Space, Land, Territory, and the Study of the Bible

Space, Land, Territory, and the Study of the Bible

By

Stephen C. Russell

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016957444

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISBN 978-90-04-33991-0 (paperback)
ISBN 978-90-04-34020-6 (e-book)

Originally published as Volume 1(4) 2016, in *Brill Research Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation*, DOI 10.1163/24057657-12340004.

Contents

Acknowledgments

I first encountered the academic study of space's tectonic dimensions and its quotidian, habitable properties as an undergraduate architecture major at the University of Pennsylvania. My first studio assignment was to "explore the space of a blank sheet of paper using a repetitive mark." I was flummoxed. But under the mentorship of Marco Frascari, Kathryn Gleason, Dennis Playdon, and Richard Wesley, I came to appreciate space as full of itself, as a record of its own production. Although my teachers did not present their bewildered undergraduates with a history of spatial studies, I sensed that their approach differed fundamentally from the Newtonian mechanics and Cartesian coordinates of my high school physics and math textbooks. The legacy of my teachers at Penn is felt here in so far as I treat space as something produced, not merely extant.

As a postdoctoral research fellow in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, I returned to the academic study of space by joining a group of doctoral students who were preparing for their qualifying examinations in the Department of Geography. This group, and especially Ashwin Jacobs and Greta Marchesi, helped me come to terms with important works on space by Antonio Gramsci, Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, Andy Merrifield, Stuart Elden, Doreen Massey, and David Harvey. In the Introduction and Part 1 of this essay, I do not present a comprehensive history of spatial studies. Instead I focus on concepts and approaches that have been influential on the discipline of geography as practiced and taught at Cal in recent decades and I highlight some additional work on space that I think will be of interest to biblical scholars.

I am particularly grateful to the Space, Place, and Lived Experience in Antiquity Program Unit of the Society of Biblical Literature for fostering interdisciplinary conversations about space. Among the many colleagues who have participated in or led this program unit, I owe a special debt of thanks to Mark George, Christl Maeir, Victor Matthews, and Eric Stewart. Stimulating conversations with them, and their own illuminating work on the Bible and space, have shaped my research agenda in important ways. My home institution, John Jay College, CUNY, provided considerable support for this essay. The Provost, Jane Bowers, granted me several pre-tenure course releases during the 2015–2016 academic year that allowed me time to write. Funding for this work was provided by a Faculty Scholarship grant from the Office for the Advancement of Research at John Jay College.

Part 3 of this essay is a revised version of an article I published in 2014 ("The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth's Vineyard," *JSOT* 38: 453-69). I am grateful to SAGE Publications for permission to use it here. For very helpful conversations about the ideas I present in Part 3, I am particularly thankful to F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, Robert S. Kawashima, Mark Leuchter, and Daniel Oden. I presented a version of this material to the Biblical Law section at the Annual Society of Biblical Literature Meeting in Chicago (2010), where I received very helpful comments and questions from Samuel Greengus, JoAnn Scurlock, and Bruce Wells, among others.

This essay was largely written at various Philadelphia cafes in the company of Jeremy Schipper, who helped me think through the structure of the whole. As I completed this study, Jeremy and Nyasha Junior were co-writing a book on how the biblical figure of Samson was invoked in struggles for black freedom in the United States. Like them, I am convinced that biblical studies has something worthwhile to say to the broader academy.

I am thankful to Tat-siong Benny Liew for his invitation to write, to anonymous peer reviewers for their helpful suggestions, and to the editorial team at Brill for their efficiency and professionalism.

Space, Land, Territory, and the Study of the Bible

Stephen C. Russell
John Jay College, CUNY, USA

Abstract

This essay, written for professional biblical scholars and graduate students being trained in biblical studies, introduces the reader to the interdisciplinary study of space and its related concepts, including land, place, and territory. It offers a synopsis of eight important approaches to the study of space: sacred, legal, political, economic, ecological, visual, social, and urban. It highlights some of the work being done by biblical scholars in conversation with spatial studies. And it reads the biblical story of Naboth's vineyard, 1 Kgs 21:1–16, in light of the legal approach to space.

Keywords

Hebrew Bible – Space – Social Space – Place – Land – Territory – Henri Lefebvre – Max Gluckman

Introduction: Basic Concepts in the Study of Space

Famously, and provocatively, Michel Foucault (1984) asserted many years ago the existence of an epochal shift in scholarly discourse from a focus on time and history toward a concern with space.[1] Indeed, for several decades, we have

1 Foucault writes, "The great obsession of the nineteenth century was, as we know, history: with its themes of development and of suspension, of crisis and cycle, themes of the ever-accumulating past, with its great preponderance of dead men and the menacing glaciation of the world. The nineteenth century found its essential mythological resources in the second principle of thermodynamics. The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein" (1986: 22, orig. 1984).

 | DOI:10.1163/9789004340206_002

been witnessing a spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences.[2] Once the domain of geographers, architects, and urban planners, space has become an object of inquiry among scholars from many disciplines, including biblical studies. In so far as biblical literature was produced by scribes living and working in particular buildings, neighborhoods, cities, and territories, and in so far as the Bible describes a physical, if inaccessible and at times imagined, world, all biblical scholars have reckoned to some extent with the spatial dimensions of the world that produced the Bible and the world described within it. This has been especially true of many wonderful studies by scholars who attend to archaeological evidence from Iron Age Israel and Judah as they read the Bible. In recent decades, biblical scholars have also begun to pay attention to conversations about space taking place across the humanities and social sciences.[3] This essay, written for professional biblical scholars and for graduate students being trained in biblical studies, aims to introduce the reader to the interdisciplinary study of space. I will refer to this interdisciplinary work as spatial studies. As I use the term here, spatial studies does not constitute a traditional discipline within the academy. Rather, spatial studies pursues a particular object of inquiry, space, from multiple disciplinary perspectives.

