

Historical Settings, Intertextuality, and Biblical Theology

Edited by
HYUN CHUL PAUL KIM,
TYLER D. MAYFIELD,
and HYE KYUNG PARK

*Forschungen
zum Alten Testament
160*

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Herausgegeben von

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)
Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

160



Historical Settings, Intertextuality, and Biblical Theology

Essays in Honor of Marvin A. Sweeney

Edited by

Hyun Chul Paul Kim,
Tyler D. Mayfield, and
Hye Kyung Park

Mohr Siebeck

Hyun Chul Paul Kim, born 1965; 1998 PhD; since 1999 Harold B. Williams Professor of Hebrew Bible at Methodist Theological School in Ohio.

Tyler D. Mayfield, born 1980; 2009 PhD; since 2012 A.B. Rhodes Professor of Old Testament at Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

Hye Kyung Park, born 1968; 2011 PhD; since 2013 Associate Professor for the Old Testament, Chang Jung Christian University, Taiwan.

ISBN 978-3-16-161790-4 / eISBN 978-3-16-161980-9

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161980-9

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

The present volume was inspired by the successful healing and recovery of Marvin A. Sweeney over the course of the last decade. It was during the Claremont reception at the SBL annual meeting, sometime around midnight on the Monday evening, that several of us sat around and shared the idea of putting together a volume connecting the legacy of Hermann Gunkel to Marvin Sweeney. We duly set about gathering together a band of willing contributors in the field, and the project was launched.

This volume, like many others, came to fruition thanks to countless people involved. Among the many, we express our heartfelt appreciation to President Kah-Jin Jeffrey Kuan at Claremont School of Theology for providing both generous funding and gracious encouragement for the volume. Superbly efficient guidance from Mohr Siebeck has been instrumental at every stage, and we offer our thanks to Katharina Gutekunst, Markus Kirchner, Elena Müller, Jana Trispel, and Henning Ziebritzki. We thank Duncan Burns for undertaking the copy-editing and typesetting of the manuscript. Our family members, colleagues, and institutions – Chang Jung Christian University in Taiwan (for Hye Kyung), Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary (for Tyler), and Methodist Theological School in Ohio (for Paul) – have provided indescribable support amid the hardships of the global pandemic that gripped us over recent years.

This volume is essentially intended to put together unique voices and insights from various experts. At the same time, from historical-critical dissections to intertextual explications to theological (re-)readings, the essays presented here showcase how they can enrich one another and together contribute to moving current biblical scholarship forward. We hereby excitedly share the complete product, which we hope will testify to the comparable depth and breadth of Professor Sweeney's own scholarly works, in celebration of his seventieth birthday and anticipation of continuous works in many more years to come.

Hye Kyung, Tyler, and Paul

Table of Contents

Preface	V
Abbreviations	X
Introduction	1

Part 1. Historical Setting

<i>Christoph Levin</i>	
The Many and the One: Integrative Monotheism in Ancient Israel	13
<i>David L. Petersen</i>	
The Priestly Portrayal of Jacob in Genesis	35
<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
On the Relation Between Textual Criticism and Source Criticism in the Pentateuch	43
<i>W. A. M. Beuken</i>	
The Rhetoric of Hosea 1–2: An Agrarian Worldview Engaged in the Transmission of Prophetic Heritage	61
<i>Brent A. Strawn</i>	
<i>Vocatio Interrupta</i> : Jonah's Call, Jonah's Silence, and Form Criticism	77
<i>Bob Becking</i>	
"Jerusalem Will Become a Heap of Ruins": On the Ancient Near Eastern Background of an Image for Devastation in Micah 3:12	95
<i>Peter Machinist</i>	
The Dialogue of Pessimism Revisited	105

Part 2. Intertextuality

Stephen L. Cook

Merciful and Wrathful?

Innerbiblical Interpretation of Exodus 34:6–7 131

Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer

In Search of Jonathan:

The Curious Case of the Missing Prince in Modern Filmic Retellings

of the David Narrative 149

Margaret S. Odell

The Abominable Image:

Gillûlîm and the Theopolitical Roots of Idolatry in Ezekiel 165

Koog P. Hong

Seeing Manasseh in the Servant's Marred Face:

A Radical Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 53 181

Dalit Rom-Shiloni

Two Prophecies in Ezekiel (14:1–11; 24:6–8)

and One Source Text (Leviticus 17):

Notes on Intertextuality and Creative Interactions 195

James D. Nogalski

Haggai 2:17, 19:

Variations on a Theme 213

Steven S. Tuell

Exploded Riddles and Inverted Metaphors:

Subverting Tradition in Ezekiel and Zechariah 227

Part 3. Biblical Theology

Tamar Frankiel

Shall the Judge of All the Earth Not Do Justice? 241

Mark E. Biddle

“Shall the Judge of All the Earth Not Do What Is Just?” (Gen 18:25):

Theodicy and the Book of Jeremiah 255

Emmanuel Ukaegbu-Onuoha

Hagar's Life Matters: Reading Hagar's Story (Gen. 16:1-16; 21:9-21) with the Lenses of Shawn Copeland's Theological Anthropology Model and Its Implications for Black Bodies.....	271
---	-----

Louis Stulman

Writing to Survive: The Voice Returns in Jeremiah's Subversive Sefer.....	285
--	-----

Konrad Schmid

Orientalism and the Hebrew Bible: How the History of Science Dealt with the Historical Origins of the Idea of Laws of Nature	303
--	-----

Corrine Carvalho

"Unless You Have Utterly Rejected Us": Trauma, Poetry, and Theology in Lamentations	315
--	-----

Mariko Yakiyama

Pauline Understanding of "the Day of the Lord" in Relation to "the Day of YHWH" in the Book of Zephaniah.....	331
--	-----

List of Contributors	345
----------------------------	-----

Bibliography.....	347
Index of References.....	381
Index of Modern Authors	405

Abbreviations

AAWG.PK	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist.
AB	Anchor Bible
ABIG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
<i>AEL</i>	<i>Ancient Egyptian Literature</i>
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
<i>AHw</i>	<i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . Wolfram von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965–81
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by James B. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ASV	American Standard Version
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BBSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplemental Series
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibB	Biblische Beiträge
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BM	British Museum
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BSNA	Biblical Scholarship in North America
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTAT	Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments
BTCB	Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

<i>CAD</i>	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . 26 vols. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2006
<i>CahRB</i>	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
<i>CBOT</i>	Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CC</i>	Continental Commentary
<i>CEB</i>	Common English Bible
<i>ConBOT</i>	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
<i>COS</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2002
<i>CT</i>	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum
<i>CTN</i>	Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud
<i>CurBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by David J. A. Clines. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2014
<i>DDD</i>	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995. 2nd rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999
<i>DHI</i>	<i>The Dictionary of the History of Ideas</i>
<i>DMOA</i>	Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui
<i>DtrH</i>	Deuteronomistic History
<i>EI</i>	<i>Erets Israel</i>
<i>EKKNT</i>	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>FAT</i>	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FCB</i>	Feminist Companion to the Bible
<i>FOTL</i>	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
<i>FRLANT</i>	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>GAG³</i>	<i>Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik</i> . Wolfram von Soden. 3rd ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1995
<i>GPBS</i>	Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship
<i>GKC</i>	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arthur E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910
<i>HAE</i>	Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–99
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>HBM</i>	Hebrew Bible Monographs
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HCOT</i>	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>HeBAI</i>	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
<i>HKAT</i>	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HSM</i>	Harvard Semitic Monographs

HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUCASup	Hebrew Union College Annual Supplemental Series
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
IBHS	<i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by George A. Buttrick. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
IRT	Issues in Religion and Theology
ISV	International Standard Version
IVBS	International Voices in Biblical Studies
JAJ	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBQ	<i>Jewish Biblical Quarterly</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JHebs	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JRitSt	<i>Journal of Ritual Studies</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplemental Series
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods Supplemental Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
JTSA	<i>Journal of Theology for Southern Africa</i>
KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–69
KAR	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts</i> . Edited by Erich Ebeling. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919–23
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KEH	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
KJV	King James Version
KTA	Kröners Taschenausgabe
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LCBI	Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LXX	The Septuagint

MDP	Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse
MT	The Masoretic Text
MVVEG	Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft
NABR	New American Bible, Revised Edition
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NET	New English Translation
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NIVAC	NIV Application Commentary
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NJPS	<i>Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text</i>
NLT	New Living Translation
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OAN	Oracles Against/About the Nations
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
<i>OrAnt</i>	<i>Oriens Antiquus</i>
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
OTR	Old Testament Readings
OTS	Old Testament Studies
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>PAPS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>
PMRGEABS	Proceedings of the Metaphor Research Group of the European Association of Biblical Studies in Lincoln
POT	De Prediking van het Oude Testament
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
PTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
REB	Revised English Bible
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
RPT	Religion in Philosophy and Theology
RRCMS	Routledge Research in Cultural and Media Studies
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RTOT	Reading the Old Testament
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAN	Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica
SANE	Sources from the Ancient Near East
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SB	Sources bibliques
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series

SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBS	Suttgarter Bibelstudien
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Studies
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico</i>
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
Siphrut	Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SMRSHLL	Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis
SOTI	Studies in Old Testament Interpretation
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SS	Studia Samaritana
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature (Lang)
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
STJ	Studia Judaica
STS	Science and Technology Studies
STW	<i>Suhrkamp</i> Taschenbuch Wissenschaft
SubBi	Subsidia Biblica
SVMCS	Studies in Violence, Mimesis, and Culture Series
SVSK.HF	Skrifter Videnskapsseelskapet. Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse
SWBAS	Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series
TAD	Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt
<i>TC</i>	<i>TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism</i>
TCBAI	Transactions of the Casco Bay Assyriological Institute
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970–
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
TNK	(see NJPS)
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TVZ	Theologischer Verlag Zurich
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBBC	Wiley-Blackwell Bible Commentaries
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WW</i>	<i>Word and World</i>
YNER	Yale Near Eastern Researches
YOS	Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts
YSJMRC	Yuval: Studies of the Jewish Music Research Centre
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschriften der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZDPV</i>	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Introduction

The legacy of Hermann Gunkel cannot be underestimated in biblical scholarship, even after more than a century. Under his influence, Gerhard von Rad's form-critical acumen, Sigmund Mowinckel's psalmic liturgical setting, and Claus Westermann's biblical theological hermeneutics have paved significant terrains. The marquee successors of von Rad's, such as Rolf Rendtorff, Erhard Gerstenberger, Klaus Koch, Hans Walter Wolf, Wolfhart Pannenberg, and many more, have embraced and metamorphosed form-critical scholarship into various methods. Rolf P. Knierim, as one of von Rad's pupils, has made invaluable contributions not only in sharpening form-critical approaches but also bridging academic interchanges between the European continent and North America, as his transition from Heidelberg to Claremont illustrated. Marvin A. Sweeney has championed carrying such vital and generative legacies from Gunkel to von Rad to Knierim.

Sweeney's impact, however, goes beyond form criticism. As a devout Jew who took courses at one of the historic Protestant institutions, Princeton Theological Seminary, Sweeney opted to undertake a doctoral program at another Protestant one, Claremont, under a *Doktorvater* of German descent! Sweeney's interreligious passion, including Jewish-Christian collaborations, has thus been testified by his own life, more than bountiful writings. Like his own Christian teachers, including David Petersen for his first undergrad biblical course at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Sweeney has taught, mentored, and inspired numerous Christian, alongside Jewish, students. Thus, it is no surprise that Sweeney is respected as a preeminent scholar and a gracious colleague and caring teacher by many scholars, Jewish and Christian alike. Sweeney's exceptional mentorship and genuine friendship have further encompassed the differences of gender and race, as can be acknowledged by the diversity of the present volume's editors and authors.

This volume both takes up the legacy of Hermann Gunkel and honors Marvin Sweeney by addressing three central themes in biblical scholarship: historical settings, intertextuality, and biblical theology.

1. Historical Settings

This section traces and reassesses the multifaceted aspects relevant to the historical settings of the ancient texts, writers, and worlds. As the FOTL

(Forms of the Old Testament Literature) commentary series, including Sweeney's *Isaiah 1–39* and *Isaiah 40–66* volumes,¹ illustrates, historical settings entail diverse dimensions: not only the form-critical elements of genres, structures, settings (whether *Sitz im Leben* or *Sitz im Buch*), and concept but also the intertwined reconstructing methods, including textual criticism, source criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism, tradition history, archaeology, ancient Near Eastern texts, history of religion,² rhetorical criticism, and sociological criticism. Marvin Sweeney's scholarship has been foregrounded in this subfield, even as he innovatively advanced it into deeper and broader branches, such as *Isaiah 1–4 and the Post-Exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition*, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel*, as well as *The Twelve Prophets*, *Zephaniah*, *1 & 2 Kings*, and *Ezekiel* commentaries, plus countless articles on these approaches.³

The first contribution to Part 1, Christoph Levin's piece, "The Many and the One: Integrative Monotheism in Ancient Israel," seeks to demonstrate integrative monotheism in ancient Israel. It is not easy to discern between polytheism and monotheism in religions. Polytheism is deeply related to form a unity, while monotheism cannot avoid the many facets of the one God. Levin emphasizes the exclusive monotheism of the Israelites in the later time of the Second Temple period rather than earlier times. His interest lies in determining the religious diversity of the names of the divine and integrative monotheism in ancient Israel and Judah. He specifically insists on integrative monotheism in the Yahwist's history. He argues for multiple forms of the divine in the Yahwist's narratives, such as the three visitors to Abraham (Gen 18:1–6), Jacob's struggle at the brook Jabbok (Gen 32:23–33), the story of Balak and Balaam (Num 22–24), angel's ascending and descending at Bethel (Gen 28:11–19), the burning bush story of Moses (Exod 3:1–5) and more. Levin also points out the integrative tendency of the divine characters of

¹ Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39, with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*, FOTL 16 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); idem, *Isaiah 40–66*, FOTL 19 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016).

² Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, trans. K. William Whitney (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006 [1895]). See also Chris L. de Wet, "On Comparability: Critical Evaluation of Comparative 'Background' Studies between Biblical and Contemporary Southern African Contexts," *Religion & Theology* 22 (2015): 53.

³ Marvin A. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–4 and the Post-Exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition*, BZAW 171 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988); *The Twelve Prophets*, 2 vols., Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000); *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); *Zephaniah*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); *1 & 2 Kings: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007); *Reading Ezekiel: A Literary and Theological Commentary*, RTOT (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2013).

the myth in Egypt and Mesopotamia. His paper opens up the horizon of religious dialogue regarding the integrative and multiple forms of the divine, for example, the Trimurti of supreme divinity in Hinduism.

David L. Petersen, in "The Priestly Portrayal of Jacob in Genesis," dissects and expounds the priestly redaction (P) in the Jacob narrative (Gen 25:19–37:1). This study first notes five common features between Gen 28 and Gen 35, as both of these texts together envelope the two divine encounter episodes (Gen 28:10–22; 32:22–32) and Jacob's sojourn with Laban (Gen 29–31). Then, analyzing the complex ways these two framing texts allude to Gen 17, Petersen delineates unique priestly overtones, such as the genealogy, royal descendants of Jacob, and the like. In reapplication of the pre-priestly texts, P adumbrates the thematic continuity between Abraham and Jacob, while underscoring polemic against Bethel. Likewise, the priestly editorship in Gen 27:46–28:9, inserted prior to the pre-priestly version resuming in Gen 28:10, presents its more significant emphasis on Jacob as an obedient son instead of a trickster (cf. Hos 12), as well as his endogamous marriage.

Jeffrey Stackert's essay, "On the Relation Between Textual Criticism and Source Criticism in the Pentateuch," demonstrates the need for the study of non-Masoretic witnesses of the Pentateuch in the source-critical work of the Documentary Hypothesis. He examines several case studies in Exodus to argue that source-critical evidence "mutually informs" text critical analyses. In these cases, the non-Masoretic witnesses provide critical information at the seams between source materials such as J and E. Stackert also proposes that some of these textual variants occur as scribes clarify and harmonize texts at the places where originally independent sources have been interconnected.

W. A. M. Beuken, in the essay, "The Rhetoric of Hosea 1–2: An Agrarian Worldview Engaged in the Transmission of Prophetic Heritage," juxtaposes the communicative patterns of the marriage metaphor with the conceptualities of agrarian reading. The initial literary analysis observes how four constitutive passages (Hos 1:2–9; 2:1–3; 2:4–17; 2:18–25) construct an integral composition and message even given their divergent literary genres. An agrarian analysis then adds an essential lens in that these texts are connected by the territorial term אֶרֶץ, "land/earth," in Hos 1–2. Thus, the fates of Israel and Judah inherently link to the "land," as the children's names are associated with both territory and people. The "land" in Hos 1:1 alludes to war and desolation of the people, while in Hos 2:2 it signifies the people's recovery and reunion, together underscoring YHWH as the source of their life in the "land." Similarly, the marriage metaphor intertwines with Israel's wilderness wandering and entry into the "land." Accordingly, the agrarian concept of eventual restoration in the "land" merges with the theme of salvation history, highlighting the people's life in the "land" under God's protection.

