Yee, 35-42. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.

Brenner, Athalya. The Intercourse of Knowledge: On Gendering Desire and 'Sexuality' in the Hebrew Bible. BIS 26. Leiden, 1997.

Brenner, Athalya. The Israelite Woman: Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative. BS. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Brensinger, Terry L. "חיה." *NIDOTTE* 2:108-113.

Brett, Mark G. *Genesis: Procreation and the Politics of Identity*. OTR. London: Routledge, 2005.

Brett, Mark G. "Nationalism and the Hebrew Bible." In *The Bible in Ethics: The Second Sheffield Colloquium*. Edited by John W. Rogerson, Margaret Davies and M. Daniel Carroll R., 136-163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

Brettler, Marc Z. "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Samuel." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin, 71-90. Bethesda, MD.: University Press of Maryland, 1996.

Brettler, Marc Z. "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics." *JBL* 108 (1989): 395-418.

Brettler, Marc Z. "King, Kingship." *NIDB* 3:505-512.

Brettler, Marc Z. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 1-2." *JBL* 116/4 (1997): 601-612.

Brettler, Marc. Z. "The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT* 49 (1991): 87-97.

Briffard, Colette. "Moïse versus Sargon." *VT* 60 (2010): 479-482.

Brisch, Nicole. Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond. OIS 4. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2008.

Brodie, Thomas L. Genesis as Dialogue : A Literary, Historical, & Theological Commentary. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Brooke, G. J. "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Pesher." *DSD* 17 (2010): 361-386.

Brown, Brian. "Kingship and Ancestral Cult in the Northwest Palace at Nimrud." *JANER* 10/1 (2012): 1-53.

Brown, Jeannine K. "Genre Criticism and the Bible." In *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory*. Edited by David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant, 111-150. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Brown, William P. "The Didactic Power of Metaphor in the Aphoristic Sayings of Proverbs." *JSOT* 29/2 (2004):133-154.

Broyles, Craig C. *Psalms*. NIBC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

Brueggemann, Walter. "David and His Theologian." *CBQ* 30 (1968): 156-181.

Brueggemann, Walter. *David and His Theologian: Literary, Social, and Theological Investigation of the Early Monarchy*. Edited by K. C. Hanson. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Faith in the Empire." In *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*. Edited by Richard A. Horsley, 25-40. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Brueggemann, Walter. *1 & 2 Kings*. S & H BC. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2000.

Brueggemann, Walter. *First and Second Samuel*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990.

Brueggemann, Walter. "From Dust to Kingship." *ZAW* 84 (1972): 1-18.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Kingship and Chaos (A Study in Tenth Century Theology)." *CBQ* 33 (1971): 317-332.

Brueggemann, Walter. The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith. OBT 1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Life and Death in Tenth Century Israel." *JAAR* 40 (1972): 96-109.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone." *CBQ* 32 (1970): 532-542.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Solomon: Israel's Ironic Icon of Human Achievement*. Columbia, South Carolina, 2003.

Brueggemann, Walter. Texts under Negotiation: The Bible and Postmodern Imagination. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Brueggemann, Walter. "The Tribes of Yahweh: An Essay Review." *JAAR* 48 (1980): 441-451.

Brueggemann, Walter. "The Trusted Creature." *CBQ* 31 (1969): 484-498. [Cf. also Brueggemann, Walter. *David and His Theologian: Literary, Social, and Theological Investigation of the Early Monarchy*. Edited by K. C. Hanson, 46-62. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011.]

Buber, Martin. *Good and Evil*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952,1953.

Buccellati, Giorgio. "Adapa, Genesis, and the Notion of Faith." *UF* 5 (1973): 61-66.

Buchanan, George Wesley. "The Old Testament Meaning of the Knowledge of Good and Evil." *JBL*75 (1956): 114-120.

Budde, Karl. Die biblische Urgeschichte (Gen 1-12, 5) untersucht. Glessen: J. Ricker, 1883.

Budde, Karl. "Zu H. Th. Obbinks Aufsatz, 'The Tree of Life in Eden.'" *ZAW* 47 (1929): 54-62.

Burge, Gary M. "Life." *NIDB* 3: 655-661.

Burns, E. "Dream Form in Genesis 2.4b-3:24: Asleep in the Garden." *JSOT* 37 (1987): 3-14.

Butler, Judith, John Guillory, and Kendall Thomas. *What's Left of Theory? New Work on the Politics of Literary Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Callender, Dexter E. Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Callender, Dexter E., Jr. "The Primal Human in Ezekiel and the Image of God." In *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. SBL Symposium 9. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 175-193. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Calvin, John. *A Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by John King. London: Banner of Truth, 1847. Originally, published in Latin (1554).

Camp, Claudia V. "The Wise Women of 2 Samuel: A Role Model for Women in Early Israel?" *CBQ* 43 (1981): 14-29.

Camp, Claudia V. "What's So Strange About the Strange Woman?" *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by D. Jobling, 17-31. Cleveland: Pilgrim, 1991.

Camp, Claudia V. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Decatur: Almond Press, 1985.

Camp, Claudia V. "The Female Sage in Ancient Israel and in the Biblical Wisdom Literature." In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue, 185-204. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Camp, Claudia. "2 Sam 14:1-20: Wise Woman of Tekoa." In Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament. Edited by Carol Myers, 263-264. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.

Camp, Phillip G. "David's Fall: Reading 2 Samuel 11-14 in Light of Genesis 2-3." *RQ* 53/3 (2011): 149-158.

Campbell, Antony F. *2 Samuel*. FOTL 8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Campbell, Antony F. and Mark A. O'Brien. *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Carmichael, Calum. "The Giving of the Decalogue and the Garden of Eden." In Thinking Towards New Horizons: Collected Communications to the XIXth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Ljubljana 2007. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 55. Edited by Matthias Augustin and Hermann Michael Niemann, 21-234. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007.

Carr, David M. "The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential." In *Congress Volume Helsinki*. VTSup 148. Edited by Martti Nissinen, 505-535. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Carr, David M. *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Carr, David. "The Politics of Textual Subversion: A Diachronic Perspective on the Garden of Eden Story." *JBL*112/4 (1993): 577-595.

Carson, Richard F. and Tremper Longman III. *Science, Creation and the Bible: Reconciling Rival Theories of Origins*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2010.

Cassuto, Umberto. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis: Part I: From Adam to Noah. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1944.

Catanzaro, C. J. "A Literary Analysis of Genesis I-XI." Ph.D dissertation, University of Toronto, 1957.

Chan, Michael. "Rhetorical Reversal and Usurpation: Isaiah 10:5-34 and the Use of Neo-Assyrian Royal Idiom in the Construction of an Anti-Assyrian Theology." *JBL* 128/4 (2009): 717-733.

Chevel, Simeon. "Compositry and Creativity in 2 Samuel 21:1-14." *JBL* 122/1 (2003): 23-52.

Childs, Brevard S. "The Etiological Tale Re-Examined." *VT* 24 (1974): 387-397.

Childs, Brevard S. "Tree of Knowledge, Tree of Life." *IDB* 4:695-697.

Childs, Brevard S. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*, 2nd edition. SBT. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Claassens, L. Juliana. "Biblical Theology as Dialogue: Continuing the Conversation on Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Theology." *JBL*122/1 (2003): 127-144.

Clark, W. Malcolm. "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2-3." *JBL* 88 (1969): 266-278.

Clayton, Peter A. Chronicle of the Pharaohs: The Reign-By-Reign Record of the Rulers and Dynasties of Ancient Egypt. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.

Clemens, David M. "The Law of sin and death: Ecclesiastes and Genesis 1-3." *Themelios* 19 (1994): 5-8.

Clements, Ronald E. "Psalm 72 and Isaiah 40-66: A Study in Tradition." *PRS* 28/4 (2001): 333-341.

Clements, Ronald E. *Wisdom in Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*. CBQBS 26. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994.

Clines, David J. A. "אדם, The Hebrew for 'Human, Humanity': A Response to James Barr." *VT* 53 (2003): 297-310.

Clines, D.J.A. "Possibilities and Priorities of Biblical Interpretation in an International Perspective." *BI* 1 (1993): 67-87.

Clines, David J. A. "Theme in Genesis 1-11. In *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11.* Edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, 285-309. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Clines, David J. A. *The Theme of the Pentateuch.* JSOTSup 10. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.

Clines, David J.A. "The Tree of Knowledge and the Law of Yahweh." *VT* 24/1 (1974): 8-14.

Clines, David J.A. *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament.* JSOTSup 94. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, 25-48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Coats, George W. "The God of Death: Power and Obedience in the Primeval History." *Interpretation* 29/3 (1975): 227-39.

Coats, George W. *Genesis, with an Introduction to Narrative Literature.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Cogan, Morton. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* SBLMS 19. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. and Edward L. Greenstein. *The State of Jewish Studies.* Detroit: Wayne State University, 1990.

Cohn, Robert L. "Narrative Structure and Canonical Perspective in Genesis." *JSOT* 25 (1983): 3-16.

Collins, C. J. "What Happened to Adam and Eve? A Literary-Theological Approach to Genesis 3." *Presbyterion* 27/1 (2001): 12-44.

Collins, C. John. *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary.* Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P & R Publishing, 2006.

Collins, John J. "Before the Fall: The Earliest Interpretations of Adam and Eve." In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, 293-308. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Coogan, Michael D. "In the Beginning." In *The Oxford History of the Biblical World.* Edited by Michael D. Coogan, 2-31. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Cooper, Alan. "'The Lord Grants Wisdom': The World View of Proverbs 1-9." In *Bringing the Hidden to Light: the Process of Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Stephen A. Geller.* Edited by Kathryn F. Kravitz and Diane M. Sharon, 29-43. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Cooper, Jerrold S. "Divine Mesopotamia: A Fleeting Phenomenon." In *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond.* OIS 4. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2008.

Cooper, Jerrold S. "Genre, Gender, and the Sumerian Lamentation." *JCS* 58 (2006): 39-47.

Cooper, Jerrold. S. "Assyrian Prophecies, the Assyrian Tree, and the Mesopotamian Origins of Jewish Monotheism, Greek Philosophy, Christian Theology, Gnosticism, and Much More." *JAOS* 120/3 (2000): 430-444.

Coppens, J. "L'Ideologie Royale Ougaritique." In *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae: Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl.* Edited by M. A. Beek, A. A. Kampman, C. Nijland, and J. Ryckmans, 81-89. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Cornelius, Izak. "בֵּן." *NIDOTTE* 1: 875-878.

Cornelius, Izak. "Paradise Motifs in the 'Eschatology' of the Minor Prophets and the Iconography of the Ancient Near East. The Concepts of Fertility, Water, Trees and 'Tierfrieden' and Gen 2-3." *JNSL* 14 (1988): 41-83.

Cosser, William. "The Meaning of 'Life' (Hayyim) in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes." *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions* 15 (1953-54): 48-53.

Craig, Kenneth M. "Misspeaking in Eden, or, Fielding Questions in the Garden (Genesis 2:16-3:13)." *PRS* 27/3 (2000): 235-47.

Craig, Kenneth M. "Questions Outside Eden (Genesis 4.1-16): Yahweh, Cain and Their Rhetorical Interchange." *JSOT* 86 (1999): 107-128.

Craig, Kenneth M. Asking for Rhetoric: The Hebrew Bible's Protean Interrogative. BIS 73. Boston: Brill, 2005.

Creach, Jerome F. D. "Like a Tree Planted by the Temple Steam: The Portrait of the Righteous in Psalm 1:3." *CBQ* 61/1 (1999): 34-46.