In this Introduction, I very briefly introduce a network of concepts related to space, including place, land, and territory.[4] Part 1 presents eight overlapping approaches to the study of space. I term these approaches the sacred, the legal, the political, the economic, the ecological, the visual, the social, and the urban. These do not constitute an exhaustive map of spatial studies. Nor do they offer a full history of the study of space, which stretches back to Aristotle and beyond.[5] Rather, my discussion of these approaches and one or two key scholars representing each provides the reader with some navigable pathways through the vast scholarly literature on space produced in recent decades. In Part 2, I note

2 For an outline of this spatial turn, see, for example, Warf and Arias 2009.

3 I discuss some of this work by biblical scholars in Part 2 of this essay.

4 For introductions to key concepts in spatial studies, see Holloway and Rice 2003; Gallaher 2009.

5 Casey (1997) offers an intellectual history of a network of concepts related to space. He shows how the development of this intellectual constellation was bound up with social and political changes on the one hand and technological developments on the other. He charts the notion of place as a container in the work of Aristotle; the emergence of space over place in Hellenestic and Neo-Platonic thought; the absolute, mathematized notion of space in the work of Newton, Descartes, and Leibniz; and the reemergence of place as a concept connected to the body, memory, and affect in the work of Heidegger, Bachelard, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, and Derrida.

some important contributions from scholars working at the intersections of spatial studies and biblical studies. Their work illustrates how spatial studies can open up new avenues of inquiry for biblical scholars, leading to fresh readings of the Bible. Part 3 presents, as a case study, a fresh reading of the biblical story of Naboth's vineyard, 1 Kgs 21:1–16, in light of the legal approach to space. Finally, the Conclusion very briefly summarizes the volume and notes some directions for future research at the intersection of biblical studies and spatial studies.

Space and Social Space

Spatial studies deploys a network of concepts related to space, sometimes with great fluidity and at other times with more technical precision. The most encompassing term used by geographers and other spatial studies scholars to denote their object of study is space. Within spatial studies the term often refers to the terrestrial, planetary space in which human beings live, rather than to the vast universe studied by astronomers, the atomic particles and waves treated by physicists, or the pure geometry analyzed by mathematicians. Although these are all spatial concepts and properly included in any formal definition of space, spatial studies is especially focused on space as experienced and produced at human and societal scale. In everyday usage, the term space sometimes carries the legacy of Newton, Descartes, and Leibniz, for whom space is infinite and infinitesimal with an abstract existence separate from the objects that fill it. But scholars working within spatial studies, influenced by the work of Henri Lefebvre among others, treat space as composed of objects and relations between objects, not as a theoretical grid in which objects are hung.[6] Furthermore, they understand space as having a history. Space is produced, which is to say, it takes shape under the influence of political and economic actors. Being produced, space is not purely uniform, but real, uneven, twisted, connected, rhythmic. Nor is space constituted by purely inanimate objects. For scholars working in spatial studies, space is connected to memory, the body, and culture, as well as to society, economics, and politics. Spatial studies, as I sketch it here, treats space as it has been perceived, conceived, and lived by human beings in the course of history and within the rhythms of everyday life. The term, "social space" (Lefebvre 1991 [French original, 1974]), is sometimes used to distinguish a particular conceptualization of space—that it is produced; that it has a history and rhythm;

6 As we will see in Part 1, Lefebvre reckons with the possibility of abstract conceptions of space, but he emphasizes how such space shapes the real world with political results—space as imposed by planners, engineers, architects, and the like.

that it is perceived, conceived, and lived within human society—from other definitions of space.

Place, Land, Territory, Territoriality, Terrain

Other spatial terms have narrower ranges of meaning or distinct emphases. Spatial studies sometimes deploys the term place to emphasize the emotional and affective resonances of home—space as produced and rendered meaningful by the body, memory, and culture.[7] Land connotes the economic value of space and rights to it enjoyed by individuals or groups within society. Spatial studies is aware that land often gives spatial expression to social relationships and their history—my land, our land, and so on. Territory often refers to land on a societal scale, as controlled, regulated, and exploited by the modern nation state or by other large-scale social structures, such as those based on an ideology of shared kinship.[8] Territoriality emphasizes strategies and practices

---

7 See especially Bachelard 1964 (French original, 1958); Tuan 1977; 1991; 2007; Basso 1996; Cresswell 2004. Bachelard writes, "Space that has been seized upon by the imagination cannot remain indifferent space subject to the measures and estimates of the surveyor. It has been lived in, not in its positivity, but with all the partiality of the imagination. Particularly, it nearly always exercises an attraction" (1964: xxxvi). Bachelard offers a psychoanalysis of memories of place. He explores the affective qualities of archetypal spaces, including the house (1964: 38–73), drawers, chests, and wardrobes (1964: 74–89), nests (1964: 90–104), shells (1964: 105–135), and corners (1964: 136–147), as well as certain spatial relationships, including the miniature and inside-outside. Spatial studies also uses the term place at a societal scale. Keith H. Basso, for example, has offered a compelling treatment of Apache place-names that observes their didactic function (1996). According to Basso, "[H]istorical tales are distinguished from all other forms of Apache narrative by an opening and closing line that identifies with a place-name where the events in the narrative occurred" (1996: 51). Furthermore, "all but a very few Apache place-names take the form of complete sentences" (1996: 46)—for example, "Water Flows Inward Under a Cottonwood Tree," or "White Rocks Lie Above in a Compact Cluster." In this way, the audience of an Apache historical narrative is able to imagine a site they have never seen. Furthermore, the place-name implies a particular viewpoint, from which the water would appear to flow inward rather than outward, or from where the rocks could be seen to form a compact cluster. As such, the place-name locates the story's audience in the landscape itself. Such narratives "are valued primarily as instruments of edification" (1996: 138). Tuan offers an analysis of place at all scales. His general approach is nicely embodied in his appropriation of a definition of geography from the 1940s and 1950s: "Geography is the study of the earth as the home of people" (Tuan 1991). On the body and space, see especially Pile 1996.