Brent Strawn's essay, "*Vocatio Interrupta*: Jonah's Call, Jonah's Silence, and Form Criticism," argues that Jonah 1 and 3 use and ironically break the literary conventions of a prophetic call form for literary and theological purposes. Using Habel's delineation of the prophetic call, Strawn notes that the first two verses of Jonah 1 follow the typical pattern; then, the pattern is broken after the divine commission so that no verbal objection, divine reassurance, or sign is given. In Jonah 3, the pattern is interrupted again at the same point. Ultimately, the essay argues that this interruption affects the presentation of the prophet since Jonah attempts to escape the divine call. Further, what seems to be obedience by Jonah in 3:3 may not be so.

Bob Becking's study, "'Jerusalem Will Become a Heap of Ruins': On the Ancient Near Eastern Background of an Image for Devastation in Micah 3:12," explores a single verse in a Micah prophecy of doom, focusing on the motif of turning a city into a ruin. Becking highlights the presence of this theme in Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions and argues that the heap of ruins language represents divine, catastrophic punishment for disobedience. The author(s) of Micah adopts this concept – God punishing God's rebellious people – and threatens Jerusalem's elite with this fate.

In his "The Dialogue of Pessimism Revisited," Peter Machinist introduces a thoroughgoing and updated study on the structure and meaning of the Akkadian wisdom composition generally known as "The Dialogue of/on Pessimism." A fresh translation of the text (of the fuller Assyrian version instead of the Babylonian version) is followed by detailed notes and expositions. Machinist then expounds on the complex yet intricate structure. Underneath the ten stanzas of the dialogues between the master and his servant, there are five groups in pairs, each pair containing thematic opposition: for example, "going out to the palace" (stanza I) vs. "staying home to dine" (stanza II), "committing a crime: breaking up human relations" (stanza V) vs. "loving a woman: binding human relations" (stanza VI), and so on. While the logical progression concerning the organization is debated, Machinist further elucidates the movement from the public to the domicile affairs, toward the climactic group 5 (stanzas IX and X) – which not only extends from individuals and families to the entire country but ultimately withdraws to ambiguity in the servant's undermining the master's command. This abrupt breakdown of the progression is deliberate and coherent – as humor leaning toward satire – and reveals the servant as the real master.

2. Intertextuality

Part 2 of the volume describes comparative analysis of biblical literature that people can interpret with inner-biblical or non-biblical texts. Intertextual characters in various texts appear if readers consider that the texts already

contain multiple perspectives. The scholarly method of intertextuality impacts the study of biblical theology and scholars seeking semantic enhancement to improve textual meanings. It also encourages the readers of the biblical texts to deepen the relationship between biblical texts and their contexts by relying on a synchronic approach. Sweeney's work in biblical intertextuality is highlighted primarily in two monographs published in 2010 and 2014, respectively.⁴ He emphasizes the intertextual debates in the Pentateuch, Deuteronomistic History, prophetic literature, apocalyptic literature, Qumran texts, and Midrashic literature. Sweeney is concerned principally with the intertextual relationships between prophetic literature and biblical or non-biblical texts for Jews and Christians.

The first contribution in this section, Stephen L. Cook's "Merciful and Wrathful? Innerbiblical Interpretation of Exodus 34:6–7," explores the compact, theological formulation of these two verses in Exodus. He argues for a new rhetorical structure of the passage, divided into four two- and three-part lines, and the interpretive effects of this structure. Cook also explores the placement of these verses after Israel's bull apostasy as the covenant relationship is at risk. Finally, the essay concludes with a treatment of how these verses are taken up in later biblical texts.

Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer's essay, "In Search of Jonathan: The Curious Case of the Missing Prince in Modern Filmic Retellings of the David Narrative," investigates the essential yet disregarded character "Jonathan" through reception history in films and TV series. Over against the usual spotlights highlighting David's heroics or Saul's rivalry, Tiemeyer's study focuses more fully on Jonathan with respect to gender, loyalty, friendship, love, and more. Between David and Jonathan, the inconsistent depictions of Jonathan regarding camaraderie or enmity in film dramatizations relegate Jonathan as a foil to portray David as the rightful throne successor. Between Bathsheba and Jonathan, unlike the explicit descriptions of Bathsheba's sexuality, Jonathan's gender role frequently becomes ambiguous and incoherent, which Tiemeyer takes as evidence for Jonathan's love, more than loyalty or friendship.

The study by Margaret S. Odell, "The Abominable Image: גלולים and the Theopolitical Roots of Idolatry in Ezekiel," draws the intertextual relationship between biblical texts and Near Eastern context regarding the Hebrew term, גלולים, which is possibly translated idols in English. She focuses on the meanings of this term in the book of Ezekiel. גלולים could be understood not only in cultic but also in political and social vassalage relationship between Judah and Mesopotamia. Odell demonstrates how the term גלולים shifted

⁴ Marvin A. Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005; repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010); *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-biblical Literature*, FAT 89 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

from the royal image (*šalmu*), a feature of Mesopotamian royal iconography for absolute allegiance. She also points out the theopolitical nature of Josiah's reforms from the social-historic perspectives. Ezekiel also has the iconographic function within theopolitical context regarding the association of the גלולים with punishments for Judah's breaking of a covenant with Babylon. In addition, Odell demonstrates that the term גלולים etymologically originated from stone for engraving without the cultic understanding, but it can indicate royal agency around the Ezekiel period of ancient Mesopotamia. She emphasizes royal images of *šalmu* in imperial landscapes throughout Assyrian palaces. The image was to extend the king's presence and legitimize his rule to be found everywhere. Odell also presents the גלולים term as a symbol of Israel's inner shame in Ezekiel for political security, and she suggests a contemporary application of the term for broken politics today.

Koog P. Hong presents a radical reader-oriented intertextual reading between Manasseh of DtrH and the Suffering Servant of Isa 53 through René Girard's "scapegoat mechanism" in the essay, "Seeing Manasseh in the Servant's Marred Face: A Radical Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 53." Hong notes the prevalent "us" vs. "them" dynamics even extant in the Hebrew Bible, linked to the rituals of Lev 16, victimizing the "other" as the unclean, unchosen, or chaotic. In the community's tendency to create a scapegoat amid calamity, Dtr opted to victimize Manasseh. By the same token, the servant's deformity and victimization can be attributed to the same dynamics of social exclusion and scapegoating. As deification of the victim and divinization of the servant merge together between lynching mob and scapegoated victim, far more than the (individual or collective) identity of the servant, Hong opines that the singer of Isa 53 is singing a requiem for all victims who suffered for many. Amid the rampant hate culture, this analysis warns "us" against indiscriminately villainizing "others"; even within the Hebrew Bible, the Chronicler sought to restore the personhood of Manasseh, whose face Dtr abjectly erased.

Dalit Rom-Shiloni's study, "Two Prophecies in Ezekiel (14:1–11; 24:6–8) and One Source Text (Leviticus 17): Notes on Intertextuality and Creative Interactions," argues that Ezek 14 and 24 uses the text of Lev 17 but in differing ways. In Ezek 14, the structural framework and legal style of Lev 17 are used, but the content is different. In Ezek 24, the prophet manipulates the theme of Lev 17. These uses of Pentateuchal materials demonstrate Ezekiel's willingness to utilize the same priestly text within different passages for different purposes.

James D. Nogalski's contribution, "Haggai 2:17, 19: Variations on a Theme," examines two allusions to other prophetic texts within Hag 2. Haggai 2:17, which is probably a later insertion, adapts Amos 4:9, while Hag 2:19, which is syntactically awkward, draws upon Joel 1–2. Why refer to these earlier prophetic passages? These two allusions describe the change in

the fertility of the land, a theme within the Book of the Twelve, and demonstrate a contrast between the positive response of the people in Haggai and the negative responses of Israel earlier in Amos and Joel.

Steven Tuell's essay, "Exploded Riddles and Inverted Metaphors: Subverting Tradition in Ezekiel and Zechariah," examines the use of Ezekiel in the later book of Zechariah. Tuell argues that the editors of Zechariah use metaphors and images from Ezekiel but twist them to create new meanings. He considers the cooking pot metaphor in Ezek 11 and 24, which is subverted in Zech 12, and the image of the smelting furnace in Ezek 22, which is inverted in Zech 13.