Creach, Jerome F. D. "The Mortality of the King." In *Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.* Edited by John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell, 237-249. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Crenshaw, James L. "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature." *JBL*88 (1969): 129-142.

Crewe, Jonathan. "Can a Polemic be Ethical? A Response to Michel Foucault." In *Polemic: Critical or Uncritical.* Edited by Jane Gallop, 135-152. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Text Behind the Text of the Hebrew Bible." In *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review.* Edited by Hershel Shanks, 139-155. New York: Random House, 1992.

Crossan, John Dominic. "Felix Culpa and Foenix Culprit: Comments of 'Direct and Third Person Discourse in the Narrative of the Fall' by Hugh C. White." Semeia 18 (1990): 107-111.

Crouch, C. L. "Ezekiel's Oracles against the Nations in Light of a Royal Ideology of Warfare." ANEM. JBL 130/3 (2011): 481.

Crouch, C. L. Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion. ANEM. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Crouch, C. L. "חטאת as Interpolative Gloss. A Solution to Gen 4,7." *ZAW* 123 (2011): 250-258.

Crouch, C. L. War and Ethics in the Ancient Near East Military Violence in Light of Cosmology and History. BZAW 407. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

Culler, Jonathan. "Presupposition and Intertextuality." In The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction, 100-118. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Currid, John D. Against the Gods: The Polemical Theology of the Old Testament. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2013.

Daemmrich, Ingrid G. *Enigmatic Bliss: the Paradise Motif in Literature.* New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Dafni, Evangelia G. "Zum extensionalen und intentionalen Gehalt der Aussage: נפשך אם־אעזבך חי־יהוה וחי־ (2 Könige 2,2ff.)." In *Schriftprophetie. Festschrift für Jörg Jeremias zum 65. Geburtstag.* Edited by Friedhelm Hartenstein, Jutta Krispenz, and Aaron Schart, 37-54. Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2004.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology.* SPIB 113. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms 1-50.* AB 17. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1965.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms 51-100.* AB 17. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1968.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms 101-150.* AB 17. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1970.

Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others.* Translated and with an introduction and notes by Stephanie Dalley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Damrosch, David. The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Literature. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Davenport, Tracy. "An Anti-Imperialist Twist to 'The Gilgameš Epic'." In Gilgameš and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Madelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21-23 July 2004. ANESSup 21. Edited by Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks, 1-23. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Davies, G. I. *Hosea.* NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Davis, Ellen F. "Scriptural Texts: Two Psalms." In *Justice and Rights: Christian and Muslim Perspectives.* Edited by Michael Ipgrave. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2009.

Davis, Ellen F. "Critical Traditioning: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic." *Anglican Theological Review* 82/44 (2000): 733-51.

Day, John, Robert P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson. *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J.A. Emerton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Day, John. *From Creation to Babel" Studies in Genesis 1-11*. LHB/OTS 592. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

De Boer, P. A. H. "Vive le Roi!" *VT* 5/3 (1955): 225-231.

De Bruyn, Frans. "Genre Criticism." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory : Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Edited by Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993, 79-85.

De Claissé-Walford, Nancy. "Tree of Knowledge, Tree of Life." *NIBD* 5:659-661.

De Savignac J. "Theologie Pharaonique et Messianisme D'Israel." *VT* 7/1 (1957): 82-90.

De Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1-12*, LHB/OTS 516. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Volume 1: Social Institutions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Dearman, J. Andrew. *The Book of Hosea*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Deist, Ferdinand. "Genesis 1-11, Oppression and Liberation." *JTSA* 73 (1990): 3-10.

Delitzsch, Franz. *Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon*, volume 1. Translated by M. G. Easton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Dell, Katharine J. *The Book of Proverbs in Social and Theological Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Dickson, Keith. "Enki and Ninhursag: The Trickster in Paradise." *JNES* 66/1 (2007): 1-32.

Dickson, Keith. "Looking at the Other in *Gilgamesh*." *JAOS* 127/2 (2007): 171-182.

Dickson, Keith. "The Wall of Uruk: Iconicities in *Gilgamesh*." *JANER* 9/1 (2009): 25-50.

Dietrich, Walter. *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* Translated by Joachim Vette. Atlanta: SBL, 2007.

Diller, Carmen. "'Er soll leben, solange die Sonne bleibt' (Ps 72,5): Die Räumlichen und zeitlichen Deminsionen der Königsherrschaft in Psalm 72." In *Studien zu Psalmen und Propheten: Festschrift für Hebert Irsigler*. Edited by Carmen Diller, Martin Mulzer, Kristinn Ólason and Ralf Rothenbusch. Freiburg: Herder, 2010.

Dobbs-Alsopp, F.W. *Lamentations*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2003.

Dozeman, Thomas B. "Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character." *JBL*108/2 (1989): 207-23.

Dragga, Sam. "Genesis 2-3: A Story of Liberation." *JSOT* 55 (1992): 3-13.

Duff, David, editor. *Modern Genre Theory*. LCR. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

Duncker, Christina. Der andere Salomo: Eine sychrone Untersuchiung zur Ironie in der Salomo-Kompostiion 1 Könige 1-11. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008.

Dutcher-Walls, Patricia. "The Circumscription of the King: Deuteronomy 17:16-17 in its Ancient Social Context." *JBL* 121/4 (2002): 601-616.

Dutcher-Walls, Patricia. *Narrative Art, Political Rhetoric: The Case of Athaliah and Joash*. JSOTSup 209. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Dyck, Jonathan E. "A Map of Ideology for Biblical Critics." In *Rethinking Contexts, Reading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*. JSOTSup 299. Edited by M. Daniel Carroll R., 108-128. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Eagleton, Terry. "Aesthetics and Politics." In *Between Ethics and Aesthetics: Crossing the Boundaries*. Edited by Dorota Gowacka and Stephen Boos. Albany: State University Press, 2002.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.

Eaton, J. H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. SBT, second series 32. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, [1976?].

Edelman, Diana. "The Iconography of Wisdom." In *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Edited by Yairah Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and Oded Lipschits, 149-153. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Edenburg, Cynthia. "From Eden to Babylon: Reading Genesis 2-4 as a Paradigmatic Narrative." In *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid, 155-167. SBLAIL 8. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

Edenburg, Cynthia. "Intertextuality, Literary Competence and the Question of Readership: Some Preliminary Observations." *JSOT* 35/2 (2010): 131-148.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph. Editors. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 2nd edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1966-1977.

Emerson, Caryl. "Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory : Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Edited by Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993, 242-244.

Emerton , J. A. "The Date of the Yahwist." In *In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day, 107-129. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Emmrich, Martin. "The Temptation Narrative of Genesis 3:1-6: A Prelude to the Pentateuch and the History of Israel." *EQ* 73 (2001): 3-20.

Engnell, I. " 'Knowledge' and 'Life' in the Creation Story." *Supplement to VT* 3 (1955): 103-119.

Enns, Peter. The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn't Say about Human Origins. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2012.

Eslinger, Lyle. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category." *VT* 42/1 (1992): 47-58.

Eslinger, Lyle. "The Enigmatic Plurals Like 'One of Us' (Genesis I 26, III 22, and XI 7) in Hyperchronic Perspective." *VT* 56/2: 171-184.

Eslinger, Lyle. "Viewpoints and Points of View in 1 Samuel 8-12." *JSOT* 26 (1983): 61-76.

Eslinger, Lyle. *Into the Hands of the Living God.* JSOTSup 54. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989.

Evers, John D. *Myth and Narrative: Structure and Meaning in Some Ancient Near Eastern Texts.* AOAT 241. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1995.

Falkenstein, A. and W. von Soden. *Sumerische und Akkadische Hymnen und Gebete.* Zürich: Artemis Verlags, 1953.

Fauth, W. "Der Königliche Gärtner und Jäger im Paradeisos. Beobachtungen zur Rolle des Herrschers in vorderasiatischen Horticultur." *Persica* 8 (1979): 1-53.

Feldman, Louis H. "The Concept of Exile in Josephus." In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* Edited by James M. Scott, 145-172. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Fewell, Danna Nolan. "Introduction: Writing, Reading, and Relating." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible.* Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell, 11-20. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Fields, Lee M. "Proverbs 11:30: Soul-Winning or Wise Living?" *JETS* 50/3 (2007): 517-535.

Finkelstein, Jacob J. "The Study of Man: Bible and Babel: A Comparative Study of the Hebrew and Babylonian Religious Spirit." *Commentary* 26 (1958): 431-444.

Firth, David G. *1 & 2 Samuel.* AOT 8. Nottingham: Apollos, 2009.

Fisch, Harold. "Ruth and the Structure of Covenant History." *VT* 32 (1982): 425-437.

Fishbane, Michael. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: the History of Its Interpretation.* Edited by Magne Saebø. Volume 1, part 1: Antiquity, 33-48. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Fishbane, Michael. "The Old Testament and Exegetical Tradition." In *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel.* Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 15-30. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998.

Fishbane, Michael. "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis." *JBL* 99/3 (1980): 343-361.

Fishbane, Michael. "Types of Biblical Intertextuality." In *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*. Edited by A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø, 39-44. Leiden – Boston – Köln: E. J. Brill, 2000.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fishbane, Michael. *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Fisher, Loren R. *Genesis, A Royal Epic: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Second edition. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2011.

Fokkelman, J. P. *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*. 4 volumes. SSN 20, 23, 27, 31. Assen, Netherlands: 1981-1993.

Fokkelman, J.P. Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, Assen, 1975.

Forman, Charles C. "Koheleth's Use of Genesis." *JSS 5 (1960): 256-263.*

Forti, Tova. "The Polarity of Wisdom and Fear of God in the Eden Narrative and in the Book of Proverbs." *BN/NF* 149 (2011): 45-57.

Foster, Benjamin R. "The Adapa Story (1.129)." In *CS* 1:449.

Foster, Benjamin R. Review of Adapa and the South Wind: Language Has the Power of Life and Death. JAOS 122/4 (2002): 865-866.

Foster, Benjamin. "Gilgamesh: Sex, Love and the Ascent of Knowledge." In *Gilgamesh: A Reader*. Edited by John Maier, 63-78. Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1997.

Foster, Benjamin. "*The Hymn to Aten*: Akenaten Worships the Sole God." *CANE* 3: 1751-1761.

Fox, Michael V. "The Epistemology of the Book of Proverbs." *JBL* 126/4 (2007): 669-684.

Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Franke, Sabina. "Kings of Akkad: Sargon and Naram-Sin." *CANE* 2: 831-841.

Frankfort, Henri. Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Frayne, Douglas. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Early Periods / 4: Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Fredericks, D. C. "נְשָׁמָה." *NIDOTTE* 3: 190.

Freedman, David Noel. Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980.

Fretheim, Terence E. "Creator, Creature, and Co-Creation in Genesis 1-2." In *All Things New: Essays in Honor of Roy A. Harrisville*. Edited by Arland J. Hultgren, Donald H. Juel, and Jack D. Kingsbury, 11-20. St. Paul: Word & World, Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, 1992.

Fretheim, Terence E. *1 & 2 Kings*. WBC. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

Fretheim, Terence E. Creation, Fall, and Flood; Studies in Genesis 1-11. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969.

Fretheim, Terence E. *Genesis*. New Interpreter's Bible, volume 1. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994, 319-674.

Fretheim, Terence E. "ידע." In *NIDOTTE*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997. 409-414.

Fretheim, Terence E. "Is Genesis 3 a Fall Story?" *Word and World* 14.2 (1994): 144-53.

Fretheim, Terence E. "שכל." In *NIDOTTE*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997: 3:1243.