8 On territory and territoriality, see especially Gottmann 1973; Sack 1986; Johnston 1995; Murphy 1996; Johnston 2001; Cox 2002; Delaney 2005; Vollard 2009; Storey 2012; Elden 2013; Dawson et al 2014.

connected with territory. Military struggles for control of territory, in which land is both the object and location of armed conflict, is sometimes emphasized by the use of the term terrain.[9] These several terms—place, land, territory, territoriality, terrain—have a more limited range of meaning than the term space, even as considerable semantic overlap remains among all of them.

Boundary, Border, Frontier, Borderland

Land or territory controlled by an individual or group is differentiated from land or territory controlled by other individuals or groups by one type of boundary or another.[10] At the societal scale, spatial studies distinguishes between borders and frontiers. A border is a relatively thin zone or line demarcating one acknowledged territorial region from another acknowledged territorial region. A frontier is a much wider zone that distinguishes an acknowledged territorial center from the unacknowledged lands beyond. While the term border connotes multiple legitimate territories, the term frontier presents a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate territories. For example, the term frontier was used to differentiate centers of European colonial power in the Americas from the lands occupied by indigenous peoples. The term is ideological in so far as it presents a relation of power as being part of the natural order of things. Spatial studies has come to emphasize that borders are active in so far as they perform a variety of functions within and between societies.[11] The term borderlands connotes the relationships of exclusion, inclusion, exchange, and hybridity that characterize territory close to a border.

Nature and Landscape

Some spatial terms evoke the relationship between human power over land and geological, biological, and meteorological processes that appear to varying degrees to be outside of human control or influence. Nature, especially when

---

9 On terrain and power, Stuart Elden writes, "[C]onflict over land is twofold: both over its possession and conducted on its terrain. Land is both the site and stake of struggle. In this it differs from conflict over other resources. Strategic-military reasons thus become significant. These can be understood through a notion of terrain, a relation of power, with a heritage in geology and in the military, the control of which allows the establishment and maintenance of order" (2013: 9).

10 On the politics of borders and frontiers, see Prescott 1965; 1987; Anderson 1996; Diener and Hagen 2010; Popescu 2012; Elden 2013: 53–95.

11 A succinct and useful starting point for thinking about scholarly approaches to borders is Newman 2006. Diener and Hagen (2012) offer a brief introduction to borders that sets them in historical perspective and treats them as active forces related to political and social life. See also Wastl-Walter 2011 and Wilson and Donnan 2012.

contrasted with culture, is an encompassing term for these processes. But spatial studies understands nature to be mythological, indeed ideological. No part of the modern world is entirely beyond human influence.[12] The apparent binary relationship between nature and culture is undermined by the fact that the very concepts nature and culture are shaped by society. These concepts present a view of the world and relations of power within it. Of course, the world that produced the Bible had neither the population size nor the technological complexity of the modern world. Even biblical scholars, however, will recognize that ancient literature evokes nature—the steppe, the wild, the wilderness, the swamp, the mountain—in order to demonstrate and assert relations of power.[13] The closely-related term landscape also evokes human power over land but, as used within spatial studies, landscape emphasizes the perspective of the viewer.

Spatial Scales, Time, Rhythm

Spatial studies treats space at a variety of human scales, from home to planet. Especially in recent decades, the human body has become a central yardstick in speaking about how space is produced, imagined, and experienced.[14] Spatial studies observes how a phenomenon may present itself at different scales, and how phenomena operating at different scales may interact with one another. The term spatial flows refers to movement—for example, of labor or of goods

12 Lefebvre writes, "[Physical] natural space is disappearing. Granted, natural space was—and it remains—the common point of departure: the origin. . . . Everyone wants to protect and save nature; nobody wants to stand in the way of an attempt to retrieve its authenticity. Yet at the same time everything conspires to harm it. The fact is that natural space will soon be lost to view. . . . Nature is also becoming lost to thought. For what is nature? How can we form a picture of it as it was before the intervention of humans with their ravaging tools? Even the powerful myth of nature is being transformed into a mere fiction. . . . True, nature is resistant, and infinite in its depth, but it has been defeated, and now waits only for its ultimate voidance and destruction" (1991: 30–31).

13 To cite but a single example, consider the rhetoric of a royal inscription of Iahdun-Lim (ca. 1820–1796 BCE): "Now in a waste, a land of thirst, in which from days of old no king had built a city, I took pleasure in building a city. I dug its moat [and] called it Dūr-Iaḫdun-Līm (Fort Iaḫdun-Līm). I opened a canal for it and called it Išīm-Iaḫdun-Līm (Iahdun-Līm has determined (its) destiny)" (RIM E4.6.8.1 35–49, trans. Douglas R. Frayne).