3. Biblical Theology

The final section of this volume highlights theological approaches to the Hebrew Bible, addressing the themes of Jewish theology, justice, theophany, loss, and trauma. These diverse contributions confront significant ethical and theological challenges within the biblical text. Marvin Sweeney's interest in this subfield is found, for example, in his publications regarding Jewish Biblical Theology, including *Reading the Hebrew Bible after the Shoah* and *Tanakh: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. Both of these books take up the task of reading the Hebrew Bible as a Jewish biblical theologian in a post-Shoah world. In addition, they view the Hebrew Bible as addressing critical questions of theodicy, i.e., God's involvement in and relationship with evil, suffering, loss, and pain.

The first contribution to Part 3, "Shall the Judge of All the Earth Not Do Justice?" by Tamar Frankiel deals with theodicy in biblical narratives and Jewish traditions. Frankiel begins with the issue of divine justice in the narratives related to righteousness and justice in Genesis. She focuses on the paradigms and paradoxes in the narratives of Abraham's family and Moses. Frankiel emphasizes God's partnerships with humans and dimensions of justice. Her paper invites us to consider that theodicy is basically related to theism, which describes the meaning of God. God's character and divine purposes can exceed the definition of ethics from a human perspective.

Mark Biddle's study, "'Shall the Judge of All the Earth Not Do What Is Just?' (Gen 18:25): Theodicy and the Book of Jeremiah," examines inner-biblical dialogue in the book of Jeremiah related to the theodicy discourse that Marvin A. Sweeney often discusses in his studies and teaching and particularly in his monograph, *Reading the Hebrew Bible after the Shoah*. Biddle demonstrates the multiplicity of Jeremiah's voices regarding YHWH's theodicy relative to the guilty or innocent. Likewise, Abraham pleads with YHWH for Sodom to save the righteous in Gen 18. The theological understanding of theodicy widens the oracle of Jeremiah. Judah was punished

because of all the guilt of Jeremiah's audience in Jer 2–10. One notably recognizes a Jeremian theodicy in the voice of the oracles against Babylon (Jer 50–51). Biddle points out that even though YHWH continued to send warnings to Judea, their obstinate inability to recognize the alert caused the punishment. His study raises the question of how *all* can be the common targets of YHWH's judgment. Meanwhile, the standard question of the innocent remains to be discussed in the theodicy discourse.

Emmanuel Ukaegbu-Onuoha in his piece, "Hagar's Life Matters: Reading Hagar's Story (Gen 16:1–16; 21:9–21) with the Lenses of Shawn Copeland's Theological Anthropology Model and Its Implications for Black Bodies," interprets Hagar's stories (16:1–16; 21:9–21) from M. Shawn Copeland's anthropological approach to Black theology for today's issue of Black Lives Matter. Previous philosophers – Hume, Kant, or Hegel – viewed the bodies of Black people as "ugly, inferior, unintelligent, worthless except as property, instruments of production, breeding/reproduction, and sexual violence" that objectified the human body. Ukaegbu-Onuoha agrees with Copeland who insists on the body as subject. Hagar's role is to build up the matriarch of the "Hagarites" since her subject position could be found in a tenacious survival status. She becomes a historical subject. Her narratives metaphorically induce such issues as liberation, freedom, human rights, or justice. Ukaegbu-Onuoha draws the parallels of human rights advocacy between Hagar's narratives in the Bible and Black Lives Matter in recent years towards the discourse of a life as subjectivity. He insists that Hagar is a symbol of resistance because she refused to be treated as property in slavery laws and became a champion of rights. Likewise, African American female bodies crave for freedom and liberation for themselves and their future generations.

Louis Stulman highlights biblical voices that "testify to a God who resides on the margins with the wounded and the defeated," in his paper titled, "Writing to Survive: The Voice Returns in Jeremiah's Subversive *Sefer*." He points to the book of Jeremiah as a testimony of loss throughout his lament oracle in the history of trauma, not that of triumph. Stulman also describes the book as the meaning-making literature of the disasters of the Israelites instead of an artifact of memory. He insists that, unlike other prophets, Jeremiah used writing as a survival stratagem during serious moments of the prophet's life and the difficult history of Judah. According to Stulman, "Although Jeremiah's prophetic mission fails and his oracle speech is largely rejected, the written world, the *sefer*, persists as a resilient witness of God's faithfulness to the ill-treated prophet and his war-torn community." Stulman exemplifies Jeremiah's strategic usage of *sefer* in six places: Jer 25:1–14; 29:1–32, 30–31; 36:1–32; 45:1–5; and 51:59–64. For example, *sefer* confirms hope from the divine words to Jeremiah (30:1). *Sefer* functions as creation, recitation, rejection, and recreation of scrolls or the word of God (36:2). Stulman moreover points out that *sefer* texts in both the MT and the Greek of

Jeremiah, and its Hebrew *Vorlagen*, suggest “a sustained interest in the conversion of spoken prophecy to written prophecy, and perhaps a shift from prophetic to scribal authority.”

Konrad Schmid in his “Orientalism and the Hebrew Bible: How the History of Science Dealt with the Historical Origins of the Idea of Laws of Nature” aims to unravel how the history of science dealt with the historical origins of the idea of laws of nature in the ancient Near East and Israel. The laws of nature were previously and commonly treated as the discourse of Greek philosophy; however, Schmid argues that the idea of a legal organization of natural laws in ancient time was a product of the Babylonian and ancient Israelites. He begins with Edgar Ziesel’s research on the concept of natural laws in the pre-Greek history. Ziesel demonstrates that God determines natural laws in Job 28:25–26; 26:10; 38:10, 11; Ps 104:9; Prov 8:29; and Jer 5:22. According to Schmid, Ziesel lacks the history of science. He points out legal language to cosmic phenomena in Jer 31:35–36; 33:25–26; 38:12, 33; Ps 148:3–6. He also insists on natural and cosmic laws in Mesopotamia texts. He points out the ordering of celestial, Marduk’s supremacy over the divine word, and regularity of the celestial movements as Marduk’s legislative design. Schmid suggests the concept of the natural laws in Mesopotamia and ancient Israel was not normative, but descriptive.

Corrine Carvalho, in her “‘Unless You Have Utterly Rejected Us’: Trauma, Poetry, and Theology in Lamentations,” reconceives the ritual functions of Lamentations in light of the ancient Near East and its relevance in today’s world. After reviewing pertinent Sumerian liturgical laments, which had their esoteric origins by and for the male elites, Carvalho posits that they may have had public performative aspects as well. Comparatively, the poems of Lamentations ought not to be inspected merely as ancient artifacts, but instead can evoke communal memoirs of trauma and reenactments of outrage. Such voices that expose evil and subvert hegemony can be heard from those oppressed and assaulted even in today’s United States.

Mariko Yakiyama’s essay, “Pauline Understanding of ‘the Day of the Lord’ in Relation to ‘the Day of YHWH’ in the Book of Zephaniah,” compares and contrasts 1 and 2 Thessalonians and presents a thesis that rather than the imminence of parousia during the lifetime of the apostle Paul, “the day of the Lord” essentially emphasizes the importance of how to live faithfully in the present world. In this analysis, Yakiyama argues that the intertextual and thematic relationships between 1 Thessalonians (with its focus on salvation) and 2 Thessalonians (on judgment) mirror those between Isaiah and the Twelve Prophets, as the latter relations have been elucidated by Marvin Sweeney. Likewise, the day of the Lord in the LXX, especially Zephaniah, urges repentance and calls to worship with renewed faith in God’s sovereignty, which subsequently influenced Paul’s theology.

Part 1.
Historical Settings

The Many and the One

Integrative Monotheism in Ancient Israel*

Christoph Levin

Polytheism and monotheism are no strict alternatives. The conflicting experiences of existence which religion sets out to solve do not call in question the unity of the world, while conversely, the unity of the world cannot do away with the contradictions in our existence. A polytheistically shaped religion will not be able to avoid seeing the multiplicity of the divine as being nevertheless in some form a unity, and a monotheistically molded religion will not be able to avoid recognizing the many facets of experience of the world as reflecting in some way the ambiguity of the experience of the one God, thus to a certain degree calling his unity in question.¹ Religion does not necessarily follow the rules of a binary logic while trying to understand the foundations of being. In its relation to the situation it is rather aspectual and existential. This is true not only for the pre-modern world, but also today.

If polytheism and monotheism do not in this way constitute absolute alternatives, we should be hesitant about offering explanations of their relationship in the sense of a historical development, and about judgments along the lines of a lower or higher stage of religion. This is not to deny that in the history of religion a path did run from polytheism to monotheism. And on this path it has undoubtedly been shown that the monotheistic idea of God offers the greater challenge to thought, and that it also has the greater power soteriologically, as well as in regard to ethics.

* This essay is a revised English translation from the original German essay titled "Integrativer Monotheismus im Alten Testament," *ZTK* 109 (2012): 153–75.

