Introduction

Purpose

Most commonly translated in English Bibles as "jealousy," in French as *jalousie*, and in German as *Eifersucht*, the Hebrew noun קנאה and its related verbal and adjectival forms typically appear in biblical passages describing social relations and interactions, especially conflicts, within communities. The attitudes and reactions of those involved in these relational conflicts are often described by the biblical authors as being motivated by קנאה. In Gen 26, the Philistines' behavior toward Isaac is driven by קנאה when they sabotage the patriarch's wells. In Gen 37, קנאה motivates the brothers of Joseph to orchestrate his removal from the household. In Num 5:11–31, a husband is motivated by קנאה when he suspects his wife of adultery and brings her before a priest to perform a procedure that will determine her guilt or innocence. The term קנאה is also adapted into religious terminology to describe divine behavior and attitudes toward the Israelites. In the Hebrew Bible, Yahweh is understood as a god who expresses and embodies קנאה, whether it be against foreigners who attempt to usurp his authority (e.g., Ezek 36:5–6) or against Israelites who maintain the cult of a foreign deity (e.g., Deut 32:16, 21). It is in the latter context that the obligation of exclusivity in the divine–human relationship, perhaps the best known of the word's connotations, is expressed through the term קנאה. In the Decalogue, Yahweh is identified as an אל קנא who will not tolerate the worship of other deities (e.g., Exod 20:2–6// Deut 5:6–10). Biblical Hebrew קנאה is also used by supplicants to express their acknowledgment of Yahweh's prerogatives (e.g., Num 25:11–13).

Scholarly approaches to קנאה, whether applied as a divine or human expression, have primarily focused on its representation as an internal state, reflecting feelings of what a modern interpreter might call jealousy, envy, or zeal. As we will discuss throughout this work, this understanding of קנאה imposes a perspective embedded in modern psychological concepts that may have been foreign to these ancient authors. Here, we will show that the term in fact reflects categories of experience and cultural values unique to the world of the biblical authors that

are not easily translated into a modern interpreter's point of view. The intention of this work is to reframe our understanding of קנאה by highlighting its social significance and meaning and by contextualizing how it reflects and reorients social relationships and hierarchical structures. What we will find is that קנאה often appears when rights and expectations seem violated or threatened, particularly when the violation involves the unjustified transfer of such rights to someone else. In these passages, the offended individual(s) react(s) in a way that arises from and are largely determined by certain prescriptions inherent in and sanctioned through the social norms reflected in the Hebrew Bible.

History of Interpretation

In the Hebrew Bible, the root קנא occurs a total of 85 times. Among these attestations, it is explicitly attributed to Yahweh 41 times, while in the remainder, it is attributed to nondivine and/or human subjects. The noun קנאה is attested 43 times, while the adjective קנוא/קנא is attested eight times—in its adjectival use, it appears only as a divine attribute, which is commonly translated as "jealous (God)." The verb קנא occurs 28 times in the D-stem and four times in the C-stem. We will refer to these verbal iterations by the common noun קנאה for the basis of discussion, unless explicitly referring to its adjectival form (קנוא/קנא).

The Lexica

Before we explore how the various lexica treat and categorize קנאה, we should note that it is not the intent of this study to frame our analysis of biblical קנאה as primarily an issue of translation. The problems and inconsistencies of translations of the term in English Bibles and dictionaries are merely indicative of a larger interpretive issue stemming from undervaluing the social significance of the term. However, in order to provide a complete picture of where scholarship stands today, this study will present the lexical treatments to demonstrate the interpretive complexity of the term and to show how secondary, in fact foreign, concepts have been imposed upon it in translations that overlook its full context.