14 In my view, some of the most compelling work on space in recent years combines the legacy of Marx, Gramsci, and Lefebvre with Foucault's attention to the body. Space proper is not a dominant theme in Foucault's writings. His brief essay on heterotopia (1986 [French original, 1984) is perhaps his most direct treatment of the subject. Nevertheless, his attention to the body as an object of knowledge and power is pervasive (e.g., 1973; 1995).

and services—within and between spatial scales. Spatial studies recognizes that spatial flows often fall into recognizable patterns.[15] Maps offer a symbolic representation of space at scale.[16] Spatial studies is keenly aware that cartography can serve political ends.[17] Decisions about what information to include on a map, and how to present it, are intimately bound up with relations of power.[18]

Spatial studies treats space as inseparable from time at two scales.[19] First, space and time are related through the process of history. At the most obvious level, particular places have taken shape over time. But scholars of space, and Lefebvre in particular, understand the historical relationship to be deeper, as I discuss in Part 1. Second, space and time are related through rhythm, through repetition and variation in mechanical and organic processes.[20] In recent decades, spatial studies has paid particularly close attention to the rhythms of the body, to everyday life. Spatial studies understands these scales, history and rhythm, to be connected.[21]

I have presented these terms—space, social space, place, land, territory, territoriality, terrain, boundary, border, frontier, borderlands, nature, landscape, scale, spatial flows, map, rhythm—in schematic and simplified fashion in order to orient readers who are for the first time approaching the vast scholarly literature on space. To appreciate the subtlety and complexity of these

---

15 On spatial flows, see, for example, Wilson 1974; 2000; Batty 1976; Fotheringham 1984.

16 Useful starting points for thinking about the history and politics of cartography include Bagrow 1964; Laxton 2001; Jacob 2006; Thrower 2008; Schulten 2012. On ancient cartography, see Janni 1984; Dilke 1985; Bekker-Nielsen 1988; Campbell 2000; Talbert and Brodersen 2004; Talbert and Unger 2008; Talbert 2012.

17 On maps, Elden notes, "Cartography is a key political practice that both represents and produces political space" (2013: 12). He offers a brief history of cartography from Roman times through the Medieval period (2013: 143–53).

18 To cite but one example, Denis E. Cosgrove (2001) has traced the history of the idea of the globe itself. He asks, "What have been the historical implications for the West of conceiving and representing the earth as a unitary, regular body of spherical form?" (2001: 9).

19 Lefebvre writes, "Time and space, the cyclical and the linear, exert a reciprocal action: they measure themselves against one another; each one makes itself and is made a measuring-measure: everything is cyclical repetition through linear repetitions" (2004: 8).

20 To illustrate the impossibility of repetition without variation, Lefebvre cites the repetition of unity (1 + 1 + 1 . . .) and notes, "Differences appear immediately in this sequence: odd and even . . . divisible . . . indivisible or prime numbers" (2004: 6–7). Lefebvre concludes, "Not only does repetition not exclude differences, it also gives birth to them; it produces them" (2004: 7).

21 For example, in discussing rhythm, Lefebvre writes, "Differences induced or produced by repetitions constitute the thread of time. Cyclical repetition and the linear repetitive separate out under analysis, but in reality interfere with one another constantly" (2004: 8).

concepts and their semantic overlap, the reader can do no better than to dive into some of the most influential works on space written in the last half century. In Part 1 that follows, I highlight some of these.

Part 1. A Map: Influential Approaches to the Study of Space

The intellectual terrain traversed by scholars treating space and its related concepts is too vast to map in this essay. Here, I offer the reader some navigable paths through the scholarly literature, paths that I hope will open up further avenues for the reader's own exploration.[22] I highlight six approaches to space that have been and continue to be generative, and I outline a seventh approach that provides a robust enough framework for appreciating some of these six and other approaches to space. Let us call the first six approaches the sacred, the legal, the political, the economic, the ecological, and the visual; and let us call the seventh the social. The legal, the political, the economic, the ecological, and the visual approaches recognize, in different ways, the role that society plays in creating, apprehending, and experiencing space.[23] Scholars utilizing these approaches do not treat space as an absolute, universal, mathematized entity. Rather, they emphasize how humans shape space and imbue it with meaning. The seventh approach, the social, offers a framework for thinking broadly about the relationship between human society and space. At the end of this section, I briefly note an eighth approach that is defined by its object of study rather than its methods: the urban. These eight approaches to space are not mutually exclusive; I present this schematic map in order to make the literature on space more accessible to biblical scholars.

The Sacred Approach

Our first approach to space, the sacred, is associated especially with Mircea Eliade (1958; 1959 [French original, 1957]). The object of his inquiry, religion, had previously been explained in terms of other phenomena. Émile Durkheim

22 I do not map here philosophical approaches to space. For a history of these, see especially Casey 1997. Recent philosophical works treating spatial concepts include those by Jeff Malpas on place (1999; 2006), by Peter Sloterdijk on spheres (2011; 2014; 2016), and by Roberto Casati and Achille C. Varzi on holes (1994) and on mereology, topology, and spatial representation (1999). For introductions to some of the most influential scholars and approaches within spatial studies, see Peet 1998; Hubbard and Kitchen 2004; Cresswell 2013.

23 The sacred approach is quite different, as I discuss further below.

(1915 [French original, 1912]), for example, defined religion in terms of its notion of the sacred and presented an analysis of what he considered its most elementary form, totemism.[24] Durkheim argued that the totem was nothing other than a symbol of society itself. For Durkheim, the religious could be explicated in terms of the social. Eliade shares with Durkheim a conviction that religion is best defined in terms of the sacred, but for Eliade the sacred is an irreducible concept. It cannot be adequately explained in terms of other phenomena but demands treatment on its own terms. Eliade traces across a number of religious traditions several shared patterns that together illuminate religion's basic concept, the sacred. Among these shared patterns is sacred space.

For Eliade, religious humans experience space as structured around a distinction between sacred, cosmic order and profane chaos.[25] Sacred space marks a hierophany, an irruption of the sacred into this world.[26] It serves as an *axis mundi* that permanently links heaven, earth, and underworld.[27] It marks the sacred center of the world, the primordial home to which religious humans long to return. It provides a symbolic representation of the cosmos, an *imago mundi*. Sacred space represents and points back towards the mythological time of origins in which the world itself was structured out of chaos. Indeed, Eliade's concept of sacred space cannot be separated from his notion of the eternal return—the possibility of repeatedly and regularly retuning to

24 Durkheim writes, "A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden—beliefs and practices which unite into a single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them" (1915: 62).