¹ For a survey on the debate about the religion of Egypt, Greek, Assyria, and Israel/Judah, see Barbara N. Porter, ed., *One God or Many? Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World*, TCBAI 1 (Casco Bay, ME: Assyriological Institute, 2000), and Manfred Krebernik and Jürgen van Oorschot, eds., *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients*, AOAT 298 (Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2002).

1. Exclusive Monotheism as a Feature of Second Temple Judaism

Where Israel's religion is concerned, an explanation along the lines of a historical development seems at first sight to be inescapable, and this all the more since the study of the literary history has proved the unhistorical character of the biblical picture, according to which the demand for the exclusive worship of YHWH stood at the beginning of Israel's religious history – that the history linking Israel with its god began with the revelation on Sinai, when the god YHWH chose the Israelites to be his people, and committed them to worship him and him alone; but this picture has no foundation in historical reality. We know today that from the aspect of the history of religion this revelation-theology explanation, so to speak, is an anachronism, with which the Judaism of the Second Temple *ex post* created for itself a story about its origins.

Underlying this biblical picture, the scholarship of the last two centuries unearthed the actual history of the religion of Israel and Judah as it probably proceeded until the destruction of the First Temple. The reconstruction was initially made with the methods of source criticism, by way of a re-dating of the Pentateuch sources, later through a comparison with written witnesses from neighbouring civilizations, as these increasingly became known; and during recent decades more and more based on archaeology, epigraphy, and iconography. We know today that, religiously speaking, ancient Israel did not differ essentially from its ancient Near Eastern environment. As far as our present subject is concerned: as long as the First Temple was in existence, no explicit demarcation line was drawn against polytheism.

What is also of great importance is that in the period of the Second Temple, the religious norm was not monotheistic in the narrower sense. The commandment to worship the god YHWH exclusively – “I am YHWH your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage; you shall have no other gods besides me” (Exod 20:2–3 par. Deut 5:6–7) – is expressly occasioned by the existence of other gods. The “other gods” are not considered to be imaginary, as if idolatry would be related to entities existing only in the imagination of their erring worshippers. Instead the prohibition is directed against the worship of gods who really exist. The sin is concrete; whether it has to do with the worship of the Baalim, or whether the Israelites are reproached with having worshipped either the gods of the previous inhabitants of their country, or the gods of the neighboring peoples. In so far the Bible does not maintain a monotheism, but for the Judaism of the Second Temple propagates an exclusive monolatry. The polemical zeal with which the exclusive worship of YHWH is demanded is not directed to the outside world but serves the unity and cohesion of the people's own group.

It is only on the margin of the Hebrew Bible that the actual existence of other gods is disputed as well. The relevant assertions are confined to a few passages in the second part of the book of Isaiah (Isa 44:6; 45:5, 6, 14, 18, 21, 22; 46:9),² and – dependent on them – a few sentences in the late framework of the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 4:35, 39; 32:39).³ Even in these cases, it is a matter of dispute whether the pronouncement “I am YHWH, and there is no god besides me” should be interpreted in an absolute sense, as meaning “there is no god at all except me” or whether it has to do with the relation of God’s people to their God, i.e.: “For Israel there is no god except me.”

2. Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah

The program of exclusive monolatry which determined the period of the Second Temple and forms the focus of the biblical writings stands in remarkable contrast to the religious diversity which we can observe for the period of the Israelite and Judean monarchy.

An indication of this are the names. They show that in Israel the cult of the god YHWH was a relatively late phenomenon. The name Israel, which we first come across on the victory stele of the Pharaoh Merneptah which dates from about 1209 BCE, is related to the god El.⁴ There are no toponyms at all with YHWH as theophoric element. Instead we find place-names with El, such as Bethel and Jezreel, with Anat, such as Beth-anath (Josh 19:38; Judg 1:33) and Anathoth (1 Kgs 2:26; Jer 32:7), with the sun god, such as Bet-shemesh, and above all with the Baal, such as Baalah (Josh 15:9; 2 Sam 6:2), Baalath (Josh 15:29; 1 Kgs 9:18)⁵ and many others.

Among personal names, too, numerous references to the Baal can be found in the earlier period. Even two of King Saul’s sons had Baal names, Ishbaal (2 Sam 2:8; 1 Chr 8:33; 9:39) and Merib-baal (2 Sam 21:8), as well as one of his grandsons, Merib-baal Jonathan’s son (2 Sam 4:4; 1 Chr 8:34; 9:40). Names

² Reinhard G. Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterocesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55*, FAT 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), destroyed the basis for the usual dating of Deutero-Isaiah in the time of the Babylonian exile by proving that the Persian great king was not yet mentioned in the oldest literary stratum of the book. The book has hardly been written before the middle of the fifth century, and, to be more precise, probably in Jerusalem, because it is closely familiar with the liturgy of the temple.

³ See Matthias Albani, *Der eine Gott und die himmlischen Heerscharen: Zur Begründung des Monotheismus bei Deuterocesaja im Horizont der Astralisierung des Gottesverständnisses im Alten Orient*, ABIG 1 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).

⁴ Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature (AEL)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 2:73–78; *COS* 2.6:40–41 (James K. Hoffmeier).

⁵ See Nadav Na’aman, “Baal Toponyms,” in *DDD*: 140–41.

of this kind can also be frequently found epigraphically. In the ninth century even a reigning king of Israel, Baasha, bore a Baal name (1 Kgs 15:33). Over against this, we have Abijam, the son of Rehoboam, a king of Judah, who had a name related to Yam, the sea god (1 Kgs 15:1).⁶ This finding permits the deduction that the Canaanite pantheon (which we know best from the texts from Ugarit, which date from the fourteenth century BCE) were familiar in Israel and Judah too and played a part in cultic worship.

In fact nothing else is to be expected. For under Palestinian climatic presuppositions, a monotheistic idea of God would have contradicted experience more emphatically than would have been the case elsewhere. The abrupt change from the winter rains to the summer drought taught people that the divine forces which determine life were not continuously in power. The Ugaritic myths tell of the annual conflict between the weather god Baal and the sea god Yam, who embodies the chaos which is hostile to life.⁷ When Baal wins this struggle at the beginning of autumn, the vegetation period begins with thunderstorms. In this struggle he is supported by his sister and wife Anat.⁸ Toward the end of the vegetation period Baal is defeated by the god of death Mot,⁹ and is forced to descend to the underworld until in autumn he appears on the stage once more, as a contending god.

Because the unity of being remains constant in spite of the seasonal alternation of the god's death and resurrection, the Ugaritic pantheon also includes the father of the gods, El, and his wife Athiratu. El represents what has been aptly called the "the sacred world in the background."¹⁰ It is not by chance that the name El is the Semitic term for god *per se*.¹¹ El presides over the assembly of the gods, which is also depicted in the image of a royal family. He endorses the monarchy of the younger gods in their various victories, but does not intervene himself in the struggles between the rivals, so his sovereignty on earth is not efficacious in the direct sense.

A change begins in the middle of the ninth century with the Omri dynasty. The Canaanite pantheon shrinks in favor of the weather god. It is from that time only that the personal names formed with the name of YHWH begin among the kings of Israel and Judah, becoming the rule until the end of the

⁶ See Fritz Stolz, "Sea," in *DDD*: 737–42.

⁷ See *COS* 1:241–74 (Dennis Pardee); *ANET*, 129–42 (Harold L. Ginsberg).

⁸ See Peggy L. Day, "Anat," in *DDD*: 36–43.

⁹ See John F. Healey, "Mot," in *DDD*: 598–603.

¹⁰ Victor Maag, "Syrien – Palästina," in *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orient*, ed. Hartmut Schmökel, KTA 298 (Stuttgart: Kröner, 1961), 574, following Gerardus van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation: A Study in Phenomenology*, trans. John E. Turner, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 164–66 (§ 18, 3).

¹¹ See Wolfgang Herrmann, "El," in *DDD*: 274–80.