Friedman, Richard Elliott. The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works, Harvard Semitic Monographs. Chico, CA.: Scholars Press, 1981.

Frisch, Amos. "Structure and Its Significance: The Narrative of Solomon's Reign (1 Kings 1-12:24)." *JSOT*51 (1991): 3-14.

Fritz, Volkmar. *1 & 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Anselm Hagedorn. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003, 182.

Frolov, Serge. "Succession Narrative: A "Document" or a Phantom?" *JBL* 121/1 (2002): 81-104.

Frow, John. *Genre*. NCI. London: Routledge, 2006.

Frymer-Kensky, T. "The Atrahasis Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Gen 1-9." *Biblical Archaeologist* 40 (1977): 147-55.

Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. "The Sage in the Pentateuch: Soundings." In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue, 275-287. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Galambush, Julie. "*ādām* from *adāmā*, *iššā* from *îš*: Derivation and Subordination in Genesis 2.4b-3.24." In *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes*. JSOTSup 173. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, William P. Brown and Jeffrey K. Kuan, 33-46. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Gallop, Jane. *Polemic: Critical or Uncritical*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Gardner, A. "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" *SJT* 43 (1990): 1-18.

Gardner, Anne. "The Way to Eternal Life in Dan 12:1e-2 or How to Reverse the Death Curse of Genesis 3." *ABR* 40 (1992): 1-19.

Geertz,Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gehrke, Ralph D. "Genesis Three in the Light of Key Hermeneutical Considerations." *CTM* 36 (1965): 534-60.

Geller, Stephen A. Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible. London: Routledge, 1996.

Genge, H. "Zum »Lebesbaum« in den Keilschriftkulturen." *AO* 33 (1971): 321-334.

George, A.R. The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts, Volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

George, A.R. The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts, Volume 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Gerleman, G. "חיה." *TLOT* 1:411-417.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations*. FOTL 15. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Gertz, Jan Christian. "The Formation of the Primeval History." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 107-135. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Gertz, Jan Christian. "Von Adam zu Enosch." In *Gott und Mesch im Dialog: Festschrift für Otrto Kaiswer zum 80. Geburtsag*. Edited by Markus Witte, 215-236. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Gese, H. "Der bewachte Lebensbaum und die Heroen: zwei mytholigische Ergänzungen zur Urgeschchte der Quelle J." In *Wort und Geschichte: Festschrift fürKarl Elligerzum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Gese, H. P. Rüger, 77-85. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 18. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukerchener Verlag, 1973. Reprinted in *Vom Sinai zum Zion: Alttestamentlich Beiträge zur biblishen Theologie*, 99-112. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, 64. Munich: Kaiser, 1974.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Second edition. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Giorgetti, Andrew. "The 'Mock Building Account' of Genesis 11:1-9: Polemic against Mesopotamian Royal Ideology." *VT* 64 (2014): 1-20.

Giovino, Mariana. *The Assyrian Sacred Tree: A History of Interpretations*. OBO. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2007.

Gitay, Yehoshua. "On the Foundation of Human Partnership and the Faculty of Speech: A Thematic and Rhetorical Study of Genesis 2-3." *OTE* 20/3 (2007): 689-702.

Glassner, Jean-Jacques. "À propos des jardins mésopotamiens." In *Jardins d'Orient*. RO 3. Edited by Groupe pour l'etude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient. Paris: Groupe pour l'etude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient, 1991.

Gmirkin, Russell. Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.

Gnuse, Robert K. "A Process Theological Interpretation of the Primeval History in Genesis 2-11." *HBT* 29/1 (2002): 23-41.

Gnuse, Robert K. "An Overlooked Message: The Critique of Kings and Affirmation of Equality in the Primeval History." *BTB* 36/4 (2006): 146-154.

Goitein, S.D. "Women as Creators of Biblical Genres." *Proof* 8/1 (1988): 1-33.

Goldingay, John. *Isaiah.* NIBC. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.

Goldingay, John. *Psalms, Volume 2: Psalms 42-89.* BCOT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Golka, Friedemann W. The Leopard's Spots: Biblical and African Wisdom in Proverbs. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.

Good, Edwin M. *Irony in the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

Gordis, Robert. "The Significance of the Paradise Myth." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 52 (1936): 86-94.

Gordis, Robert. "The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls." *JBL* 76 (1957):123-138.

Gordon, Robert P. "The Ethics of Eden: Truth-Telling in Genesis 2-3." In *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue.* Edited by Katharine J. Dell, 11-33. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

Gordon, Robert P. *1 & 2 Samuel: A Commentary.* Exeter, Devon: Paternoster Press, 1986.

Gordon, Robert P. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon*, Society for Old Testament Study Monographs. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2006.

Görg, M. "Weisheit als Provokation: Religionsgeschichtliche und theolgische Aspekte der Südenfallerzählung." In *Die Kraft der Hoffnung. Fs J. Schreiner.* Edited by A. E. Hierhold, *et al.* Bamberg : St. Otto, 1986, 19-34.

Gosse, Bernard. "L' écriture de Gn 3, le serpent dualité de la femme et de l'homme." *BN* 98 (1999): 19-20.

Gosse, Bernard. "L'inclusion de l'ensemble Genèse-II Rois, entre la perte du jardin d'Eden et celle de Jérusalem. " *ZAW* 114/2 (2002): 189-211.

Gottwald, Norman K. "Early Israel as an Anti-Imperial Community." In *In the Shadow of Empire Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance.* Edited by Richard A. Horsley, 9-24. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Gottwald, Norman K. "Kingship in the Book of Psalms." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*. Edited by William P. Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Gottwald, Norman K. *The Politics of Ancient Israel*. LAI. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Gowan, Donald E. *From Eden to Babel: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1-11*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Grant, Jamie A. The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy's Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms. AcBib 17. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.

Gray, John. "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice." *VT* 2 (1952/3): 193-220.

Gray, John. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. 2nd fully revised edition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

Gray, John. The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra: A Social Myth of Ancient Canaan. Leiden: Brill, 1955.

Green, Douglas J. "I Undertook Great Works": The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions. FAT, 2nd series 41. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Greenstein, Ed. "The Formation of the Biblical Narrative Corpus." *AJS Review* 15 (1990): 151-178.

Greenwood, Kyle R. "When ʾĀdām Became a Man." Annual Meeting of the 2013 Society of Biblical Literature. Baltimore, Maryland, November 25, 2013

Grottanelli, Cristiano. "Kingship in the Ancient Mediterranean World." *ER* 8:317-322.

Grottanelli, Cristiano. "Kingship: An Overview." *ER* 8: 312-317.

Grottanelli, Cristiano. Kings & Prophets : Monarchic Power, Inspired Leadership, & Sacred Text in Biblical Narrative. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Guillaume, Ph. "The Demise of Lady Wisdom and of *Homo Sapiens*: An Unwise Reading of Genesis 2 and 3 in Light of Job and Proverbs." *Theological Review* 25/2 (2004): 20-38.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. MLBS. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Gunn, David M. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. JSOTSup 6. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.

Guttirrez, Miguel. "'L'homme créé à l'image de Dieu' dans l'ensemble littéraire et canonique Genése, chapitres 1-11." Ph.D. dissertation. Strassbourg: University of Strassbourg, 1993.

Hackett, J. A. "'There Was No King in Israel': The Era of the Judges." In *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, 177-218. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hallo, William W. "Adapa Reconsidered: Life and Death in Contextual Perspective." *Scriptura* 87 (2004): 267-277.

Hallo, William W. "Assyriology and the Canon." *American Scholar* 59/1 (1990): 105-108.

Hallo, William W. "Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Literatures: A General Introduction." In *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*. Edited by David S. Vanderhooft and Abraham Winitzer, 151-163. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Hallo, William W. "Compare and Contrast: The Contextual Approach to Biblical Literature." In *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature*, Scripture in Context III, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies. Edited by William W. Hallo, Bruce William Jones, and Gerald L. Mattingly, 1-30. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Halpern, Baruch. *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel*. HSM 25. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1981.

Halpern, Baruch. David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Halton, Charles. "Allusions to the Stream of Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Oracles." *ANES* 46 (2009): 50-61.

Hamilton, Mark W. "At Whose Table? Stories of Elites and Social Climbers in 1-2 Samuel." *VT* 59 (2009): 513-532.

Hamilton, Mark W. "Isaiah 32 as Literature and Political Meditation." *JBL* 131/4 (2012): 663-684.

Hamilton, Mark W. "Prosperity and Kingship in Psalms and Inscriptions." In *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*. Edited by David S. Vanderhooft and Abraham Winitzer,185-205. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Hamilton, Mark W. Review of Reinhard Müller, Königtum und Gottesherrschaft:Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik. JSOT 29/5 (2005): 150-151.

Hamilton, Victor P. *Handbook on the Historical Books*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*. The NICCOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50*. The NICCOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Handy, L.K. "Solomon." *DOTHB*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson, 921-929. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005.

Hanson Richard S., *The Serpent Was Wiser: A New Look at Genesis 1-11.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

Hanson, K. C. "When the King Crosses the Line: Royal Deviance and Restitution in Levantine Ideologies." *BTB* 26/1 (1996): 11-25.

Haraguchi, Takaaki. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Deuteronomy 29-30." *AJT* 51/1 (2001): 24-37.

Harman, Allan. "Particles." *NIDOTTE* 4: 1028-1042.

Hartley, John E. *Genesis.* NICOT. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

Hartman, Louis F. "Sin in Paradise." *CBQ* 20 (1958): 26-40.

Harvey, John E. Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology." *EQ* 46 (1974): 81-102.

Hatton, Peter T. H. *Contradiction in the Book of Proverbs: The Deep Waters of Counsel.* Society for Old Testament Study Monographs. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2010.

Hauser, Alan J. *From Carmel to Horeb: Elijah in Crisis.* JSOTSup 85. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990.

Hauser, Alan Jon. "Genesis 2-3: The Theme of Intimacy and Alienation." In *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature.* JSOTSup 19. Edited by David J. A. Clines, David M. Gunn, and Alan J. Hauser, 20-36. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.

Hawass, Zahi. "Khufu." *OEAE* 2: 234.

Hays, J. Daniel. "Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT* 28/2 (2003): 149-174.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hays, Richard B., Stefan Alkier and Leroy A. Huzenga, editors. *Reading the Bible Intertextually.* Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Hazony, Yoram. *The Philosophy of Hebrew Scripture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Healey, John F. "The Immortality of the King: Ugarit and the Psalms." *Or* 53 (1984): 245-254.

Hebel, Udo J., compiler. Intertextuality, Allusion, and Quotation: An International Bibliography of Critical Studies. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Heidel, Alexander. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Heim, K. M. "Kings and Kingship." *DOTHB.* Edited by Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson, 610-623. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005.

Heim, Knut M. "The Perfect King of Psalm 72: An 'Intertextual' Inquiry." In *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, 223-248. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995.

Hendel, Ronald. "Historical Context." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 51-81. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Hendel, Ronald. "The Archaeology of Memory: King Solomon, Chronology, and Biblical Representation," in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel in Honor of William G. Dever*. Edited by Seymour Gitin, J. Edward Wright, and J. P. Dessel, 219-230. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Hepner, Gershon. "Israelites Should Conquer Israel: The Hidden Polemic of the First Creation Narrative." *RB* 113/2 (2006): 161-180.

Hepner, Gershon. *Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel*. Studies in Biblical Literature 78. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

Hepner, Gershon. "Verbal Resonance in the Bible and Intertextuality." *JSOT* 96 (2001): 3-27.