Etymological investigations of Biblical Hebrew קנאה have been fraught with difficulties. There exists little definitive evidence from early West Semitic to clarify its origins and semantic development, and the limited data from East Semitic are not easily incorporated into treatments of the term.[1] Early

---

1. For example, E. Reuter asserts that etymological investigations of קנא are unproductive ("קנא," *TDOT* 13:48). So also Küchler, "Der Gedanke des Eifers Jahwes," 42–43. In addition to sparse comparative data, another aspect of this root that may cause etymological difficulties is

interpretations relied primarily on the translations of the term found in the Septuagint, which most often rendered קנאה in Greek with variations of nominal ζῆλος and its verbal counterpart ζηλοῦν.[2] The reflex of the lexeme ζηλ- in English is "zeal," which resembles its meaning in Biblical Greek, but the word has a variety of different nuances, including admiration, sexual jealousy, and emulation in both Classical and Biblical Greek.[3] Among the lexica, the renderings proposed in these entries are largely influenced by the Greek renderings and include emotion language related to expressions of jealousy, including envy and zeal.[4]

---

the ambiguity created by its final *aleph* (III-א). Historically, it is not uncommon for final *aleph* roots to be indistinguishable from other final weak roots, thus complicating the process by which scholars identify attestations. While the root קנא does occur in later dialects of Aramaic, it has yet to be discovered in Old Aramaic or Official Aramaic texts. Lexical entries for קנא in Syriac include translations "jealousy," "zeal," and "envy" (Sokoloff, *Syriac Lexicon*, 1379). Other late West Semitic attestations include Ge'ez *qan'a*, "to be envious, be jealous, be zealous, be eager, emulate, imitate" (Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez*, 433), Modern South Arabian Mehri *qáynə* (Johnstone, *Mehri Lexicon*, 232), Shehri (Jibbali) *qéni*, "to be jealous (of)" (Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon*, 147), and Soqotri *qn'* ("être jaloux") (Leslau, *Lexique soqotri*, 377). Arabic attests to a root *qn'*, which means "to become intensely red," as in a man's beard (perhaps by dye) or a person's extremities (Lane and Lane-Poole, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, 2565), but the relationship between Hebrew קנאה and Arabic *qn'* is semantically unclear (Kogan, *Genealogical Classification of Semitic*, 89 n. 265). A recent article by Gérard Nissim Amzallag proposes that the original context of Biblical Hebrew קנאה in Semitic languages was metallurgic and acquired a secondary meaning dealing with the feeling of jealousy ("Furnace Remelting," 240, 248). He follows G. R. Driver, who notes that the term occurs in the Cairo Geniza's Ben Sira (12:11) with a metallurgic meaning and suggests that this reflects the original Hebrew manuscript ("Hebrew Notes," 276). However, these conclusions cannot be supported since the available Ben Sira fragments found at Qumran do not contain this passage. Moreover, the Greek manuscripts of Ben Sira reflect an original חלאה, "rust; copper" (Ezek 24:6, 11). Finally, no other cognate languages explicitly attest to a metallurgic meaning of the root. Although Arabic does suggest a meaning related to the color red, the relationship between Biblical Hebrew קנאה and Arabic *qn'* is uncertain, and it is more probable that the Arabic acquired a secondary meaning. Since the writing of this manuscript, Matthew Richard Schlimm came to similar conclusions regarding Amzallag's argument and goes into great detail on the various issues with the linguistic evidence used by Amzallag ("Jealousy or Furnace Remelting"). Further, in consideration with the Akkadian cognates, it is more likely that the semantic range of the proto-Semitic root involved the emotion concept roughly resembling English jealousy. We will discuss the value of the Akkadian data in the next chapter.

2. The only exceptions being Deut 32:16 (παροξύνειν), Ps 105:16 (παροργίζειν), Ezek 36:5 (θυμός), Prov 3:31 (κτᾶσθαι) and 14:30 (καρδία αἰσθητική).