Israelite and Judean monarchies.¹² In seventh-century Judah, the YHWH names are far and away the most prevalent, epigraphically too.¹³

The concentration on the warlike weather god YHWH can best be explained by the growing strength of the Iron Age monarchy which in Israel begins with the Omride dynasty. With the powerful position of the warlike monarchs, the world of the gods changes too from an aristocracy to a monarchy. The weather god as the life-determining principle is given the key position. We can see this development also among Israel's neighbors, with the Ammonite god Milcom, the Moabite god Chemosh, and the Edomite god Qôs.¹⁴

However, the existence of what was virtually a monolatry at the king's court and in the royal cult does not mean that the rest of the pantheon disappeared. The myths about the periodic struggle of the gods – the conflict between the weather god and the chaos embodied by the sea – remained vital. The earliest psalms show with clarity that the resurrection and accession of the weather god continued to be celebrated in cultic drama at the autumn New Year festival until the end of Judah.¹⁵ Myths of this kind even underwent a vigorous revival in the late eschatology.¹⁶ There are also signs that the weather god continues to keep his sister-wife, even though no traces of this have been preserved in the Bible. As late as at the end of the fifth century, in the Jewish military colony in Egyptian Elephantine a goddess Anat-Yahu or Anat-Bethel was still worshipped as well as the god YHWH.¹⁷

¹² The change which is expressed therein has already been seen by Julius Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 7th ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1914), 100–101 with n. 3.

¹³ Compare the list presented by Johannes Renz, *Die althebräischen Inschriften, Teil 2: Zusammenfassende Erörterungen, Paläographie und Glossar*, HAE II/1 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995), 53–87; also Frederick W. Dobbs-Allsopp et. al., eds., *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 583–622; and Jeffrey H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions*, HSS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 47–63.

¹⁴ See Emile Puech, “Milcom,” in *DDD*: 575–76; Hans-Peter Müller, “Chemosh,” in *DDD*: 186–89; Ernst-Axel Knauf, “Qôs,” in *DDD*: 674–77.

¹⁵ See Reinhard Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott: Studien zur althebräischen Kultlyrik anhand ausgewählter Psalmen*, BZAW 387 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008); Friedhelm Hartenstein, “Wettergott – Schöpfergott – Einziger: Kosmologie und Monotheismus in den Psalmen,” in *JHWH und die Götter der Völker: Symposium zum 80. Geburtstag von Klaus Koch*, ed. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Martin Rösel (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 84–91.

¹⁶ See the famous presentation by Sigmund Mowinckel, *Psalmestudien II: Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie*, SVSK.HF 1921/6 (Kristiania: Dybwad, 1922); also Gunther Wanke, *Die Zionstheologie der Korachiten*, BZAW 97 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966), esp. 106–9.

¹⁷ Anat-Yahu: Arthur Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), No. 44:3 = Bezael Porten and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents*

In the early period even the god YHWH himself was not a single entity. This is actually shown by the renowned שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל: “Hear, O Israel, YHWH is our God, YHWH is a single one” (Deut 6:4). This programmatic assertion is neither a monotheistic acknowledgment in the sense of “Only YHWH is God,” nor is it a demand for the sole worship of the god YHWH, in the sense of “Only YHWH is *our* God.” The Hebrew text, rather, has the numeral אֶחָד, “one.” The antithetical relation to this is not “another god” but “several YHWHs.”¹⁸ We know today from inscriptions that YHWH was worshipped under various forms in various places. Just as there was the Baal of Tyre and the Baal of Ekron (2 Kgs 1:2), and many other Baalim, too,¹⁹ there was also the “YHWH of Samaria” and the “YHWH of Teman.”²⁰

At the same time, an incompatibility within the very personality of the god YHWH could arise. For the god YHWH could be worshipped simultaneously in two neighboring kingdoms which were from time to time locked in warlike conflict. From a religious viewpoint this meant that the god YHWH was divided, and thus YHWH, the god of Israel, went to war against YHWH, the god of Judah.²¹ This constellation is the background to the message which the book of Hosea directed against Israel – probably from a Judean perspective. In the introductory sign-act of the prophet’s marriage, YHWH proclaims: “You are not my people, and I am not your God” (Hos 1:9 txt. em.). This utterance probably still goes back to the eighth century, that is to say, when Israel and Judah existed side by side.

from *Ancient Egypt (TAD)* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1986–1999), B7.3:3; Anat-Bethel: Cowley No. 22:125 = *TAD* C3.15:128.

¹⁸ See Erik Aurelius, “Der Ursprung des Ersten Gebots,” *ZTK* 100 (2003): 7. Already Manfred Weippert, “Synkretismus und Monotheismus: Religionsinterne Konfliktbewältigung im alten Israel,” in *Jahwe und die anderen Götter: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des antiken Israel in ihrem syrisch-palästinischen Kontext*, FAT 18 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 1, assumes, that “the *šma’ Yisrā’el* [...] originally should rather fend off notions of different local forms of the god of Israel.”

¹⁹ See Wolfgang Herrmann, “Baal,” in *DDD*: 132–39; cf. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 1, trans. M. E. J. Richardson (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2001), 143–44.

²⁰ Documented in the inscriptions found in 1975/76 on pithos 1 and 2 from Kuntillet ‘Ağrūd which date from the ninth century BCE. See Graham I. Davies, ed., *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 78–82; Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions*, 277–98, esp. 277–97; and Erhard Blum, “Die Wandinschriften 4.2 und 4.6 sowie die Pithos-Inschrift 3.9 aus Kuntillet ‘Ağrūd,” *ZDPV* 129 (2013): 21–54.

²¹ See Herbert Donner, “Hier sind deine Götter, Israel!” (1973), in *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten*, BZAW 224 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 72: “Since ancient times the cult for YHWH was fragmented locally in the country.”

3. Integrative Monotheism in Ancient Israel and Judah

There are, basically speaking, two possible ways of replacing the religious diversity by the program of the exclusive worship of YHWH. The one is the polemical rejection of all deviating forms of divine worship; we find this formulated in the First Commandment: “You shall have no other gods besides me” (Exod 20:3 par. Deut 5:7). On the surface, this is the dominant way in the Bible. But the other possibility is for the god YHWH to take over the functions of other gods in addition to his own.

The two methods are not mutually exclusive. The *integrative monotheism* which comes into being through the adoption of further divine functions is even in a certain way the presupposition of exclusive monolatry, if that is not to become sterile and lose its relation to life. In fact the integration process preceded historically the exclusive monolatry which determined the religion of the Second Temple, and it belongs at least as much to the particular character of the Hebrew Bible as the latter.

The obvious example is the *שָׁמַע יְשׁוּעָאֵל* which has been already mentioned. This maintains nothing less than that the different forms of the god YHWH which existed in Israel and Judah and their individual regions are all forms of a single god, because YHWH is a single god, *אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה*.²² This *programmatic mono-yahwism* set a standard. It is not without good reason that the formula was later also understood in the sense of an acknowledgment of the uniqueness of God *per se*.

At the beginning it did not mean this. Most scholars today date this programmatic creed as belonging to the seventh century, and associate it with the policy of the Judean king Josiah (639–609 BCE), who after the collapse of the Assyrian empire probably set out to incorporate parts of the former province of Samerina into his own territory and, for this, caused a kind of Judean “all-Israel ideology” to be developed which eventually became the presupposition for the idea that the Judeans were God’s people, “Israel.”

A second example is what recent research discusses under the term the “solarization of YHWH.”²³ Several Psalms connect with YHWH statements and metaphors which otherwise used to be attributed to the sun god.²⁴ Another example is the relation between YHWH and El. It is one of the special features of ancient Near Eastern religion that the contours of a deity are not sharply

²² See Aurelius, “Der Ursprung des Ersten Gebots,” 11.

²³ See Hans-Peter Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments*, OBO 66 (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitäts-Verlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985); Bernd Janowski, “JHWH und der Sonnengott: Aspekte der Solarisierung JHWHs in vorexilischer Zeit,” in *Die rettende Gerechtigkeit: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments 2* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 192–219.

²⁴ See Deut 33:2; Pss 19; 72; 84:12; Isa 60:1–3; Hos 6:3, 5; Zeph 3:5; Mal 3:20.

drawn. This is also true of the concept of YHWH in Israel and Judah. In the Bible, the names YHWH and El/Elohim are used indiscriminately for one and the same god, although his individuality is emphatically maintained. We meet this in the texts with certainty from the seventh century onwards, and the variety of divine names persisted even in the era of the Second Temple, when the worship of several gods was subject to a strict prohibition.

In our ears the identification of YHWH and Elohim may not be surprising because *Elohim* is also the Hebrew term for god *per se*, and in the framework of monotheism the god YHWH has *per se* become the god whose individual name was increasingly avoided or paraphrased. Yet the role of the Canaanite god El was also retained, so that one can say that “the sacred background” and the weather god who dies and rises again coincide, just as in the Christian concept the annual cultic drama about the birth, death, and resurrection of the Son of God does not exclude the personal unity of the Son with God the Father. It is speculative, but not perhaps without meaning, that אֱלֹהִים, the Hebrew term for *god*, is a plural, which nevertheless as a rule is seen grammatically as a singular, and has mutated from being a *term* for god into being the *title* or *name* of what is from now on the only God²⁵ – besides the name יְהוָה, which is none the less still retained. Named by the plural אֱלֹהִים, the concept of the single god is integrative *per se*, so to speak.