Hertzberg, H. W. "Die Nachgeschichte Alttestamentlicher Texte Innerhalb Des Alten Testaments." *ZAW* 66 (1936): 110-121.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I & II Samuel*. Old Testament Library. Translated by J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*. New York: Farrar Straus & Giroux, 1955.

Hess, Richard S. "Literacy in Iron Age Israel." In *Windows into Old Testament History*." Edited by V. Philips Long, David W. Baker and Gordon J. Wenham, 82-102. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Hess, Richard S. "One Hundred Fifty Years of Comparative Studies on Genesis 1-11: An Overview." In *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. Edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, 362-382. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Hess, Richard S. "Writing about Writing: Abecedaries and Evidence for Literacy in Ancient Israel." *VT* 56/3 (2006): 342-346.

Hettema, T.L. and A. van der Keeij. "Introduction." In Religious Polemics in Context: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR) Held at Leiden, 27-28 April 2000. Edited by T.L. Hettema and A. van der Kooij, xi-xxv. Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004.

Hillers, Delbert R. "Dust: Some Aspects of Old Testament Imagery." In *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*. Edited by John H. Marks and Robert M. Good, 105-109. Guilford, Connecticut: Four Quarters Publishing Company, 1987.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Lamentations*. Second Edition. AB 7A. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Hoffmeier, James K. "Some Thoughts on Genesis 1 & 2 and Egyptian Cosmology." *JANESCU* 15 (1983): 39-49.

Hoftijzer, J. "David and the Tekoite Woman." *VT* 20 (1970): 419-444.

Hoftijzer, Jacob. "Holistic or Compositional Approach? Linguistic Remarks to the Problem." In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 98-114. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Holladay, John S. "Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy: An Explicitly Archaeological Approach." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1981.

Holter, Knut. "The Serpent in Eden as a Symbol of Israel's Political Enemies: Yahwistic Criticism of the Solomonic Foreign Policy?" *SJOT* 4/1 (1990): 106-12.

Honeyman, A.M. "*Merismus* in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL*71/1 (1952): 11-18.

Hooke, S. H., editor. Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Psalms 2: A Commentary*. Hermencia. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Psalms 3: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

Houston, Walter J. "Sex or Violence? Thinking Again with Genesis about Fall and Original Sin." In *Genesis and Christian Theology*. Edited by Nathan MacDonald, Mark W. Elliott and Gran Macaskill, 140-151. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Houston, Walter J. Contending for Justice: Ideologies and Theologies of Social Justice in the Old Testament. LHB/OTS 428. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Houston, Walter. "The King's Preferential Option for the Poor: Rhetoric, Ideology and Ethics in Psalm 72." *BibInt* 7/4 (1999): 341-367.

Höver-Johag, I. "טוב." *TDOT*. Vol. V. Trans. David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Howard, David M. "The Case for Kingship in the Old Testament Narrative Books and the Psalms." *TrinJ* New Series 9 (1988): 19-35.

Howard-Brook, Wes. "Come Out, My People!": God's Call out of Empire in the Bible and Beyond. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2010.

Humphreys, W. Lee. *The Tragic Vision and the Hebrew Tradition*. OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Hurowitz, Victor Avigdor. "Paradise Regained: Proverbs 3:13-20 Reconsidered." In Sefer Moshe: the Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism. Edited by Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul, 49-62. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Hurowitz, Victor Avigdor. "The Divinity of Humankind in the Bible and the Ancient Near East: A New Mesopotamian Parallel." In *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*. Edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael J. Williams, 263-274. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Hurvitz, Avi. "Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts." *HA* 14 (1973): 74-79.

Hurvitz, Avi. "The Recent Debate on Late biblical Hebrew: Solid Data, Experts' Opinions, and Inconclusive Arguments." *HS* 47 (2006): 191-210.

Husser, Jean-Marie. "Entre Mythe et Philosophie: La Relecture Sapientielle de Genèse 2-3." *RB* 107/2 (2000): 232-259.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Hutter, M. "Adam als Gärtner und König (Gen 2,8.15)." *BZ* 30 (1986): 259-262.

Hutton, J. M. "Isaiah 51:9-11 and the Rhetorical Appropriation and Subversion of Hostile Theologies." *JBL* 126/2 (2007): 271-303.

Irwin, Brian P. "Not Just Any King: Abimelech, the Northern Monarchy, and the final form of Judges." *JBL* 131/3 (2012): 443-454.

Irwin, W. I. "The Metaphor in Proverbs 11:30." *Bib* 65 (1984): 97-100.

Ishida, Tomoo. The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology. BZAW 142. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.

Izr'el, Shlomo. Adapa and the South Wind: Language Has the Power of Life and Death. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Jacobsen, Thorkild, translator and editor. *The Harps that Once: Sumerian Poetry in Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. "The Eridu Genesis." *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 513-529.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

James, E.O. *The Tree of Life: An Archaeological Study*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.

Jamieson-Drake, D.W. Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Janowski, Bernd. "Die Frucht der Gerechtigkeit: Psalm 72 und die judäische Königsideologie." In *„Mein Sohn bist du" (Ps 2,7) : Studien zu den Königspsalmen.*" SBS 192. Edited by Eckart Otto and Erich Zenger, 94-134. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2002.

Jaroš, Karl. "Die Motive der Heiligen Bäume und der Schlange in Gen 2-3." *ZAW* 92 (1980): 204-215. *TLOT* 3:1102-1103.

Jenni, Ernst. "קֶדֶם, *qedem*, **past times**." *TLOT* 3:1102-1103.

Jenni, Ernst. "עוֹלָם *'olām* **eternity**." *TLOT* 2:852-862.

Jenni, Ernst. "Das Wort 'ōlām im Alten Testament." (Part 1.) *ZAW* 64 (1952): 197-248.

Jenni, Ernst. "Das Wort 'ōlām im Alten Testament." (Part 2 .) *ZAW* 65 (1953): 1-35.

Jenni, Ernst. *Die Präpositionen Beth.* Die hebräischen Präpositionen. Volume 1. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1992.

Jenson, Philip. "Snakes and Ladders: Levels of Biblical Law. In *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament God and Humans in Dialogue.* Edited by Katharine J. Dell, 187-207. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Job, J. B. Review of Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft:Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik.* FAT. Second Series 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Jobling, David . "Myth and Its Limits in Genesis 2.4b-3.24." In *The Sense of Biblical Narratives: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986, 17-43.

Jobling, David. " 'Forced Labor': Solomon's Golden Age and the Question of Literary Representation." *Poststructuralism as Exegesis, c* 54 (1992): 57-76.

Jobling, David. "Deconstruction and the Political Analysis of Biblical Texts: A Jamesonian Reading of Psalm 72." *Semeia* 59 (1992): 95-127.

Jobling, David. "The Value of Solomon's Age for the Biblical Reader." In *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennlium.* Edited by Lowell K. Handy, 470-492. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Joffe, Alexander H. "The Rise of Secondary States in the Iron Age Levant." *JESHO* 45/4 (2002): 425-467.

Johnston, Philip S. *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.

Joines, Karen Randolph. *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament.* Haddonfield: Haddonfield House, 1974.

Jungbluth, Rüdiger. *Im Himmel und auf Erden: Dimensionen von Königsherrschaft im Alten Testament.* BWANT. 10th series, volume 16. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.

Kaiser, Otto. *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*. Translated by John Sturdy. Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1975.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "Wisdom Theology and the Center of Old Testament Theology." *Evangelical Quarterly* 50 (1978): 132-146.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "Inner Biblical Exegesis as a Model for Bridging The 'Then' And 'Now' Gap: Hos 12:1-6." *JETS* 28/1 (1985): 33-46.

Kalimi, Isaac. Early Jewish Exegesis and Theological Controversy: Studies in Scriptures in the Shadow of Internal and External Controversies. Vol. 2 Jewish and Christian Heritage Series. Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2002.

Kalugila, Leonidas. The Wise King: Studies in Royal Wisdom as Divine Revelation in the Old Testament and Its Environment. ConBOT 15. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1980.

Kaminski, Carol M. "Beautiful Women or 'False Judgment'? Interpreting Genesis 6.2 in the Context of the Primaeval History." *JSOT* 32/4 (2008): 457-473.

Kaminsky, Joel S. "Paradise Regained: Rabbinic Reflections on Israel at Sinai." In *Jews, Christians, and the Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures*. Edited by Alice Ogden Bellis and Joel S.Kaminsky, 15-43. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Kaminsky, Joel S. "The Theology of Genesis." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 635-656. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Kang, Jung Ju. The Persuasive Portrayal of Solomon in 1 Kings 1-11. EUS/TS 760. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003.

Kapelrud, A. S. "You Shall Surely Not Die." In *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen*, VTSup 50. Edited by André Lemaire and Benedikt Otzen, 50-61. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. "King and Fertility: A Discussion of II Sam 21:1-14." In *God and His Friends in the Old Testament*." [Oslo?]: Universitetsforlaget, 1979.

Kaplan, Jonathan. "Samuel 8:11-18 as 'A Mirror for Princes'." *JBL* 181/4 (2012): 625-642.

Kass, Leon. *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis*. New York: Free Press, 2003.

Kawashima, Robert S. "Comparative Literature and Biblical Studies: The Case of Allusion." *Proof* 27 (2007): 324-344.

Kawashima, Robert S. "*Homo Faber* in J's Primeval History." *ZAW* 116/4 (2004): 483-501.

Kawashima, Robert S. "Literary Analysis." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by

Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 83-104. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Keel, Othmar. Goddesses and Trees, New Moon and Yahweh: Ancient Near Eastern Art and the Hebrew Bible. JSOTSup 261. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Keel, Othmar. The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms. Translated by Timothy J. Hallett. New York: Seabury, 1978.

Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I & II Samuel.* Translated by J. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprinted 1982.

Kempf, Steve. "Who Told the Truth?" *Notes on Translation* 14/1 (2000): 34-46.

Kenik, Helen A. *Design for Kingship: The Deuteronomistic Narrative Technique in 1 Kings 3:4-15.* SBL Dissertation 69. Chico, California: Scholar's Press, 1983.

Kennedy, James M. "Peasants in Revolt: Political Allegory in Genesis 2-3." *JSOT* 47 (1990): 3-14.

Kessler, Martin and Karel Deurloo. *A Commentary on Genesis: The Book of Beginnings.* New York: Paulist, 2004.

Kessler, Rainer. "Gott und König, Grundeigentum und Fruchtbarkeit." *ZAW* 108 (1996): 214-22.

Kidner, Derek. *Genesis : An Introduction and Commentary.* .Chicago: Inter-varsity Press, 1967.

Kikawada, I. M. "Two Notes on Eve." *JBL*91/1 (1972): 33-37.

Kikawada, Isaac M., and Arthur Quinn. *Before Abraham Was: The Unity of Genesis 1-11.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.

Kikwawada, I. M. "The Shape of Genesis 11:1-9." In *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of J. Muilenburg.* Edited by J. J. and M. Kessler Jackson, 18-32. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974.

Kim, Jin-Soo. Bloodguilt, Atonement, and Mercy: An Exegetical and Theological Study of 2 Samuel 21:1-14. European University Studies. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007

Kissling, Paul. *Genesis*, vol. 1. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO.: College Press, 2004.

Klein, Jacob. "A New Look at the 'Oppression of Uruk' Episode in the Gilgameš Epic." In *Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen.* Edited by Tzvi Abusch, 187-201. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Kline, Meredith G. "Because it Had Not Rained," *WTJ* 20 (1957): 146-57.

Kline, Meredith G. "Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

Knapp, Andrew. "David and Hattushili III: The Impact of Genre and a Response to J. Randall Short." *VT* 63/2 (2013): 261-275.