3. LSJ, 75. In classical literature, ζῆλος can indicate emulation, jealousy, zeal, admiration, and a number of similar emotions. For a study of ζῆλος in Classical Greek, see Sanders, *Envy and Jealousy*, 46–57. On a summary of ζῆλος in Biblical Greek, see Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 25–43. See also "zeal for the law" in 1 Macc 2:24, 26, 27, 50, 54, 58. There are a few instances in Ben Sira where ζῆλος resembles "envy" (compare Sir 37:10; 45:18).

4. In many modern readings of קנאה, jealousy and envy are casually used as synonyms, while zeal is treated separately. See, for example, *BDB*, 888; *HALOT* 2:1109–10. For a fuller treatment on the various translations of קנא in the Hebrew Bible, see Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 8–20. For a critique of the inconsistences in the translations of קנא in biblical scholarship and the laxity of usage of envy and jealousy in American English, see Elliot, "God—Zealous or Jealous," 80–82.

For example, *The Brown–Driver–Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (*BDB*) provides four possible and distinct translations for the D-stem: "to be jealous of," "to be envious of," "to be zealous for," or "to excite to jealous anger."[5] The C-stem is translated "to provoke to jealous anger." While *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (*HALOT*) provides a similar semantic range for the term, its presentation of קנא provides no distinction between instances of "envy," "jealousy," and "rage," and instead organizes the verbal attestations on the grammatical construction of the verb (קנא ב־, קנא ל־, קנא את־).[6] As for the nominal attestations, three translations are given for קנאה, all dealing with some nuance of jealousy, zeal, and anger in both *BDB* and *HALOT*.[7] קנא/קנוא, which is only attested as an attribute of Yahweh, is translated as "jealous" or "zealous" both in the lexica and in various English translations of passages in which this term is attested.[8] We will go into further detail on the limitations of these translations from an anthropological perspective in the following chapter, but for now it is significant to note that the presentation of קנאה in the lexica generally assumes that the expression is closely related to, if not dependent upon, its Greek rendering and primarily present the term and related attestations as a feeling or internal state related to jealousy, envy, and zeal.

Interpretations of קנאה

In treatments of קנאה in biblical scholarship, considerable attention is paid to its use as a divine or religious expression that is provoked by apostasy, idolatry, or foreign threats.[9] In comparison, there exists minimal investigation of nondivine attestations of the term, even among commentators.[10] Although instances of per-

---

5. *BDB*, 888.

6. *HALOT*, 2:1109–10. For example, under קנא meaning 1.a. (with accusative את), *HALOT* does not differentiate between to be envious (*beneiden*) and to be jealous (*eifersüchtig sein*); although the two English expressions and German equivalents share a family resemblance, they generally have slightly different meanings. More precise definitions of envy and jealousy acknowledge that the two expressions involve responses to different social situations. For the distinction between envy and jealousy, see Clanton, "Jealousy and Envy," 411, 421; East and Watts, "Jealousy and Envy." According to these interpretations, envy is experienced when one desires something another person possesses and may involve feelings of resentment. The motivation of envy is not to protect a valued relationship or to assert a personal right, as is often the case with jealousy.

7. *BDB*, 888; *HALOT*, 2:1110.

8. *BDB*, 888; *HALOT*, 2:1110. See also Exod 20:5; 34:14 in NET, NJPS, NKJV, and NRSV.

9. For example, Küchler, "Der Gedanke des Eifers Jahwes"; Bernhardt, *Gott und Bild*, 86–96; Brongers, "Der Eifer des Herrn Zebaoth"; Renaud, *Je suis un dieu jaloux*; Dohmen, "'Eifersüchtiger ist sein Name'"; Elliot, "God—Zealous or Jealous"; Kim, "Yhwh as Jealous Husband"; Amzallag, "Furnace Remelting."