25 Eliade writes, "For religious man (*sic*), space is not homogenous; he experiences interruptions in it; some parts of space are qualitatively different from others. . . . There is, then, a sacred space, and hence a strong, significant space; there are other spaces that are not sacred and so are without structure or consistency, amorphous. Nor is this all. For religious man (*sic*), this spatial nonhomogeneity finds expression in the experience of an opposition between space that is sacred—the only *real* and *real-ly* existing space—and all other space, the formless expanse surrounding it" (1959: 20).

26 Eliade writes, "Every sacred space implies a hierophany, an irruption of the sacred that results in detaching territory from the surrounding cosmic milieu and making it qualitatively different" (1959: 26). Eliade's concept of a hierophany bears some resemblance to Rudolf Otto's notion of the numinous, the human experience of the wholly-other that is both terrifying and fascinating (Eliade 1959: 8–13; Otto 1958 [German original, 1917]). But Eliade does not treat only what Otto regarded as irrational. Rather, he takes as his object of inquiry the sacred in its entirety (1959: 10).

27 Eliade summarizes this pattern, "(a) holy sites and sanctuaries are believed to be situated at the center of the world; (b) temples are replicas of the cosmic mountain and hence constitute the pre-eminent 'link' between earth and heaven; (c) the foundations of temples descend deep into the lower regions" (1959: 39).

the mythic time of origins—nor from his treatment of myth as expressing relationships between religious symbols. Rather, sacred space is one integral component of a larger network of concepts through which Eliade explicates religion.

The Legal Approach

A second approach to space, the legal, focusses on how power over land held by an individual or group relates to power over land held by other individuals or groups within a set of rules accepted by and enforceable by society.[28] This approach includes concepts operating at different societal scales, from individual property rights to tribal or royal territorial administration. Anthropologist Max Gluckman has presented a particularly useful framework for considering rights in land at all societal scales (1965: 75–112; already nascent in Gluckman 1943).[29] I distill from his approach three broadly-applicable principles that together constitute a useful paradigm for considering property rights in the Bible and the world that produced it.[30] First, Gluckman analyzes relations to property in terms of rights. For Gluckman, ownership is too vague a term to precisely describe the varying relations to property operating in societies observed

28 I limit my discussion here to how human power over land has functioned within recorded history. Another line of inquiry has focused on the moral and philosophical basis of human power over land. For example, John Locke writes, "Though the earth, and all inferior creatures, be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person: this nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever, then, he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property" (1821: 209). And John Stuart Mill writes, "The Institution of property, reduced to its essential elements, consists in the recognition, in each person, of a right to the exclusive disposal of what he or she have produced by their own exertions, or received by gift or by fair agreement, without force or fraud, from those who produced it. The foundation of the whole is, the right of producers to what they themselves have produced" (1891: 155). On these and other approaches to property, see Nozick 1974; Ryan 1984; Carter 1989; Ellerman 1992: 36–90; Garnsey 2007: 144–48.

29 On the legacy of Gluckman's approach to land tenure, see Sutherland 1980; Humphrey 1998: 118–39; Verdery 2003: 56–58; 2004: 189–98; Sikor 2004: 75–95; Hann 2005: 112–14; Hann 2007: 287–318; Shipton 2009: 70–72. Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann (1999) also analyze land rights at different societal scales in so far as they treat property rights in terms of cultural tradition, laws, social relations, and practices.

30 I do not offer here a representative summary of Gluckman's work but focus on aspects of his work that I find helpful for thinking about land tenure in the ancient world. On Gluckamn's work in relation to the history of anthropological approaches to law, see Tuori 2015: 150–83.

by anthropologists.[31] Following the lead of American jurist Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld (1919), Gluckman regards legal relations as existing between people rather than between people and objects. For Gluckman, individuals or groups hold the right to use land in particular ways. Freedom to use land in specified ways is a right since it relates to the rights of others to use that land in similar or different ways, or it may exclude them from using it all together. Second, Gluckman observes that different individuals or groups in society can hold different kinds of rights in the same piece of land.[32] In particular, he distinguishes between productive rights in land—for example, depending on context, the right to cultivate, pasture, fish, mine, build, etc.—and administrative rights in land, which do not involve the direct use of land but rather its management and control—for example, depending on context, the right to allocate land to others or impose limits on its use, or the right to some form of rent or tax on assigned lands.[33] Third, Gluckman observes that rights entail and are contingent upon responsibilities.[34] For example, depending on context, those with productive rights in land may also have the responsibility to pay

31 Gluckman is particularly concerned with the Lozi of Zambia, but he aims to offer a framework that is broad enough to provide analytical clarity for the study of property rights in any society. He draws on anthropological studies of several societies, including Firth 1936; Wilson 1938; Richards 1939; Schapera 1943; Allan et al 1948; Goodenough 1951; Elias 1951; Sheddick 1954.

32 Gluckman writes, "[S]everal groups or persons may hold different kinds of rights in the same piece of land while it is devoted to a particular kind of use" (1965: 77). He continues, "[A]s the Lozi see the allocation of land, it is in a chain of distribution from the king to the village headman (*sic*), to household head, to subordinates in the household; and therefore landholding is formulated in a straightforward series of allocations" (1965: 85).

33 Gluckman writes, "In practice, among long-settled tribes the tribal land is already allocated to and, divided among first-level subordinate political units who, either by joint decision or through their leaders, administer what I shall call 'a primary estate of administration'—administration here covering powers to allocate the land further within the group, to dispose of it, to control and regulate its use, and to defend it against trespassers. Within such a primary estate of administration there may be allocation of secondary and even tertiary estates of administration to the series of nesting subordinate groups of decreasing size" (1965: 78).