Knight, Douglas A. *Law, Power, and Justice in Ancient Israel.* LAI Louisville: Westminster, 2011

Knoppers, Gary N. "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program." *CBQ* 57/2 (1995):

Knoppers, Gary N. "'There was none like Him': Incomparability in the Books of Kings." *CBQ* 54/3 (1992): 411-432.

Kofoed, Jens Bruun. Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Kooij, Arie van der. "The Story of Paradise in the Light of Mesopotamian Culture and Literature." In *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms: A Festschrift to Honour Professor John Emerton for his Eightieth Birthday.* VTSup 135. Edited by Katharine J. Dell, Graham Davies, and Yee Von Koh, 3-20. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Koptak, Paul E. *Proverbs.* NIVAC. Grand Raids: Zondervan, 2003.

Krasovec, Joze. *Der Merismus.* BO 33.Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.

Krispenz, Jutta. "Wie Viele Bäume Braucht das Paradies? Erwägungen zu Gen II 4b-III 24." *VT* 54 (2004): 301-318.

Kruger, H.A.J. "Genesis 3 Part II: Myth as vehicle for a Polemic against Religion, Ideology and Wisdom." *OTE*14/2 (2001): 214-234.

Kruger, H.A.J. "Myth, ideology, and wisdom: A brief survey." Part I. *OTE*14/1 (2001): 47-75.

Kvanvig, Helge S. *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading.* JSOJSup 149. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

L'Heureux, Conrad E. *In and out of Paradise : The Book of Genesis from Adam and Eve to the Tower of Babel.* New York: Paulist Press, 1983.

Laato, Antti. "Psalm 132 and the Development of the Jerusalemite/Israelite Royal Ideology." *CBQ* 54/1 (1992): 49-

Laato, Antti. "Second Samuel 7 and Ancient Near Eastern Royal Ideology." *CBQ* 59/2 (1997): 244-270.

Laato, Antti. *A Star Is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

LaCocque, André. *The Trial of Innocence: Adam, Eve, and the Yahwist.* Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

Lambert, W. G. "Gilgamesh in Literature and Art." In *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden.* OBO. Edited by Hans Ulrich Steymans, 91-112. Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Lambert, W. G. "Trees, Snakes and Gods in Ancient Syria and Anatolia." *BSOAS* 48/1 (1985): 435-451.

Landy, Francis. *Paradoxes of Paradise: Identity and Difference in the Song of Songs*. Bible and Literature. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.

Landy, Francis. "The Song of Songs and the Garden of Eden." *JBL* 98 (1979): 513-28.

Lanfer, Peter Thacher. *Remembering Eden: The Reception History of Genesis 3:22-24*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Langdon, S. *Babylonian Penitential Psalms to which are added Fragments of the Epic of Creation from Kish in the Weld Collection of the Ashmolean Museum Excavated by the Oxford-Field Museum Expedition*. OECuT 7. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927.

Laniak, Timothy S. *Finding the Lost Images of God: Uncover the Ancient Culture, Discover Hidden Meanings*. AC, AF. [Cf. especially the chapter, "The Divine Monarch and His Regents pages 71-87.] Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Lasine, Stuart. "Everything Belongs to Me: Holiness, Danger, and Divine Kingship in the Post-Genesis World." *JSOT* 35/1 (2010): 31-62.

Lasine, Stuart. "The King of Desire: Indeterminacy, Audience, and the Solomon Narrative." *Semeia* 71 (1995): 85-118.

Lasine, Stuart. *Knowing Kings: Knowledge, Power, and Narcissism in the Hebrew Bible*. Semeia Studies 40. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Layton, Scott C. "Remarks on the Canaanite Origin of Eve." *CBQ* 59 (1997): 22-32.

Leclant, Jean. "Peppy II." *OEAE* 3: 34-35.

Leonard, Jeffery M. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *JBL* 127/2 (2008): 241-265.

Leprohon, Ronald J. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt." In *CANE* 1:273-287. New York: Scribner, 2000.

Leprohon, Ronald J. and Denise M. Doxey. *The Great Name: Ancient Egyptian Royal Titulary*. SBLWAW. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.

Leveen, Adriane. "Reading the Seams." *JSOT* 29/3 (2005): 259-287.

Levinson, Bernard M. "The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah." *VT* 51/4 (2001): 511-534.

Lewis, Brian. *The Sargon Legend: A Study of the Akkadian Text and the Tale of the Hero Who Was Exposed at Birth*. ASORDS 4. Cambridge, MA.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980.

Linville, James. "Rethinking the 'Exilic' Book of Kings." *JSOT* 75 (1997): 21-42.

Liverani, Mario. "Adapa, Guest of the Gods." In *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*. Edited and inroduced by Zainab Bahrani and Marc Van De Mieroop, 3-23. London: Equinox, 2004.

Livingstone, Alasdair. *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea.* SAA 3.11 (pp. 26-27). Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1989.

Loader, James Alfred. "The Primeval Narrative as a Literary Myth." *OTE* 16/2 (2003): 309-321.

Loader, James Alfred. "The Significant Deficiency of Revelation in Wisdom." *OTE* 14/2 (2001): 235-259.

Loader, James Alfred. "Emptied Life—Death as the Reverse of Life in Ancient Israel." *OTE* 18/3 (2005): 681-702.

Longman III, Tremper. "Literature, Interpretation, and Theology." *NIDOTTE* 1: 103-124

Longman III, Tremper. *Proverbs.* BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Longman, Tremper III. *How to Read Genesis.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005.

Lorberbaum, Yair. *Disempowered King: Monarchy in Classical Jewish Literature.* KLJS 9. London: Continuum, 2011.

Lorberbaum, Yair. *Subordinated King: Kingship in Classical Jewish Literature.* Ramat-gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2008. (Hebrew).

Luc, A. "עדם." *NIDOTTE* 3: 538-541.

Lucas, E. C. Review of *Wise King-Royal Fool* by Johnny E. Miles, *JSOT* 29/5 (2005): 77.

Luckenbill, D. D. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia.* 2 volumes. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1926-1927.

Lyke, Larry L. *King David with the Wise Woman of Tekoa: The Resonance of Tradition in Parabolic Narrative.* JSOTSup 255. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997.

Lyon, D. G. *Keilschifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien. (1722-705 v. Chr.).* AB 5. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1977.

Machinist, P. "Literature as Politics: The Tukulti-Ninurta Epic and the Bible." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 455-482.

Machinist, Peter. "Hosea and the Ambiguity of Kingship in Ancient Israel." In *Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.* Edited by John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell, 153-181. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Macrae, Allan A. "עלם." *TDOT*, 2:672-673.

Magonet, J. "The Themes of Genesis 2-3." In *A Walk in the Garden, Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden,* ed. P. Morris and D. Sawyer, 39-46. JSOTSup vol. 136, Sheffield: JSOT Press 1992.

Maier, John, editor. *Gilgamesh: A Reader.* Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1997.

Malamat, Abraham. "Longevity: Biblical Concepts and Some Ancient Near Eastern Parallels." *AfOB* 19 (1982): 215-224. Reprinted in *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues*. CHANE. Leiden: Brill, 2001, 389-400.

Malul, Meir. *Knowledge, Control and Sex: Studies in Biblical Thought, Culture and Worldview*. Tel Aviv-Jaffa:Archaeological Center Publication, 2002.

Marcus, Ralph. "The Tree of Life in Proverbs." *JBL* 62 (1943): 117-120.

Mare, H. W. "King's Garden." *ABD* 4:48.

Marx, Alfred. "Le Yahwiste salominien au regard des sciences sociales." *VT* 62 (2012): 398-415.

Marx. Alfred. "Solomon, our le modèle de l'homme heureux." *VT* 58/3 (2008): 420-423.

Matthews. Victor H. *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. Second edition. New York: Paulist, 1997.

May, H. G. "The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12-19." In *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, 166-176. New York: Harper & Brother, 1962.

Mayer, W. "Ein Mythos von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs." *Or* 56 (1987): 55-68.

Mayes, Andrew D. H. "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament." *JSOT* 82 (1999): 57-82.

Mays, James Luther. *Psalms*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1994.

Mazar, B. "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis." *JNES* 28 (1969): 73-83.

McCarter, P. Kyle. "Aspects of the Religion of the Israelite Monarchy: Biblical and Epigraphic Data." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

McConville, J. G. *God and Earthly Power: An Old Testament Political Theology, Genesis-Kings*. Library of Old Testament/Old Testament Studies 454. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

McKinlay, Judith E. "To Eat or Not to Eat: Where Is Wisdom in This Choice?" *Semeia* 86 (1999): 73-84.

Mein, Andrew. "Psalm 101 and the Ethics of Kingship." In *Ethical and Unethical in the Old Testament: God and Humans in Dialogue*. Edited by Katharine J. Dell, 11-33. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

Mendenhall, George E. "The Shady Side of Wisdom: The Date and Purpose of Genesis 3." In *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*. Edited by Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim and Cary A. Moore, 319-334. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. "Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages." In *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday*, edited by H. A. McKay and D. J. A. Clines, 257-280. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. ConBOT 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.

Meyers, Carol. "Food and the First Family: A Socioeconomic Perspective." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 27-50. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Meyers, Carol. "Kinship and Kingship: the Early Monarchy." In *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan, 220-271. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Michel, Andreas. *Theologie Aus Der Peripherie: Die Gespaltene Koordination Im Biblischen Hebraisch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Middleton, J. Richard. *The Liberating Image: the Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005.

Miles, Johnny E. *Wise King-Royal Fool*. JSOTSup, 399. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Sex and Wisdom: What the Garden of Eden Story Is Saying." *BR* 10/6 (1994): 21, 52.

Miller, Geoffrey P. "The Kingdom of God in Samuel." Paper presented at the SBL annual meeting. San Diego: November 23, 2014.

Miller, Geoffrey P. *The Ways of a King: Legal and Political Ideas in the Bible*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Miller, Patrick D. "Faith and Ideology in the Old Testament." In *Magnalia Dei—The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest* Wright. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke and Patrick D. Miller, 464-479. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Miller, Patrick D., Jr. "Power, Justice, and Peace: An Exegesis of Psalm 72." *FAM* 4 (1986): 65-70.

Miner, Earl. "Allusion." *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Edited by Alex Preminger, 18. Princeton: Princeton university Press, 1965.

Miner, Earl. "Allusion." *The New Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Edited by A. Preminger and V. Brogan, 38-39. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Moberly, R. W. L. "Did the Interpreters Get it Right? Genesis 2-3 Reconsidered." *JTS* 59/1 (2008): 22-40.

Moberly, R. W. L. *The Theology of the Book of Genesis*. OTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Moberly, R. W. L. "Did the Serpent Get it Right?" *JTS* 39 (1988): 1-27.

Mobley, Gregory. "The Wild Man in the Bible and the Ancient Near East." *JBL* 116/2 (1997): 217-233.

Moe-Lobeda, Ron. *The Mystery of Eve & Adam: A Prophetic Critique of the Monarchy*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2012.

Moor, Johannes C. de. "East of Eden." *ZAW* 100/1 (1988): 105-11.

Moore, Barrington. *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt*. White Plains, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1978.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82." *HUCA* 14 (1939): 29-126.

Morgenstern, Mira. *Conceiving a Nation: The Development of Political Discourse in the Hebrew Bible*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

Morris, Paul and Deborah Sawyer , eds. *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*. *JSOT*Sup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Urmensch und Königsideologie." *ST* 2 (1948): 71-89.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Volumes 1-2. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962.

Moye, Richard H. "In the Beginning: Myth and History in Genesis and Exodus." *JBL* 109/4 (1990): 577-598.