In view of this multiple nomenclature, the weight given to the name of God is remarkable. The name is an expression of individuality. Perhaps God’s individuality is so much stressed because it was not in fact sharply delineated. In the Second Temple period, God was still talked about alternately as YHWH and Elohim; indeed even in late times a number of other names were added which, although they were rooted in earlier tradition, only now became more widespread in religious literature – for example, the name שֶׁנִּי in the book of Job, or the title אֱלֹהֵינוּ in the story about Abraham’s war with the kings (Gen 14:18, 19, 20, 22), which is one of the latest texts in the Torah in general.

4. The Yahwist’s History

A special representative of integrative monotheism is the *Yahwist’s History*, the basic document of the narrative in the Pentateuch. From its text it is possible

²⁵ See Erhard Blum, “Der vermeintliche Gottesname ‘Elohim,’” in *Gott Nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Philipp Stoellger, RPT 35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 97–119, against Albert de Pury, “Wie und wann wurde ‘der Gott’ zu ‘Gott’?” (ibid., 121–42), as well as against Konrad Schmid, “Differenzierungen und Konzeptualisierungen der Einheit Gottes in der Religions- und Literaturgeschichte Israels,” in *Der eine Gott und die Götter: Polytheismus und Monotheismus im antiken Israel*, ed. Konrad Schmid and Manfred Oeming, ATANT 82 (Zürich: TVZ, 2003), 11–39.

to deduce exegetically in a number of instances how the god YHWH assumes in himself other forms of the divine. This goes in line with the distinction between pre-editorial written sources and the editorial additions and comments of the Yahwist's redaction. According to what we know today, this took place as a reaction to the experience of the Jews in the diaspora,²⁶ but before the exclusive worship of YHWH became a doctrine, and it took place astonishingly as a matter of course, in no way mentioning the act of religious integration as such.

I shall begin with the visit of the three men to Abraham (Gen 18:1–16). To this story the Christian doctrine of the Trinity has been traditionally closely related. Andrei Rublev painted c. 1441 the icon of the Trinity on the basis of Gen 18.²⁷ The Moscow Synod of 1551 officially declared it the model for the orthodox Trinity icon. It shows the three angels sitting at a table under a tree. Abraham and Sarah are missing but the biblical origin is still recognizable.

Of course the story about Abraham's hospitality, if it is read in the context of its own premises, has nothing whatsoever to do with the Christian doctrine. And yet this kind of reception is not without foundation in the text itself.²⁸

1 *And YHWH appeared to him by the oaks of Mamre,*²⁹ as he sat at the door of his tent in the heat of the day. 2 He lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, three men were standing in front of him. When he saw them, he ran from the tent door to meet them, and bowed himself to the earth, 3 and said, <My lords>, *if I have found favor in your (sg.) sight, do not pass by your (sg.) servant.* 4 Let a little water be brought, and wash your (pl.) feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, 5 while I fetch a morsel of bread, that you (pl.) may refresh yourselves, and after that you (pl.) may pass on – *since you (pl.) have come to your (pl.) servant. So they said, Do as you have said.* 6 *And Abraham hastened into the tent to Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal [...], knead it, and make cakes. [...]* 8 Then he took curds and milk [...], and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree while they ate. 9 *They said to him, Where is Sarah your wife? And he said, She is in the tent.* 10 *He said, I will surely return to you in the spring, and Sarah your wife shall have a son.*

Abraham offers food and drink to three beings who, as the story goes on, show themselves to be more than human. They are in a position to prophesy that as a reward for his hospitality a son will be born to him, and this also comes about, contrary to anything that is humanly possible. They also save his nephew Lot

²⁶ See Christoph Levin, "The Yahwist: The Earliest Editor in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 126 (2007): 209–30; repr. in *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*, FAT 87 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 1–23.

²⁷ Now in the Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, Russia, Cat. No. 13012.

²⁸ See Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes im frühen Jahwismus," in *Im Gespräch mit dem dreieinen Gott: Elemente einer trinitarischen Theologie: Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Wilhelm Breuning*, ed. Michael Böhnke and Hanspeter Heinz (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985), 63–66.

²⁹ The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

by supernatural means from the wicked inhabitants of the city of Sodom, whom they punish in the form of a rain of fire from heaven (Gen 19).³⁰

Abraham meanwhile addresses the guest as if he sees only one of them. After the meal, the three men begin to speak to him, but it is then only a single person who promises Abraham that in a year he will have a son. This single person is the god YHWH. The whole scene falls under the heading of an epiphany of YHWH.

The contradiction remains unresolved. One can show that it goes back to a reinterpretation by a redactor – or, to be more exact, by the author of the Pentateuch source which we call the “Yahwist,” – of an already existing, written tradition about the visit of three divine beings to Abraham and Lot, which now becomes an epiphany of the god YHWH.³¹ In his reinterpretation, the redactor has kept the earlier tradition and inserted into it his own concept of God. The juxtaposition of, let us say, “polytheistic” tradition and Yahwistic interpretation shows that, for the editor, the three divine beings counted as compatible with the one YHWH. The parallelism did not present any logical problems to him. It was the Samaritan Pentateuch which for the first time felt the disruption to be one, and tried to correct the numerical shift.³² But this attempt could not succeed.³³ The three men are the one YHWH, and the one YHWH is the three men. And this without the identification in the text being named at all.

This integration of the divine is not a single case in the framework of the Yahwist’s Pentateuchal source; it is almost the rule. A second example is Jacob’s struggle at the brook Jabbok (Gen 32:23–33). While Jacob is attempting to ford the brook, he is attacked by a being whom the Hebrew text only calls שׂוֹנֵה, “any one, someone.”³⁴

³⁰ In Gen 19 the problem of the number occurs again. In v. 1 it is solved by adding שְׁנֵי הַמַּלְאָכִים, “the two angels,” in order to make a distinction between YHWH and two other figures who accompany him, see also v. 15aβ. Elsewhere in the story הָאֲנָשִׁים “the men” (vv. 5, 8, 10, 12, 16) are on stage.

³¹ For the redaction history of Gen 18, see Rudolf Kilian, *Die vorpriesterlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen literarkritisch und traditions geschichtlich untersucht*, BBB 24 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1966), 96–111; and Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist*, FRLANT 157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 153–58.

³² See *BHS* and the commentaries *sub loco*. The Greek translation goes in line with the Masoretic text.

³³ Between vv. 9 and 10 the break still remains. This time the Greek translation tried to harmonize it by changing it into the singular already in v. 9. However, the Samaritan Pentateuch goes in line with the Masoretic text.

³⁴ Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar: As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch*, rev. in accordance with the 28th German edition (1909) by Arthur E. Cowley, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960), § 139d; cf. Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, SubBi 14/2, 3rd ed. (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011), § 147b.

23 The same night he arose [...] and crossed the ford of the Jabbok. [...] 24 [...] *He took across the stream everything that he had.* [...] 25 [...] And someone wrestled with him until the breaking of the day. 26 When the man saw that he did not prevail against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh [...] 27 and said, Let me go, for the day is breaking. But he said, I will not let you go, unless you bless me. 28 *And he said to him, What is your name? And he said, Jacob.* 29 *Then he said, Your name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven with God and with men, and have prevailed.* 30 *Then Jacob asked him, Tell me, I pray, your name. But he said, Why is it that you ask my name?* And there he blessed him.³⁵

Jacob is strong enough to defeat this “someone” and to hold him fast. The “someone” only possesses power during the darkness. With the coming of dawn, he sees himself as threatened. Jacob uses the situation and compels the “someone” to bless him. The “someone” then blesses him, that is to say he shares his strength with him, strength which is evidently more than human. The scene is reminiscent of a fairy tale in which the hero is victorious over a demon. In this case it would be the demon of the brook Jabbok who denies the wanderer a passage over the ford.

In the form in which we have it today, the scene has been expanded by a dialogue. The “someone” asks Jacob his name. When Jacob tells him, his interlocutor answers: “Your name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel.” The patriarch is given the name of God’s people. He becomes their representative. In the context it becomes indubitably clear that only the god YHWH could have made such a change in the name. That means that the blessing which Jacob extorts from the demon becomes the god YHWH’s blessing. YHWH absorbs this demon’s function, the demon being obviously superhuman, even if not in the full sense divine.

Understandably enough, later theologians had difficulty with this interpretation. That touches especially on the statement that Jacob has defeated the demon, which is now to say: the god YHWH himself. Consequently the text was expanded so that, although Jacob is the victor, he leaves the arena with a wound, and is astonished that he is still alive, although he “has seen God face to face” (vv. 26b, 31).