34 For Gluckman, rights in land inhere in political and social status. Gluckman writes, "[R]ights to land are an incident of political and social status. By virtue of membership in the nation or tribe, every citizen is entitled to claim some land, whether it be from the king or chief, or from such political unit as exists in the absence of chiefly authority" (1965: 78). He continues, "Rights to land within a particular group are determined by status inside it and by meeting obligations inherent in that status, as well as by the terms of its allocation" (1965: 79). Since status is a multi-referential concept, and since not all societies are

some form of rent or tax or may be obligated to manage their land in such a way that it does not devalue neighboring lands; or those with administrative rights in land may also have the responsibility to protect assigned land against encroachment. Failure to meet one's responsibilities places one's rights in jeopardy. Gluckman's framework is especially suited to analyzing established society and is less applicable to, for example, moments in which the status quo is violently overturned.

The Political Approach

Critical analysis of human power over land at the highest level of society has tended to focus less on the legal and more on the political, our third approach to space. There is much overlap between these two approaches, but they differ in emphasis. While the legal approach emphasizes the regulation of human power over land according to accepted rules, the political approach observes modes of imposition, accommodation, resistance, negotiation, and collaboration employed by those seeking power over and by means of territory. The legal approach is often more concerned with relations between individuals and groups within a single society, while the political approach treats relations of power at all scales, including relations between society as a whole and other societies.

A political approach to space analyzes territory, territoriality, terrain, borders, frontiers, and maps.[35] Its distinguishing feature is its attention to how relations of power are constructed, imposed, resisted, contested, and overthrown. Influential scholars analyzing space within a broadly political approach include Stuart Elden, Robert David Sack, and Doreen Massey. Elden is well-known as an interpreter of Lefebvre, whom I discuss further below.[36] He extends Lefebvre's legacy both by his empirical groundedness and by his engagement with the work of Martin Heidegger and Michel Foucault (Elden 2001). Elden (2013) provides an intellectual history of the concept of territory by asking: "What is the relation between place and power?" (2013: 10).[37] His work is distinguished by its historical specificity—Elden traces particular relations between place and power in ancient Greek cities, the Roman Empire, the papal

---

structured as Lozi society was when Gluckman analyzed it, I reformulate this aspect of his analysis here by referring broadly to a connection between rights and responsibilities.

35 Political geography has its own extensive disciplinary history, which cannot be recounted here. For brief introductions, see Cox 2002 and Gallaher 2009.

36 See Elden 2004, and his authored or co-authored introductions in Lefebvre 2003a: xi–xix; 2004: vii–xv; 2009: 1–48.

37 See also Elden 2009, which focuses particularly on terrorism.

empire, and European empires in the New World.[38] I find particularly illuminating for biblical studies Elden's chapter on the Greek polis (2013: 21–52). He surveys Greek myths of autochthony—these contrast with ancient Israel's stories of foreign origins—and he shows how the Greek polis was both a place and a people, a theme that finds resonance in biblical and other ancient Near Eastern literature.[39] For Elden, who draws on Arlene W. Saxonhouse (1992: 111–31), the myth of autochthony serves political ends in so far as it presents as natural the Greek city's relationship to its territory.[40]

Robert David Sack (1983; 1986) offers a compelling treatment of human territoriality that emphasizes politics and that is applicable to any societal scale.[41] For Sack, territoriality is "a strategy for controlling people and things by controlling area" (1986: 5). In particular, it is especially concerned with controlling access via the establishment and maintenance of borders (1986: 20).

---

38 On territory and territoriality, see also Gottmann 1973; Johnston 1995; Murphy 1996; Johnston 2001; Cox 2002; Delaney 2005; Vollard 2009; Storey 2012; Dawson et al 2014.

39 On Israel's portrayal of itself as alien compared to Mesopotamian and Greek portrayals of themselves as natives, see Robert S. Kawashima's forthcoming *Archaeology of Ancient Israelite Knowledge*. On the political structure of ancient Near Eastern towns, see Fleming 2004 and Russell 2016: 68–83.

40 Elden writes, "Saxonhouse has noted that the theme of autochthony is useful in a number of ways. First, and as noted above, it provides a unity to the *polis*. Second, the boundaries of the *polis* are set by nature rather than human agreements. The *polis* is natural, rather than set in opposition to nature. Third, the land is seen to belong to the people by right, by birth. There was no need for conquest and forced movement of previous inhabitants. Playing a role similar to that social contract theory would many centuries later, the origins of a *polis* could be assumed to be peaceful. The consequence of this is the existing regime is the original and only one. In other words, it is not a regime that had to overthrow a previous one, but the only possible regime, thereby enhancing its legitimacy and security" (2013: 25–26).

41 Sack's emphasis on society and politics distinguishes his work on territory from Wagner (1960), Ardrey (1966), and Malmberg (1980), who treat human territoriality as an expression of a fundamental biological drive and thus related to other forms of animal association. Sack writes, "Perhaps the most well-publicized statements on human territoriality have come from biologists and social critics who conceive of it as an offshoot of animal behavior. These writers argue that territoriality in humans is part of an aggressive instinct that is shared with other territorial animals. The view presented in this book is quite different. Although I see territoriality as a basis of power, I do not see it as part of an instinct, nor do I see power as essentially aggressive" (1986: 1). Sack's critique of the biological approach to territory is shared by Raffestin (1988), for whom space becomes territory through territorialising practices of actors (1980). Raffestin's approach is political in so far as he grounds his treatment of territory in ideas about power developed from Foucault (Raffestin 2007). On Raffestin, see also Elden 2013: 5–6.