Müller, Hans-Peter. "Drei Deutungen des Todes: Genesis 3, der Mythos von Adapa und die Sage von Gilgamesch." In *Altes Testament und christlicher Glaube*, JBT. Edited by Igo Balderman, 117-134. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991.

Müller, Hans-Peter. "Parallelen zu Gen 2f. und Ez 28 aus dem Gilgamesch-Epos." *ZAH* 3/2 (1990): 167-178.

Müller, Hans-Peter. Gilgamesch-Epos und Altes Testament." In *Ernten, was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dwight R. Daniels, Uwe Gleßmer and Martin Rösel, 75-99. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991.

Müller, Hans-Peter. "Weisheitliche Deutungen der Sterblichkeit: Gen 3,19 und Pred 3,21; 12,7 im Licht antiker Parallelen." In *Mensch—Umwelt—Eigenwelt: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Weisheit Israels*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992.

Müller, Reinhard. *Königtum und Gottescherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik*. FAT. Second Series 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Murmelstein, Benjamin. "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre." [Part 1]. *WZKM*. 35 (1928): 242-275.

Murmelstein, Benjamin. "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre." [Part 2]. *WZKM*. 36 (1929): 51-86.

Murphy, Roland E. "Wisdom and Eros in Proverbs 1-9." *CBQ* 50/4 (1988): 600-603.

Murphy, Roland E. *A Study of Psalm 72 (71).* Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Murray, Donald F. *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension: Pragmatics, Poetics and Polemics in a Narrative Sequence about David (2 Samuel 5.17-7.29).* JSOTSup 264. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998.

Naidoff, B.D. "A Man to Work the Soil: A New Interpretation of Genesis 2-3." *JSOT* 5 (1978): 2-14.

Nel, Philip J. "מלך." *NIDOTTE* 2: 956-965.

Nel, Philip J. "בוש." *NIDOTTE* 1: 621-627.

Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Nicol, George G. "The Wisdom of Joab and the Wise Woman of Tekoa." *ST* 36/2 (1982): 97-104.

Niditch, Susan. "Judges, Kingship, and Political Ethics: A Challenge to the Conventional Wisdom." In *Thus Says the Lord: Essays on the Former and Latter Prophets in Honor of Robert R. Wilson.* LHB/OTS 502. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein, 59-70. New York: T & T Clark, 2009.

Niditch, Susan. *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation.* SPSH 6. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985.

Niehr, H. "ערה." *TDOT, 11:*343-349.

Nielsen, Eduard. "Creation and the Fall of Man: A Cross-Disciplinary Investigation." *HUCA* 43 (1972): 13-22.

Noll, Stephen F. "אלים." *NIDOTTE* 1: 401-403.

North, C. R. "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship." *ZAW* 50 (1932): 8-38.

O'Connor, David and David P. Silverman, editors. *Ancient Egyptian Kingship.* Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Och, Berhard. "The Garden of Eden: From Creation to Covenant." *Judaism* 37/3 (1988): 143-156.

Och, Berhard. "The Garden of Eden: From Re-Creation to Reconciliation." *Judaism* 37/4 (1988): 340-351.

Oden, Robert A., Jr. The Bible Without Theology: The Theological Tradition and Alternatives to It. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Oden, Robert A., Jr. "Divine Aspirations in Atrahasis and in Genesis 1-11." *ZAW* 93 (1981): 197-216.

Olley, John W. "Pharaoh's Daughter, Solomon's Palace, and the Temple: Another Look at the Structure of 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT*27/3 (2003): 355-369.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. "On Royal Gardens in Mesopotamia." *JNES* 24 (1965): 328-333.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. "The City of Assur in 714 B.C." *JNES* 19 (1960): 133-147.

Orelli, Conrad V. *Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit.* Leipzig: A. Lorentz, 1871.

Oswalt, John N. *The Bible among the Myths: Unique or Just Different?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66.* NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Ouro, Roberto. "The Garden of Eden Account: The Chiastic Structure of Genesis 2-3." *AUSS*, 40/2 (2002): 219-243.

Parker, Kim Ian. "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Must We Leave Eden, Once and for All?: A Lacanian Pleasure Trip through the Garden." *JSOT* 83 (1999): 19-29.

Parker, Kim Ian. "Repetition as a Structuring Device in 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT* 42 (1988): 19-27.

Parker, Kim Ian. "Solomon as Philosopher King? The Nexus of Law and Wisdom in 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT* 53 (1992): 75-91. [Reprinted in *The Historical Books* BS 40. Edited by J. Cheryl Exum, 233-248. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.]

Parker, Kim Ian. *Wisdom and Law in the Reign of Solomon.* Lewiston, New York: 1992.

Parker, Simon B. "The Historical Composition of *KRT* and the Cult of El." *ZAW* 89 (1977): 161-175.

Parker, Simon B. "Ugaritic Literature and the Bible." *NEA* 63/4 (2000); 228-231.

Parpola, Simo, editor. *State Archives of Assyria, Volume X: Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars.* Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993.

Parrish, V. Steven. "Brueggemann, Walter." *DMBI*: 242-247.

Pedersen, Johannes. "The Fall of Man." In *Interpretationes ad VT Pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel Septuagenario Missae.* Edited by Nils Alstrup Dahl and Arvid S. Kapelrud, 162-172. Oslo: Fabritius & Sonner, 1955.

Pedersen, Johannes. "Wisdom and Immortality." In *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Harold Henry Rowley.* VTSup 3. Edited by Martin Noth and D. Winton Thomas, 238-246. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955.

Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture.* Translated by Mrs. Auslaug Moller. London: Oxford University Press,1926.

Peterson, David. "The Genesis of Genesis." *In Congress Volume Ljubljana.* VTSup 133. Edited by André Lemaire, 27-40. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Pfeiffer,von Henrik. "Der Baum in der Mitte des Gartens." *ZAW* 113 (2001): 2-16.

Pola, Thomas. "Was ist 'Leben' im Alten Testament?" *ZAW* 116/2 (2004): 251-252.

Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. *Religion and Ideology in Assyria*. SANER 6. Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.

Porten, Bezalel. "The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative (I Kings 3-11)." *HUCA* 38 (1967): 93-128.

Porter, Barbara Nevling. *Trees, Kings, and Politics: Studies in Assyrian Iconography*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Göttingen: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.

Portier-Young, Anathea E. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Posener, Georges. *De la Divinité du Pharaon*, CahSA 15. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1960.

Postell, Seth D. *Adam as Israel: Genesis 1-3 as the Introduction to the Torah and Tanakh*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2011.

Postgate, J. N. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad." *CANE* 1:395-411.

Preuss, Hans Dietrich. "עוֹלָם, *ʿôlām*; עָלַם *ʿālam*." *TDOT* 10: 530-545.

Pritchard, James B. *The Ancient Near East*. Vol. II. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Pritchard, James B., 3rd ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Propp, William H. "Kinship in 2 Samuel 13." *CBQ* 55/1 (1993): 39-53.

Provan, Ian. W. "Ideologies, Literary and Critical: Reflections on Recent Writing on the History of Israel." *JBL* 114/4 (1995): 585-606.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology. Volume 1. The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Rad, Gerhard von. *The Problem of the Hexateuch: and Other Essays*. Translated by . London: SCM, 1984.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Wisdom in Israel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.

Radday, Yehuda T. and Athalya Brenner. *On Humour and the Comic in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup, Bible and Literature Series 23. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990.

Reicke, Bo. "The Knowledge Hidden in the Tree of Paradise." *JSS* I/3 (1956): 193-201.

Reinhartz, Adele. "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 117-141.

Rendsburg, Gary A. "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Genesis." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin, 47-70. Bethesda, MD.: University Press of Maryland, 1996.

Rendsburg, Gary A. *The Redaction of Genesis*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1986.

Richter, Wolfgang. "Urgeschichte und Hoftheologie." *BZ* 10 (1966): 96-105.

Rittner, Robert K. "The Great Cairo hymn of Praise to Amun-Re." *COS* 1:37-43.

Roberts, J. J. M. "The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms." *CBQ* 64/4 (2002): 675-686.

Roberts, J. J. M. "In Defense of the Monarchy: The Contribution of Israelite Kingship to Biblical Theology." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride, 377-396. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Roberts, Jason P. "Emerging in the Image of God to Know Good and Evil." *Zygon* 46/2 (2011): 471-481.

Rogerson, J. *Genesis 1-11*. OTG. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1991.

Römer, Thomas. "The Hebrew Bible as Crisis Literature." In *Disaster and Relief Management/Katastrophen und ihre Bewältigung*. FAT 81. Edited by Angelika Berlejung, 159-177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Rooker, M. "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew." *JNSL* 14 (1988):199-214.

Rose, Martin. "Names of God in the OT." *AB* 4: 1001-1011.

Rosenberg, Joel. *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Saler, Robert. "The Transformation of Reason in Genesis 2-3: Two Options for Theological Interpretation." *CTM* 36/4 (2009): 275-286.

Sandars, N.K. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin, 1960.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. NCI. London: Routledge, 2006.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1-13.

Sarna, Nahum M. *Understanding Genesis: The Heritage of Biblical Israel*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.

Sasson, Jack M. " 'The Mother of All . . .' Etiologies." In *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long*, edited by Saul M. Olyan and Robert C. Culley, 205-220. BJS 325. Providence: Brown University, 2000.

Sasson, Jack M. "סאסבתיו (sic) (Gen 2,25) and Its Implications." *Biblica* 66/3 (1985): 418-21.

Satterthwaite, P. E. "David." *DOTHB*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson, 198-206. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005.

Savran, G. "Beastly Speech: Intertextuality, Balaam's Ass and the Garden of Eden." *JSOT*, 64 (1994): 33-55.

Sawyer, John F.A. "The Image of God, the Wisdom of Serpents and the Knowledge of Good and Evil." In *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*. Edited by Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer, 64-73. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Scham, Sandra. "The Days of the Judges: When Men and Women Were Animals and Trees Were Kings." *JSOT* 97 (2002): 37-64.

Schellenberg, Annette. *Erkenntnis als Problem: Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*. OBO. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Frieburg Schweiz Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Schlimm, Matthew Richard. "At Sin's Entryway (Gen 4,7): A Reply to C. L. Crouch," *ZAW* 124/3 (2012): 409-415.

Schmid, Konrad and Christoph Riedweg. *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History*. FAT, Reihe 2, 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Schmid, Konrad. "Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomea zur Enneateuchfrage." In *Auf dem Weg: zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regnum: Festschrift Hans-Christoph Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Martin Beck and Ulrike Schorn, 1-14. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Schmid, Konrad. "Genesis in the Pentateuch." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 27-50. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Schrorer, S. "Lebensbaum." *Neues Bibel-Lexikon 2:* 602-603.

Schüle, Andreas. "Made in the 'Image of God' the Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1-3." *ZAW* 117/1 (2005): 1-20.

Schultz, Carl. "עור." *TWOT*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, 657. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

Schultz, Richard L. "Form Criticism and the OT." *DTIB*: 233-237.

Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Sergi, Omer. "The Composition of Nathan's Oracle to David (2 Samuel 7:1–17) as a Reflection of Royal Judahite Ideology." *JBL* 129/2 (2009): 261-279.

Seow, C. L. "Qohelet's Autobiography," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in honor of David Noel Freedman*, edited by A. Beck (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,1995), 275-287.

Sharp, Carolyn J. *Irony and Meaning in the Hebrew Bible*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2009.

Shea, William H. "Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Traditions." *AUSS* 15/1 (1977): 27-41.

Simon, Lászlo T. *Identity and Identification: An Exegetical and Theological Study of 2 Sam 21-24*. TG, ST 64. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 2000.