A third example of this kind, also in the Yahwist source, is the story of how Balak, the king of Moab, hires the seer Balaam to curse the Israelites, but YHWH turns his words upside down: Balaam has to bless Israel (Num 22–24). Balaam’s original oracle reads as such:

³⁵ For the redaction history of Gen 32:23–33, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 250–54. The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

The oracle of Balaam son of Beor,
 the oracle of the man whose eye is opened, [...]
 who sees the vision of וַיִּבֶן,
 falling down, but having his eyes uncovered:
 how fair are your tents, O Jacob,
 your encampments, O Israel!
 Like valleys that stretch afar,
 like gardens beside a river. (Num 24:3b, 4b–6a)³⁶

For this blessing the seer Balaam refers to a vision of Shaddai. This reference coincides strikingly with the Aramaic Balaam inscription found in 1967 at *Tell Deir ‘Alla* in the Jordan Valley, which goes back to the seventh century BCE.³⁷ In this inscription Balaam describes how in a vision he witnesses the celestial council of the Shaddai gods – they are in the plural – with the sun goddess.³⁸ Listening to their debate, he learns of the nefarious plans of the sun goddess. In the original biblical version too, the seer Balaam refers to the Shaddai gods, as he does in the non-biblical version. But in today’s text his oracle has been expanded, and it now refers to YHWH:

like <tents> that YHWH has <pitched>,³⁹
 like cedar trees beside the waters. [...]

Blessed be everyone who blesses you,
and cursed be everyone who curses you. (Num 24:6b, 9)

Again we can see that YHWH has absorbed into himself another religious appearance, in this case even a whole group of lower gods.

The integration of Elohim is less spectacular but none the less remarkable. In the well-known vision, which is linked in the tradition with the establishment of the sanctuary at Bethel, the dreaming Jacob sees a *ziggurat*, at which the angels of God (Hebr. מַלְאָכֵי יְהוָה) ascend to heaven and descend to earth (Gen 28:11–19). From this he recognizes the holiness of the place.⁴⁰

³⁶ For the redaction history of Num 22–24, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 383–87.

³⁷ First published by Jacob Hoftijzer and Gerrit van der Kooij, *Aramaic texts from Deir ‘Alla*, DMOA 19 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1976). English translation COS 2:27 (Baruch A. Levine).

³⁸ For the reading, see Manfred Weippert, “Der ‘Bileam’-Text von Tell Dēr ‘Allā und das Alte Testament,” in *Jahwe und die anderen Götter* (see n. 18), 163–88; Erhard Blum, “Die Kombination I der Wandinschrift vom Tell Deir ‘Alla. Vorschläge zur Rekonstruktion mit historisch-kritischen Anmerkungen,” in *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Rainer Albertz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Ingo Kottsieper et al., AOAT 350 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 573–601.

³⁹ The reading follows the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Greek translation.

⁴⁰ For the redaction history of Gen 28:11–22, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 216–20. The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

11 And he came to a certain place, and stayed there that night, because the sun had set. [...] 12 And he dreamed that there was a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God were ascending and descending on it. 13 *And behold, YHWH stood above it and said, I am YHWH, the God of your father Abraham and the God of Isaac.* [...] 15 *Behold, I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land.* [...] 16 *Then Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, Surely YHWH is in this place; and I did not know it.* 17 And he was afraid, and said, How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven. [...] 19 And he called the name of that place Bet-El (“House of God”).

The Yahwistic editor has expanded this tradition through a divine speech which the god standing at the top of the *ziggurat* proclaims. He begins with the formal self-introductory formula “I am YHWH, the god of your father Abraham and the god of Isaac.” With these words Elohim is explicitly identified with the god YHWH. Earlier exegesis put the change in the divine name down to the sources, not the edition, i.e., traced it back to the differing linguistic usage of the different sources of the Pentateuch. But in doing so it missed the point, from the aspect of religious history: the two names for God do not stand parallel to each other; they are integrated.

The same thing is true in the revelation to Moses at the burning bush (Exod 3:1–5). It is also non-homogeneous, from a literary point of view.⁴¹

1 Now Moses was keeping the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro, *the priest of Midian*; and he led his flock to the west side of the wilderness, and came [...] into the desert. 2 *And the angel of YHWH appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush*; and he looked, and lo, a bush was burning, yet the bush was not consumed. 3 *And Moses said, I will turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burning.* 4 *When YHWH saw that he turned aside to see*, God called to him out of the bush, Moses, Moses! And he said, Here am I. 5 Then he said, Do not come near; put off your shoes from your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground. [...] 7 *Then YHWH said, I have seen the affliction of my people who are in Egypt, and have heard their cry [...]* 8 *and I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land to a good and broad land.*

When Moses approaches, Elohim speaks to him out of the burning bush, and points him to the holiness of the place: “He looked, and lo, a bush was burning, yet the bush was not consumed. [...] And God called to him out of the bush, Moses, Moses!” Today the scene is introduced as an appearance of the angel of YHWH, and Elohim’s speech is interpreted as YHWH’s: “When YHWH saw that he turned aside to see, Elohim called to him out of the bush.”

A similar encounter between Moses and God is told as the revelation on the mountain of God (הַר הָאֱלֹהִים) in the desert of Sinai (Exod 19:2–34:28*).⁴²

⁴¹ For the redaction history of Exod 3, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 326–33. The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

⁴² For the redaction history of Exod 19–34, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 362–69. The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

19:2 And when (the Israelites) set out from Rephidim and came into the wilderness of Sinai, they encamped in the wilderness; and there Israel encamped before the mountain. 3 And Moses went up to God. [...] 24:18 [...] And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights. [...] 34:5 *And YHWH descended in the cloud and stood with him there. And he proclaimed the name of YHWH,* [...] 9 *and he said, If now I have found favor in your sight, my lord, I pray you, may go my lord in the midst of us.* [...] 28 *And he was there with YHWH forty days and forty nights.* He neither ate bread nor drank water.

Traditionally, the mountain is the dwelling place of Elohim. However, when Moses climbs up, the God on his part descends from heaven, and it is not Elohim, but rather YHWH, who is going to meet Moses and to assure him of his assistance.

It is with this presupposition that the double term **יהוה אֱלֹהִים** in the second creation account (Gen 2:5–3:24) may be explained.⁴³

5 When no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up – *for YHWH God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the ground* – [...] 7 then YHWH God formed man [...] *from the ground*, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. [...] 8 And YHWH God planted a garden in Eden, in the east; and there he put the man whom he had formed. ...

The term YHWH-Elohim is unquestionably not original, but it can hardly go back to the redaction which put together the two Pentateuchal sources, as used generally to be thought. Instead I assume that the original account had Elohim as subject, and the Yahwistic editor equated Elohim with YHWH. Again this took place without any particular pointer, as being a matter of course, religiously speaking.

The story about the wooing of a wife for Isaac (Gen 24) gives a clue to the further framework of this redaction, in the context of the history of religion. When the aged Abraham charges his servant to woo a wife for his son Isaac among the relatives living in northern Syria, he makes him swear an oath “by YHWH, the god of heaven and of the earth” (Gen 24:3, 7). This title is otherwise found only in texts dating from the Persian period,⁴⁴ and outside the Hebrew Bible in the Elephantine papyri.⁴⁵ Using this title, it seems obvious that

⁴³ For the redaction history of Gen 2–3, see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 82–92, and idem, “Genesis 2–3: A Case of Innerbiblical Interpretation,” in *Genesis and Christian Theology*, ed. Nathan MacDonald et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 85–100; repr. in *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*, FAT 87 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 51–64. The part of the text that was added by the Yahwist (or: editor J) is marked by italics.

⁴⁴ Hebrew: Jonah 1:9; Ps 136:26; Ezra 1:2 (par. 2 Chr 36:23); Neh 1:4, 5; 2:4, 20; see also Deut 3:24; Josh 2:11; Mic 6:6; Ps 92:9; Lam 3:41; Dan 4:34; 5:23; Aramaic: Ezra 5:11, 12; 6:9, 10; 7:12, 21, 23; Dan 2:18, 19, 37, 44; Greek: Jdt 5:8; 6:19; 11:17; Tob 7:13; 8:5.

⁴⁵ Cowley No. 30:2, 27–28; 31:2 (txt. em.); 32:3–4; 38:2 (txt. em.), 3, 5; 40:1; cf. 30:15; = TAD A4.7:2, 27–28; A4.8:2 (txt. em.); A4.9:3–4; A4.3:2 (txt. em.), 3, 5; A3.6:1; cf. A4.7:15.