It requires constant effort to maintain (1986: 19).[42] Sack outlines 10 tendencies and 14 combinations of tendencies that characterize territoriality (1986: 28–51).[43] These are too numerous to recount here; by way of example I mention one tendency and one combination. For Sack, one characteristic tendency of territoriality is that it "provides a means of reifying power" (1986: 32). In other words, territoriality makes visible the abstract concept of power. Several such primary tendencies, indeed all 10 of them, lead to what Sack regards as the most important combination characterizing territoriality: the existence of complex and rigid hierarchies. Sack's discussion of hierarchy, which relates territoriality to the structure of society, connects his work both to the legal approach discussed above and to the social approach discussed below. Over the course of human history, Sack maintains, the number of autonomous territorial units has declined, from perhaps tens of thousands in the upper paleolithic to roughly 150 nation states in the 1980s, when Sack writes (1986: 52). This decline has been accompanied by an increase in the size of autonomous territorial units and an increase in their hierarchical complexity. Sack's model provides helpful indices for thinking about and comparing forms of human territoriality that have existed in different periods and at different scales.

As a final example of the political approach to space, let us consider the work Doreen Massey, for whom "space is by its very nature full of power and symbolism, a complex web of relations of domination and subordination, of solidarity and co-operation" (1994: 265).[44] Massey offers three propositions

---

42 Sack summarizes, "Territoriality for humans must provide a form of classification by area, a form of communication by boundary, and a form of enforcement or control" (1986: 28).

43 Sack's 10 tendencies characterizing territoriality are: (1) to classify; (2) to communicate; (3) to enforce; (4) to reify; (5) to displace; (6) to make impersonal; (7) to appear neutral; (8) to act as a container; (9) to make place emptiable; and (10) to engender more territoriality (1986: 32–34). His 14 combinations are: (1) hierarchies; (2) grading of knowledge and responsibility according to hierarchy; (3) territorial definition of social relationships; (4) span of control, that is, supervisory efficiency; (5) conceptually emptiable space; (6) the possibility of a magical perspective; (7) mismatch and spillover; (8) to appear to be an end rather than a means of control; (9) momentum to create inequalities; (10) dividing and conquering; (11) obscuring mismatch; (12) misdirection; (13) obscuring impact; and (14) the possibility of secession (1986: 36–40).

44 Massey's political aim is evidenced, for example, when she writes, "I am arguing for an abandonment of the dichotomisation between space and time which posits space as both the opposite of time and, equally problematically, as immobility, power, coherence, representation. The significance of this . . . is political" (2005: 47). She writes, "The hope is to contribute to a process of liberating space from its old chain of meaning and to associate it with a different one in which it might have, in particular, more political potential" (2005: 55).

about space (2005). First, space is the product of relations, at all scales (2005: 9; cf. 1994: 3, 264). Spatial studies should not be concerned merely with finished objects, but with relations and processes. She asserts, "Space does not exist prior to identities/entities and their relations" (2005: 10). Rather, space is constituted by these. Second, space includes possibility and multiplicity (2005: 9; cf. 1994: 5). For Massey, the study of space should not be concerned with just one—for example, Western, male, white—story but should include "a fuller recognition of the simultaneous coexistence of others with their own trajectories" (2005: 11).[45] For example, Massey treats gender in relation to space by observing how differing economic development in different regions within the United Kingdom produced varying conditions for the maintenance of male power (1994: 191–211). In my view, Massey's attention to other stories, to other political actors, is perhaps her most important contribution to spatial studies and is an important corrective to Lefebvre, whom I discuss below. Third, space is always under construction (2005: 9; cf. 194: 268–69). For Massey, space is not the opposite of time (2005: 17–19). Rather, there is a certain connection between space and time in relation to "the duration in external things" (2005: 24). Space is a "simultaneity of stories-so-far" (2005: 9).

The Economic Approach

Our fourth approach to space, the economic, overlaps considerably with the political but pays particular attention to the factors of production—land, labor, and capital—and to spatial flows within and spatial effects of various modes of production. David Harvey (2000; 2001; 2006; 2007) has been a particularly insightful proponent of an economic approach to space. For over 40 years Harvey has regularly taught a course consisting of a close reading of Marx's *Capital* and he presents his work as an application of Marx's insights to the contemporary world.[46] For example, Harvey (2006) offers a general theory of the uneven geographical development of twentieth century capitalism rooted in Marx's dialectical materialism. Capitalism, Harvey argues, depends on accumulation through dispossession.[47] Within capitalism, crises resulting

45 On other stories, see also Cresswell 1996.

46 An online video lecture series for this course is available at <http://davidharvey.org/reading-capital/>.

47 Harvey writes, "The rise of the capitalist class did not depend initially upon its capacity to generate surpluses. It rested, rather, upon its ability to appropriate them, treat them as their own private property and launch them into circulation in search of further surpluses. . . . Accumulation through dispossession is to be construed therefore as a necessary condition for capitalism's survival (2006: 90–91).

from overaccumulation are inevitable and can be temporarily relieved through spatial fixes, that is, through the movement of capital and labor to new spaces.[48] The stability of capitalism thus depends on uneven geographical development, which Harvey traces at several scales.[49] Harvey's work is characterized by close attention to Marx's own writings, though he has at times engaged in conversations with others working in Marx's legacy, including the French *régulation* school, to whom I will return in Part 2.[50]

The Ecological Approach

Our fifth approach to space, the ecological, shares much in common with the legal and the political approaches, but emphasizes the relationship between human power over land and geological, meteorological, and biological processes that have varying degrees of independence from human influence. The ecological approach treats nature, but does not limit itself to quantitative