Simon, Uriel. "The Poor Man's Ewe Lamb: An Example of a Juridical Parable." *Biblica* 48/2 (1967): 207-242.

Simpson, Cuthbert. *The Book of Genesis*. IB 1: 437-829.

Sjöberg, Åke W. "Eve and the Chameleon." In *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. Ahlström*. JSOTSup 31. Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer, 217-225. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.

Ska, Jean Louis. "La structure du Pentateuque dans sa forme canonique." *ZAW* 113/3 (2001): 332-352.

Ska, Jean-Louis. "The Study of the Book of Genesis: The Beginning of Critical Reading." In *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup 152. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, 3-26. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Smend, Rudolf. *"The Unconquered Land" and Other Old Testament Essays*. Edited by Edward Ball and Margaret Barker. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

Smick, Elmer B. "חוה." *TWOT* 1:279-282.

Smith, Henry Preserved. *Samuel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.

Smith, Mark S. "'Your People Shall Be My People': Family and Covenant in Ruth 1:16-17." *CBQ* 69/2 (2007): 242-258.

Soden, Wolfram von. "Verschlüsselte Kritik an Salomo in der Urgeschichte des Jahwisten?" *WO* 7/2 (1974): 228-240.

Soggin, J. Alberto. "The Fall of Man in the Third Chapter of Genesis." In *Old Testament and Oriental Studies* BO 29, 88-111. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975.

Soller, Moshe. "A Latch and Clasp Connecting Deuteronomy 33:27-29 with Genesis 3:22-24: A Proposed Interpretation." *JBQ* 133 (2006): 12-15.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. CJOD. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Sommer, Benjamin D. "Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Old Testament: A Response to Lyle Eslinger." *VT* 46/4 (1996): 479-89.

Sparks, Kenton L. "*Enūma Elish* and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism." *JBL* 126/4 (2007): 625-648.

Sparks, Kenton L. Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 2005.

Speiser, E.A. *Genesis*. AB. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1986.

Spero, Shurbert. "The Biblical Stories of Creation, Garden of Eden and the Flood: History or Metaphor?" *Tradition* 33/2 (1999): 5-18.

Spronk, Klaus. *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. AOAT 219. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1986.

Stackert, Jeffrey. "Why Does Deuteronomy Legislate Cities of Refuge? Asylum in the Covenant Collection (Exodus 21:12-14) and Deuteronomy (19:1-13)." *JBL* 125/1 (2006): 23–49.

Stager, Lawrence E. "Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden." In *Frank Moore Cross Volume*. Eretz-Israel 26. Edited by Baruch A. Levine, Philip J. King, Joseph Naveh, and Ephraim Stern, 83-194. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999.

Starbuck, Scott R. A. *Court Oracles in the Psalms: The So-Called Royal Psalms in their Ancient Near Eastern Context*. SBLDS 172. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Die Paradieserzählung: Eine Auslegung von Genesis 2, 4b-3,24*. BibS(N) 60. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener , 1970.

Stern, Herold S. "The Knowledge of Good and Evil." *VT* 8 (1958): 405-418.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1985.

Steymans, Hans Ulrich. "Le psautier messianique—une approche sémantique." BLT 238. In *The Composition of the Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger 141-197. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

Stordalen, Terje. "Heaven on Earth or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature." In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History*. Edited by Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 28-57. FAT, Reihe 2, volume 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Stordalen, Terje. "Man, Soil, Garden: Basic Plot in Genesis 2-3 Reconsidered." *JSOT* 53 (1992): 3-26.

Stordalen, Terje. "The God of the Eden Narrative." In *Enigmas and Images: Studies in honor of Tryggve N. D. Mettinger*. Edited by Göran Eidevall and Blaženka Scheuer, 3-21. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Stordalen, Terje. Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000.

Strange, John. "The Idea of Afterlife in Ancient Israel: Some Remarks on the Iconography in Solomon's Temple." *PEQ* 117 (1985): 35-40.

Stratton, Beverly J. *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3*. *JSOT*Supplement Series 208. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Strine, C. A. Sworn Enemies: The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile. BZAW 436. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Strine, C. A. and C. L. Crouch. "Yhwh's Battle against Chaos in Ezekiel: The Transformation of Judahite Mythology for a New Situation." *JBL* 132/4 (2013): 883–903.

Stronach, David. "The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C." *BAI*, n.s. 4 (1990): 171-180.

Szikszai, S. "King." *IDB* 3: 11-17.

Tate, Marvin E. *Psalm 51-100.* WBC 20. Dallas: Word, 1990.

Terrien, Samuel. *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Tharekadavil, Anthony. "Is Genesis a Confusion?" *BiBh* 28 (2002): 595-631.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. editor. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Tigay, Jeffrey. H. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.

Titus, P. Joseph. *The Second Story of Creation (Gen 2:4-3:24: A Prologue to the Concept of Enneateuch?* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011.

Tomasino, Anthony. "עוֹלָם." *NIDOTTE* 3:345-351.

Tonstad, Sigve K. "The Message of the Trees in the Midst of the Garden." *JATS* 19/1 (2008): 82-97.

Tosato, Angelo. "On Genesis 2:24." *CBQ* 52/3 (1990): 389-409.

Trible, Phyllis. "Eve and Adam: Genesis 2-3 Reread." *ANQ* 13/4 (1973): 251-58.

Tromp, Nicholas J. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament.* BO. Rome: Pontifical biblical Institute, 1969.

Troxel, Ronald L. "Isaiah 7,14-16 Through the Eyes of the Septuagint." *ETL* 79/1 (2003): 1-22.

Tsukimoto, Akio. "'Der Mensch ist geworden wie unereiner'—Untersuchungen zum zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von Gen. 3, 22-24 und 6, 1-4--." *AJBI* 5 (1979): 3-44.

Turner, L. A. "Genesis, Book of." *DOTP*: 350-359.

Turner, Lawrence A. *Genesis.* RANBC. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Turner, Lawrence A. *Genesis.* Second edition. RANBC. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Hebrew Bible.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Van der Kooij, A. "'Nimrod, a Mighty Hunter Before the Lord!' Assyrian Royal Ideology as Perceived in the Hebrew Bible." *JS* 21 (2012):1-27.

Van der Borm-Croughs, Mirjam. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SBLSCS 61. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.

Van Seters, John. "In the Babylonian Exile with J: Between Judgment in Ezekiel and Salvation in Second Isaiah." In *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*. Edited by Bob Becking and Marjo C.A. Korpel, 71-89. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Van Seters, John. "The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King." *ZAW* 101 (1989): 333-342.

Vanderhooft, David S. and Abraham Winitzer, editors. *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays in the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013

Vanderkam, James and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. New York: Harper, 2002.

Vanstiphout, H. "Some Thoughts on Genre in Mesopotamian Literature." *Keilschriftliche Literatur*. 32nd Recontre assyriologique internationale. Edited by K. Kecker and W. Sommerfeld, 1-11. Berlin: Reimer, 1986.

Veenker, Ronald A. "Forbidden Fruit: Ancient Near Eastern Sexual Metaphors." *HUCA* 70-71 (1999-2000): 57-73.

Veenker, Ronald A. "Gilgamesh and the Magic Plant." *BA* 44/4 (1981): 199-205.

Veenker, Ronald A. "Syro-Mesopotamia: The Old Babylonian Period." In *Mesopotamia and the Bible: Comparative Explorations*. Edited by Mark W. Chavalas and K. Lawson Younger, 149-167. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Verheij, Arian. "Paradise Retried: On Qohelet 2.4-6." *JSOT* 50 (1991): 113-115.

Villiers, Gerda de. "Sin, Suffering, Sagacity: Genesis 2-3." In Exile and Suffering: A Selection of Papers Read at the 50th Anniversary Meeting of the Old Testament Society of South Africa OTWSA/OTSSA Pretoria, August, 2007. Edited by Bob Becker and Dirk Human, 3-17. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Villiers, Gerda de. "The *Epic of Gilgamesh* and the Old Testament: Parallels beyond the Deluge." *OTE* 19/1 (2006): 26-34.

Vogels, Walter. "The Tree(s) in the Middle of the Garden (Gn 2:9; 3:3)." *Science et Espirit* 59/2-3 (2007): 129-142.

Vogels, Walter. "'Like One of Us, Knowing *Tov* and *Ra*'." *Semeia* 81 (1988): 145-157.

Vulpe, Nicola. "Irony and the Unity of the Gilgamesh Epic." *JNES* 53 (1994): 275-282.

Wahl, Harald Martin. "'Tod und Leben' zur Wiederherstellung Israels nach Ez. XXXVII 1-14." *VT* 49/2 (1999): 218-239.

Wakely, Robin. "חור." *NIDOTTE* 2: 288-295.

Waldman, Nahum M. "What Was the Actual Effect of the Tree of Knowledge?" *JBQ* 19/2 (1990-1991): 105-113.

Walker, Larry L. "עץ." *NIDOTTE* 3: 474-482.

Walker, Larry L. "Tree of Life." *NIDOTTE* 4: 1260-1261.

Walker, Larry L. "Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil." *NIDOTTE* 4: 1259-1260.

Wallace, Howard N. "Tree of Knowledge and Tree of Life." *ABD* 6:656-660.

Wallace, Howard N. *The Eden Narrative*. HSM. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Walsh, Jerome T. "The Characterization of Solomon in First Kings 1-5." *CBQ* 57 (1995): 471-493.

Walsh, Jerome T. *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2009.

Walsh, Jerome T. "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach." *JBL* 96 (1977): 161-77. [Reprinted in *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. Edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura, 362-382. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994.]

Walter Wifall, "Bone of my Bones and Flesh of my Flesh—The Politics of the Yahwist." *CurTM* 10/1 (1983): 176-183.

Waltke, Bruce K. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

Waltke, Bruce K. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. LBI. Grand Rapids: Regency, 1989.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Walton, John H. *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Walton, John H. *Genesis: A Commentary*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

Walton, John. "Cultural Background of the Old Testament." In *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert B. Sloan, 255-273. Nashville: Broadman/Holman, 1994.

Watanabe, Kazuko. "The 'Tree of Life' in Ancient Mesopotamia - The Present State of Study and its Problems." In *Studies in Symbolism and Iconology* 3. Tokyo: Wako University (1989): 84-98.

Watanbe, Kazuko. "Lebenspendende und Todbringende Substanzen in Altmesopotamien." *BaghM* 25 (1994): 579-583.

Watson, Paul. "The Tree of Life." *RQ* 23 (1980): 232-238.

Watson, W. G. E. JSOT 32/5 (2008): 188-189. Review of the Assyrian Sacred Tree: A History of Interpretations, by Mariana Giovino.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "Deuteronomy." *ABD* 2:168-183.

Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Weisberg, David B. "The 'Antiquarian' Interests of the Babylonian Kings." In *Leaders and Legacies in Assyriology and Bible: the Collected Essays of David B. Weisberg*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012.

Weisman, Ze'ev. *Political Satire in the Bible*. SBL SemeiaSt 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel with a Reprint of the Article Israel from the Encyclopedia Britannica*. MG 35. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Cleveland: Meridian, 1957.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin: G. Romer, 1886.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*, WBC. Waco, Texas: Word, 1987.

Wenham, G.J. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story." In *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 9 (1986), 19-25.

Wente, Edward Frank. *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. SBLWAW 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Westenholz, Joan Goodnick. *Legends of the Kings of Akkade: The Texts*. MC 7. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11*. Translated by John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar's Press, 1993.

White, Hugh C. *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Whitelam, Keith W. "King and Kingship." *ABD* 4: 40-48.