10. See, however, Wagner, *Emotionen*, 75–100, who provides an exploration of both divine and nondivine expressions of קנאה in order to understand the metaphorical underpinnings of such expressions and compare with German expressions of *eifer*.

ceived sexual jealousy in the Hebrew Bible, such as the jealousy of a husband in Num 5:11–31, have incited much debate, the goal of these discussions is to illustrate how the social model of marriage relationships was adapted by biblical authors to describe Yahweh's jealous relationship with Israel.[11] Clarifying what it means to be a קנא אל, a god who embodies קנאה, has occupied biblical scholarship for generations as scholars have framed the obligation of exclusivity in ancient Israelite religion through Yahweh's expression of קנאה.[12] Most significantly, religious exclusivity is traditionally viewed as the main tenet of ancient Israelite monotheism.

One of the first academic works on this topic, written by Friedrich Küchler (1908), suggests that the original use of קנאה was in the context of conjugal relationships. In his examination, Küchler argues that the term was transferred to the religious realm to understand Yahweh's reaction to idolatry and the veneration of images. He makes an explicit connection between קנאה and the book of Hosea, a work that adopts the metaphor of marriage in its presentation of the relationship between the Israelite deity and the Israelites.[13] In this scenario, Israel is understood as the adulterous wife of Yahweh. His theory was later contested by Hendrik. A. Brongers (1963), who notes in his study that the book of Hosea, which provides rich material on the divine marriage metaphor, never uses קנאה to describe Yahweh's reaction to Israel's religious infidelity. Brongers argues that the original meaning of קנאה did not deal with conjugal or sexual love.[14] Instead of attempting to find resemblances between divine and nondivine קנאה, Brongers categorically disassociates the two, contending that divine קנאה is not grounded in human emotions, such as envy or jealousy. Instead, it should be interpreted "als Ausbruch von Grimm und Wut über Rechte, die verletzt wurden."[15] At least with regard to its use as an expression of religious exclusivity, Brongers situates the term in a more juridical context in which the protection of rights and honor is the primary concern.

The same year that Brongers published his article on divine קנאה, Bernard Renaud published *Je suis un dieu jaloux* (1963), the first and only monograph to date devoted entirely to attestations of divine קנאה in the Hebrew Bible. In his theological study,[16] Renaud identifies the relationship of love that Yahweh maintains with his elected people as the origin of divine jealousy.[17] According

---

11. For example, Anne Katrine de Hemmer Gudme analyzes Num 5:11–31 through its relation to the divine marriage metaphor ("Kind of Magic," 162–68).

12. See von Rad, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1:203–12 (208).

13. Küchler, "Der Gedanke des Eifers Jahwes," 43, 47.

14. Brongers, "Der Eifer des Herrn Zebaoth," 281–82.

15. Ibid., 284.

16. Renaud prioritizes the theological aspects of divine קנאה as a means to clarify Yahweh's role as "savior" and "redeemer" of his people (*Je suis un dieu jaloux*, 10).

17. Renaud, *Je suis un dieu jaloux*, 41, 47.

to Renaud, divine jealousy developed as a way of explaining the commandment of exclusivity (Exod 20:3 //Deut 5:7), which should be understood through Yahweh's exclusive "love" for his people. In this schema, betrayed love results in the arousal of divine jealousy and wrath. According to Renaud, Yahweh is jealous not because betrayal might cause the loss of his privileges—that is, because it would be in his self-interest to be jealous—but because it betrays the divine love on which the covenant is founded and is a direct rejection of Yahweh himself.[18]

In these interpretive treatments of קנאה, there is little discussion on the relationship between divine and nondivine קנאה. In fact, interpretive treatments of the word avoid understanding divine expressions of קנאה through the lens of human jealousy.[19] In these investigations, attestations of nondivine קנאה are primarily identified as emotion states[20] that are incongruent with קנאה in divine contexts.[21] For example, in his study of קנאה, Renaud excludes data where nominal and verbal attestations of קנאה are attributed to nondivine subjects. He asserts that while divine קנאה most likely derived from human קנאה, the term was transposed religiously and had significantly evolved from its (primarily pejorative) human counterpart to separate it from a common meaning, thus elevating divine over nondivine jealousy.[22]