Whitelam, Keith W. *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*. JSOTSup12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979.

Whybray, R. N. *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*. BZAW 135. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.

Whybray, R. N. *The Succession Narrative: A Study of II Sam. 9-20 and I Kings 1 and 2*. SBLT, second series, 9. London: SCM, 1968.

Whybray, R. Norman. *The Good Life in the Old Testament*. London: T & T Clark, 2002.

Widengren, Geo. *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion*. Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1951.

Wifall, Walter. "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b." *CBQ* 36/2 (1974): 237-240.

Wiggins, Steve A. "Of Asherahs and Trees: Some Methodological Questions." *JANER* 1/1 (2001): 158-187.

Wilch, John R. *Time and Event: An Exegetical Study of the Use of ʿēth in the Old Testament in Comparison to Other Temporal Expressions in Clarification of the Concept of Time*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Wilder, William N. "Illumination and Investiture: The Royal Significance of the Tree of Wisdom in Genesis 3." *WTS* 68 (2006): 51-69.

Wilkins, Lauress L. *The Book of Lamentations and the Social World of Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Era*. BI 6. Piscataway, New Jersey, 2010.

Willey, P.K., "The Importunate Woman of Tekoa and How She Got Her Way." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell, 115-131. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Willi, Thomas. "Die Funktion der Schlußsequenzen in der Komposition der jahwistischen Urgeschichte." In *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel: Festschrift für Siegfried Herrmann*. Edited by Rüdiger Liwak and Siegfried Wagner, 429-444. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991.

Williams, David S. "Once Again: The Structure of the Narrative of Solomon's Reign." *JSOT* 86 (1999): 49-66.

Williams, R. E. "Genesis 3—An Epitaph." *ET* 92/11 (1992): 339.

Williamson, H. G. M. "Isaiah 62:4 and the Problem of Inner Biblical Allusions." *JBL* 119/4 (2000): 734-739.

Wilson, Gerald Henry. *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. SBLDS 76. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985.

Wilson, Leslie S. *The Serpent Symbol in the Ancient Near East: Nahash and Asherah: Death, Life, and Healing*. SiJ. Lanham, Maryland. University of America, 2001.

Winitzer, Abraham. "Etana in Eden: New Light on the Mesopotamian and Biblical Tales in Their Semitic Context." *JAOS* 133/3 (2013): 441-465.

Winnett, Frederick V. "Re-Examining the Foundations." *JBL* 84 (1965):1-19.

Winter, Urs. "Der 'Lebesbaum' in der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik." In *"Bäume braucht man doch!": Das Symbol des Baumes zwischen Hoffnung und Zerstörung*. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1986.

Winter, Urs. *Frau und Göttin: Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel in dessen Umwelt*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Witte, Markus. *Die biblische Urgeschichte Redaktions und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Genesis 1,1 11.* BZAW 26. Berlin: W de Gruyter, 1998.

Wittenberg, G. H. "The Image of God: Demythologization and Democratization in the Old Testament." *JTSA* 13 (1975): 12-23.

Wittenberg, G. H. "Wisdom Influences on Genesis 2-11: A Contribution to the Debate about the 'Yahwistic' Primeval History." *OTE* 8 (1995): 439-57.

Wittenberg, G. H. *King Solomon and the Theologians.* Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1988.

Wolde, Ellen van. *Stories of the Beginning: Genesis 1-11 and Other Creation Stories.* London: SCM, 1996.

Wolde, Ellen van. *Worlds Become Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1-11.* Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974. [Originally published in German in 1965.]

Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Kerygma of the Yahwist." In *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions.* Edited by Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, 41-66. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Wong, C. I. "Faith in the Present Form of Isaiah VII 1-17." *VT* 51/4 (2001): 535-547.

Wood, Ervin. "Establishing Dates in Genesis." M.A.B.S. thesis, Multnomah School of the Bible, Portland, Oregon, 1981.

Woods, Christopher. "Sons of the Sun: The Mythological Foundations of the First Dynasty of Uruk." *JANER* 12/1 (2012): 78-96.

Wozniuk, Vladmir. "The Wisdom of Solomon as Political Theology," *Journal of Church & State*, 39/4 (1997): 657-679.

Wright, Benjamin G. III. "Joining the Club: A Suggestion about Genre in Early Jewish Texts." *DSD* 17 (2010): 289-314.

Wright, David Noel. *The Unity of the Hebrew Bible.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Wright, David P. "Holiness, Sex, and Death in the Garden of Eden." *Biblica* 77/3 (1996): 305-329.

Wright, Jacob L. "The Commemoration of Defeat and the Formation of a Nation in the Hebrew Bible." *Proof* 29 (2009): 433-473.

Wright, Richard M. *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-Exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source.* Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 419. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Wyatt, Nicholas. "Interpreting the Creation and Fall story in Genesis 2-3." *ZAW* 93 (1981): 10-21.

Wyatt, Nick. "What Has Ugarit to Do with Jerusalem?" *SWC* 8/1 (2002): 138. Religion and Philosophy Collection. EBSCOhost (accessed June 11, 2013).

Wyatt, Nicolas. "'Supposing Him to be the Gardener' (John 20:15): A Study of the Paradise Motif in John." In *'There's such Divinity doth Hedge a King': Selected Essays of Nicolas Wyatt on Royal Ideology in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature*. SOTS Monographs. Ashgate: Aldershot, U.K., 2005.

Wyatt, Nicolas. "A garden for the living—cultic and ideological aspects of Paradise. In *The Cosmography of Paradise*. Edited by A. Scafi. Warburg Colloquia. Forthcoming.121.

Wyatt, Nicolas. "The Hollow Crown: Ambivalent Elements in West Semitic Royal Ideology." In *"There's such Divinity doth Hedge a King": Selected Essays of Nicolas Wyatt on Royal Ideology in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature*. SOTS Monographs. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2005, 31-48. [Originally published in UF 18 (1986): 421-436.]

Wyattt, N. Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition. UBL 13. Münster: Trarit-Verlag, 1996.

Yee, Gale A. "Gender, Class, and the Social-Scientific Study of Genesis 2-3." *Semeia* 87 (1999): 177-192.

York, A. "The Maturation Theme in the Adam and Eve Story." In *Go to the Land I will Show You: Studies in Honor Dwight M. Young*. Edited by J. Coleson and V. Matthews, 393-410. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Zaccagnini Carlo. "An Urartean Royal Inscription in the Report of Sargon's Eighth Campaign." Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis: Papers of a Symposium held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980. Edited by F. M. Fales, 259-295. OAC 17. Roma: Instituto Per L'Oriente, 1981.

Zenger, Erich. " Überlegungen zur holistischen und kanonischen Lektüre des 72. Psalms," *JBTh* 8 (1993): 57-72.

Zenger, Erich. "The Composition and Theology of the Fifth Book of Psalms, Psalms 107-145." *JOST* 80 (1998): 77-102.

Zimmerli, Walther. "The Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology." *SJT* 17 (1964): 146-158.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
ABL	Assyrian and Babylonian Letters
ABR	Australian Biblical Review
AcBib	Academia Biblica
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AfOB	Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft
AJBI	Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute
AJSLL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature
AJT	Asia Journal of Theology
AMD	Ancient Magic and Divination
ANESSup	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts*
ANQ	Andover Newton Quarterly
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
ARAB	Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia
ASAW, p.-h.	Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akdademie der Wissenschaften, Philogisch-Historische Klasse
AsB	Assiriologische Bibliothek
ASBR	Amsterdam Studies in the Bible and Religion
ASORDS	American School of Oriental Research, Dissertation Series
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies
AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
AU	Aula Orientalis
BaghM	Baghdader Mitteillungen
BAI	Bulletin of the Asia Institute
BAS	Biblical Archaeology Society
BBRS	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements
BCOTWP	Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms
BE	Biblical Encyclopedia
BES	Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BI	Biblical Interpretation
BiBh	Bible Bhashyam
BibS (N)	Biblische Studien (Neukirchen, 1951-)
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BLS	Bible and Literature Series
BN/NF	Biblische Notizen, Neue Folge
BRev	Bible Review
BO	Biblica et Orientalia
BS	The Biblical Seminar
BT	Bible Translator
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift

BZAR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
CahSA	Cahiers de la Société Asiatique
CANE	Civilizations of the Ancient Near East
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CJOD	Contraversions: Jews and Other Differences
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica· Old Testament Series
CS	The Context of Scripture
CSR	Christian Scholar's Review
CTM	Currents in Theology and Mission
CV	Communio Viatorum
DMBI	Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters
DOTP	Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch
DSD	Dead Sea Discoveries
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DTIB	Dictionary for the Theological Interpretation of the Bible
EB	English Bible versification (given when this differs from the Hebrew verse division)
EDP	Early Dynastic Period (referring to ancient Mesopotamian history)
ER	The Encylopedia of Religion
ET	Expository Times
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
EuroJTh	European Journal of Theology
EUS/TS	European University Studies/Theology Series
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FAM	Faith and Mission
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FCB	Feminine Companion to the Bible
fn.	footnote
FTOL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
GKC	Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar
HA	Hebrew Abstracts
HACL	History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant
HBD	Harper's Bible Dictionary
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HBT	Horizons in Biblical Theology
HeyJ	Heythrop Journal
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IOS	Israel Oriental Society
ISBL	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
ITC	International Theological Commentary
JAAR	Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JAC	Journal of Ancient Civilizations

JANESCU	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
JATS	Journal of the Adventist Theological Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBQ	Jewish Bible Quarterly
JBT	Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JEBS	Journal of European Baptist Studies
JNES	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies
JNSL	Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
JESHO	Journal of Economic andSocial History of the Orient
JR	Journal of Religion
JRE	Journal of Religious Ethics
JS	Journal for Semitics
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JTSA	Journal of Theology for Southern Africa
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
KLJS	The Kogod Library of Judaic Studies
KTU	Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit
	Kückler Beitr. F. Küchler, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der assyrisch-babyloinschen Medizin
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LBI	Library of Biblical Interpretation
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LCR	Longman Critical Readers
MG	Meridian Giants
MLBS	Mercer Library of biblical Studies
NCB	New Century Bible
NCI	The New Critical Idiom
NEA	Near Eastern Archaeology
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDB	New International Dictionary of the Bible
NIDOTTE	NIDOTTE
ns	new series
OAC	Orientis Antiqui Collectio
OBJS	Oldenburgische Beiträge zu Jüdischen Studien
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OCuT	Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts
OEAE	Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt
Or	Orientalia
OTE	Old Testament Essays
OTG	Old Testament Guides

OTT	Old Testament Theology
Proof	Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History
PRS	Perspectives in Religious Studies
PTL	PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature
RANBC	Readings: A New Biblical Commentary
RB	Revue Biblique
RÉJ	Revue des etudes juives
RO	Res Orientales
RQ	Restoration Quarterly
SPSH	Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SAHG	Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete, Zurich, 1953
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and its Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSCS	Socity of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLStBL	Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
Seux	J. M. Seux, Epithètes Royales Akkadiennes et Sumériennes, Paris, 1968.
SiJ	Studies in Judaism
SJOT	Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SSN	Studia semitica Neerlandica
ST	Studia Theologica
SWC	Studies In World Christianity
TANE	The Ancient Near East: An Encyclopedia for Students
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
TG,ST	Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia
TLOT	Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
TWOT	Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen
USQR	Union Seminary Quarterly Review
VAT	Vorderasiatische Abteilung Tontafel. Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Bible Commentary
WO	Die Welt des Orients
WW	*Word and World*
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal
ZAH	Zeitschrift fürAlthebraistik
ZAW	Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZB	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
Zoh	Zohar