---

18. According to Renaud, this is not like the jealousy experienced by pagan gods, who express jealousy as a defensive mechanism to protect the privileges of the deity (ibid., 39–40). Renaud analyzes divine קנאה on a case-by-case basis, using text and source criticism to interpret the context of the passages. Developing a diachronic study of the expression, he divides the texts into four main stages: primitive texts, the Deuteronomic movement, exilic literature, and passages from the postexilic period. To Renaud, divine קנאה is a passionate and violent emotion that underwent a profound semantic transformation throughout Israelite history. At first a destructive and punitive emotion in the preexilic texts, it came to develop a more tempered meaning that represented Yahweh's ability to protect his people. Renaud posits that the meaning of קנאה was transformed in order to understand Yahweh's role in shaping history after Jerusalem was ravaged by foreign powers and the people were forced to live in exile in Babylonia (ca. 586 BCE) (ibid., 25). According to Renaud, the destructive connotation of קנאה was tempered by the use of vocabulary related to Israel's redemption, so that Yahweh's jealousy became a means not for punishment but for salvation. However, over the course of this work we will see that this has less to do with semantic variation and change and more to do with the historical and social concerns of the authors. While the basic meaning of the expression remains consistent, the context in which it is used varies.

19. See, for example, ibid., 17, 25. For a summary of the history of scholarship on this issue, see Amzallag, "Furnace Remelting," 233–37.

20. In its most basic sense, an emotion state is an amalgam of changes in somatic and/or neurophysiological (perhaps even hormonal) activity in an individual; these states are inferred and may even occur without the affected individual's perception that he or she is experiencing an emotion state. See Lewis, "Emergence of Human Emotions," 267–68.

21. That is, nondivine expressions of קנאה are thought to reflect internal and personal states that are inappropriate as divine attributes. For example, Amzallag, "Furnace Remelting," 234 with citations.

22. Renaud, *Je suis un dieu jaloux*, 17, 25.

The tendency to elevate and prioritize characteristics of קנאה as an expression of religious exclusivity widely persists in more recent investigations of the term. Like the works that preceded them, these examinations separate divine and human expressions of קנאה into different categories.[23] Others confine their treatments of the term to weighing the appropriateness of the traditional translations of jealousy, zeal, and envy.[24] For example, John H. Elliot critiques the treatment of קנאה found in dictionaries and translations for failing to distinguish between "jealousy," "zeal," and "envy," which, he argues, impedes a correct understanding of divine קנאה.[25] Although discussions of nondivine קנאה are sometimes included in these studies, scholars have tended to emphasize divine expressions of the term and the various gradations of jealousy, zeal, and envy employed to distinguish Yahweh's קנאה from others.[26]

A Comment on Scholarship

The aforementioned approaches to קנאק are primarily concerned with theological and translational issues. Their goal, even when the human realm is taken into account, is to clarify important theological concerns with regard to divine expressions of קנאה. Owing to its role as a fundamental divine attribute, the focus on קנאה in religious contexts is warranted. At the same time, the paucity of literature on its use in nondivine contexts strongly suggests that our understanding of the term is incomplete. A multitude of studies have demonstrated

---

23. For example, in a recent article Gérard Nissim Amzallag views divine קנאה as a "specific mode of action" associated with renewal via the imagery of furnace remelting but limits his scope only to attestations of אל קנא/קנוא and does not include human expressions of קנאה. The nondivine attestations, he argues, represent a negative and irrational psychological state that lacks any kind of behavioral or cognitive components ("Furnace Remelting," 234). The קנאה expression is semantically differentiated between divine and nondivine attestations in Dohmen, "'Eifersüchtiger ist sein Name'"; H. G. L. Peels, "קנא," *NIDOTTE* 3:93; Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 8–25. Although, as stated previously, קנאה in the context of marriage is often brought up in comparison with divine expressions of the term. More recently, Matthew R. Schlimm argues against understanding divine and human expressions of קנאה as semantically and etymologically distinct in a rebuttal against Amzallag ("Jealousy or Furnace Remelting").

24. Although there are those who deny any emotion content for divine expressions of the term, such as Amzallag, "Furnace Remelting," 234; Peels, "קנא," *NIDOTTE* 3:939.

25. In Elliot's analysis, he asserts that when קנאה is "jealousy" it is seen as a positive attribute, and when it is "envy," it is always negative and self-destructive, while zeal has a bit of both aspects. He also tries to solve the cognitive dissonance that translators have with attributing envy and/or jealousy to Yahweh by suggesting that God is never envious, since it is often a destructive quality, but is instead always jealous, because it is a reaction concerned with protecting oneself and one's relationships when there is a threat involved. However, envy is associated with covetousness and zeal can lead to destructive consequences. Whether or not the attestation of biblical קנאה are any of these three emotions depends on: the subject matter, narrated social context, social relations, and dynamics that are implied or stated (Elliot, "God—Zealous or Jealous," 85).

26. Compare Kim, "Yhwh as Jealous Husband," 137–39; Radwin, "Adultery," 101–5.

that religious knowledge often derives its meaning from secular concepts.[27] The tendency to omit discussions of the nondivine use of קנאה and to separate it from its divine counterpart prevents us from constructing an authentic representation of the expression.[28] In order to grasp the full meaning of קנאה, we must look at both divine and nondivine attestations in context and consider these occurrences in their entirety before any arguments are made on its semantic meaning and development. There is currently a great need for a study that accounts for both human (nondivine) and divine statements of קנאה and that provides a thorough and balanced examination of the expression in the Hebrew Bible.

As we observed in our presentation of קנאה in the lexica and beyond, there is quite a bit of variation in modern translations of words related to the root קנא in Biblical Hebrew; scholarly efforts have focused on clarifying these translations. However, further investigation will show that these issues of translation recede in importance, and even become moot, in view of a more contextualized approach to קנאה. The inconsistencies in translations of קנאה reflect a common problem pervasive in the practice of rendering ancient words into modern languages: it is not so much the meaning of an ancient word that is the primary issue in such treatments but the ability of the target language to fully accommodate what it signifies.[29] By ignoring this point, we run the risk of confusing these

27.   For example, the studies on expressions of love in Deuteronomy in Moran, "Ancient Near Eastern Background"; the divine marriage metaphor in Hosea in Ben Zvi, "Observations on the Marital Metaphor"; the use of sexual and relational metaphors in prophetic works in Moughtin-Mumby, *Sexual and Marital Metaphors*; the relationship between treaties and religious covenant in McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*; the use of juridical terminology to convey religious concepts in Wright, "Lawsuit of God"; and concepts of impurity in ancient Near Eastern thought in Feder, "Defilement, Disgust, and Disease."

28.   In a recent article, Richard Schlimm discusses the appropriateness of separating the use of קנאה in divine and human contexts ("Jealousy or Furnace Remelting"). Challenging the argument proposed by Amzallag ("Furnace Remelting"), which views divine and human קנאה as etymologically and semantically discrete, Schlimm comes to similar conclusions as this work with regard to the fundamental commonalities between divine and human קנאה. According to Schlimm, "In both human and divine contexts words from the root קנא are best understood with the traditional translation 'jealousy,' an emotion closely related to anger" ("Jealousy or Furnace Remelting," 513). However, the present work seeks to expand on these commonalities not through the discussion of the translations of related emotion terms such as "anger" or "jealousy," but through understanding the social relationships depicted in the texts under discussion.

29.   In his discussion of biblical emotions, Paul A. Kruger considers the issues in the process of translating emotional communication ("Emotions in the Hebrew Bible"). For example, in both English and German translations of קנאה, there are variations between rendering conventions, which demonstrates that the terminology and categories used to translate ancient lexical items are fluid and adaptable to the cultural conventions of the target language ("Emotions in the Hebrew Bible," 412–14; compare Baumgart, *Jealousy*, 106–13). However, as Kruger explains, scholars of ancient texts are dependent upon lexical items to discern meaning, but these texts are embedded in contexts far removed from the cultural conventions of the translator ("Emotions in the Hebrew Bible," 413). For a broader discussion of the issue of imposing Western assumptions on interpretations of the Hebrew Bible, see Lambert, "Refreshing Philology," 334–35.

modern issues of translation with the actual meaning of the Hebrew expression in context. With regard to translational variations, in the course of our study we will discover that these variations do not necessarily reflect the different nuances of קנאה in Biblical Hebrew. Rather, they reflect the variability of the modern translations in the target language with respect to jealousy-type emotions. While critiques and commentaries on the translations may be useful in further understanding our current perspectives of these emotions, we risk misrepresenting ancient קנאה by dwelling too much on issues of translation and then adapting these translations to the context of the passages. Instead, a philological investigation of קנאה should take as its starting point the contextualization of the scenarios in which this term appears, and only after this contextualization may we endeavor to clarify its semantic shade.[30]

A final problem with the majority of treatments of biblical קנאה—and in particular nondivine קנאה—is that they tend to frame the term as a sensation or feeling, emphasizing the internal, psychological aspects of the expression rather than explaining its motivations or consequences through the lens of social dynamics and external processes.[31] While nominal and verbal attestations of קנאה may include affective connotations, understanding it solely as an internal state risks missing an important aspect of the term and the biblical passages in which it appears. A careful analysis of קנאה will reveal that assuming a narrow affective context is unsatisfactory and may even cause the interpreter to overlook important literary representations of social, economic, and juridical concerns conveyed in the passages.

A New Approach to Biblical קנאה

What this study proposes is to refocus attention on the social significance of Biblical Hebrew קנאה in itself. Biblical קנאה is most often used when there is conflict between two or more parties in some kind of formal relationship. The conflicts reflected in the קנאה passages involve fundamental social roles and expectations within the literary representations of the Israelite community, including, for example, sister-wives (Gen 30:1), brothers (Gen 37:11), a husband and wife (Num 5:11–31), rival countries (Isa 11:13), and a religious community and their god (e.g., Deut 32:16, 21). In the Hebrew Bible, the primary way this

---

30. Similarly, see Schlimm, *From Fratricide to Forgiveness*, 34–37, who adopts this broad approach in his study of anger in Genesis.

31. Although note that some scholars are more inclined to expand on the behavioral qualities of divine קנאה as it relates to the Babylonian invasion and exile, restoration, and divine vengeance. See, for example, Dohmen, "'Eifersüchtiger ist sein Name,'" 295; Kim, "Yhwh as Jealous Husband," 135, 139; compare Amzallag, "Furnace Remelting," 237.

word is articulated is in terms of formally structured, if not demonstrably legal, relationships, raising the question of whether framing biblical קנאה as a social phenomenon would better elucidate the term's significance in ancient Israelite culture and religion. In subsequent chapters, we will discover that biblical קנאה reflects a complex socioliterary phenomenon, grounded in concepts and values that are found throughout Israelite literature.

Our examination will be theoretically underpinned by an ethnopsychological model known as the social constructionist approach, which will assist in clarifying the sociological implications of this term. Furthermore, in addition to providing a better understanding of this ancient expression and the texts in which it appears, this study will also raise the possibility that the aims and motivations of both the divine and nondivine קנאה are not as incongruent as was once believed. By demonstrating a sensitivity to the social context of the term, we will discover how קנאה serves as an index of social relationships for the purpose of communicating ancient Israelite views concerning beliefs, values, and social expectations. Through the exploration of a number of case studies of biblical קנאה and by placing the term's use in its social context, a more complete interpretation emerges that will deepen our understanding of ancient Israelite social organization and its impact on the construction of fundamental religious ideas.