48 Harvey summarizes the process: "Capital accumulation is, furthermore, assumed to posses the following fundamental characteristics: (1) activity is expansionary and growth is accepted as both inevitable and good, (2) growth is sustained through the exploitation of living labor in production, (3) class struggle is endemic but not threatening, (4) technological change (or 'progress') is inevitable and accepted as a good in itself, (5) the system is contradictory and inherently unstable (conditions of production of capital in the workplace perpetually conflict with those of realization of capital in the market, for example), (6) crises are inevitable and are characterized by overaccumulation (a condition in which surpluses of capital and labor exist side by side with seemingly no way to bring them together), and (7) if the surpluses cannot be somehow absorbed then they will be devalued (written down, sold at a loss or even physically destroyed). Overaccumulation crises can be at least temporarily relieved either by a temporal shift (the absorption of capital and labor surpluses in long-term projects such as large scale public works) or through a spatial fix (dispersing or exporting capital and labor surpluses into new and more profitable spaces)" (2006: 95–96).

49 Harvey writes, "[T]here is an aggregate degree of accumulation through dispossession that must be maintained if the capitalist system is to achieve any semblance of stability. Uneven geographical development through dispossession, it follows, is a corollary of capitalist stability" (2006: 93). Harvey notes the connection between economy and political struggles for territory: "The role of territorial power here is to ensure open spaces within which surplus capitals in particular can move. The effect is for capital accumulation to diffuse outwards on the world stage. But ultimately all the territories 'occupied' by capitalism will produce capital surpluses looking for a spatial fix. Geopolitical rivalries for influence or control over territories invariably result. This rivalry helped produce two world wars between capitalist powers in the twentieth century" (2006: 108).

50 See Castree 2007.

analyses of the physical environment.[51] Rather, it emphasizes praxis, critiquing society's effect on the planet.[52] It raises ethical questions about human agricultural practice.[53] And it is keenly aware that concepts like nature, the environment, and the country are socially constructed and thus serve political ends.

As an example of a scholar working within this broad approach to space, consider Raymond Williams (1973). Williams perceives a gap between his own experience of childhood in rural Wales and portrayals of the country in the great literary works he studied at Cambridge (1973: 2–3). In a sweeping analysis of this gap, he shows how British notions of the country, the city, and their relationship are in fact myths.[54] With examples stretching back to Thomas More, he demonstrates that literary portrayals of the country as natural and simple disguise class struggles in rural communities.[55] The fictional portrayal of the relationship between town and country served "to promote superficial comparisons and to prevent real ones" (1973: 54). Williams recovers something of the lived experience of rural communities, stripped of the ideology of country life.

---

51 For example, see Glacken 1967; Worster 1993.

52 For example, see Aldo Leopold's work on Sauk County, Wisconsin (1949), Rachel Carson's on oceans (1951; 1955; 1962), Thomas E. Lovejoy's on biological diversity (1976; 1978; 1979), or Barry Lopez's on the arctic (1986). In so far as his later work addresses moral dimensions of human relationships to space, place, and home, Sack (1997), whom I discussed under the political approach to space, also engages praxis.

53 For example, Berry 1977; Jackson 1980; Thompson 1995; Lehman 1995; Zimdahl 2006.

54 Williams writes, "On the actual settlements, which in the real history have been astonishingly varied, powerful feelings have gathered and have been generalised. On the country has gathered the idea of a natural way of life: of peace, innocence, and simple virtue. On the city has gathered the idea of an achieved centre: of learning, communication, light. Powerful hostile associations have been developed: on the city as a place of noise, worldliness and ambition; on the country as a place of backwardness, ignorance, limitation. A contrast between country and city, as fundamental ways of life, reaches back into classical times. Yet, the real history, throughout, has been astonishingly varied" (1973: 1).

55 For example, Williams sees behind the depiction of Thomas More's *Utopia* a particular social experience: "An upper peasantry, which had established itself in the break-up of the strict feudal order, and which had ideas and illusions about freedom and independence from the experience of a few generations, was being pressed and expropriated by the great landowners, the most successful of just these new men (*sic*), in the changes of the market and of agricultural techniques brought about by the growth of the wool trade. . . . This is then the third source of the idea of an ordered and happier past set against the disturbance and disorder of the present. An idealisation, based on a temporary situation and on a deep desire for stability, served to cover and evade the actual bitter contradictions of the time" (1973: 44–45).

The Visual Approach

A sixth approach to the study of space, the visual, is related to the ecological in so far as it is concerned with the relationship between culture and nature, but it analyzes this relationship using methods derived from the study of the history of visual art. The visual approach to space focuses on landscape and emphasizes the perspective of the viewer and the meanings imposed through the act of viewing.[56] Denis E. Cosgrove has been particularly influential within this approach (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988; Cosgrove 1998 [original, 1984]; 2001; 2008). He traces connections between the idea of landscape, especially as represented in painting traditions in Renaissance Italy, England, and North America, and social and economic features of these regions in the Renaissance period and later. Indeed, he offers a history of this relationship that covers the transition from feudalism to capitalism.[57] For Cosgrove, landscape is a social product in so far as it expresses relations of power within society (1998: 14).[58] Cosgrove himself flatly admits in the new introduction (1998: xx–xxi) to the republished version of his 1984 landmark contribution that much of the original does not hold up to historical nor to theoretical scrutiny. Nevertheless, his basic approach of relating artistic depiction, ideology, and societal practice has proven enormously influential. He observes how landscape painting does not accurately represent those living in and working the land but instead invokes the wealthier and more powerful viewer apprehending the bucolic scene.[59]

---

56 On landscape, see J. B. Jackson 1970; 1980; 1984; 1994; 1997; Geoffrey Jellicoe 1960–1970; 1961. See also Jellicoe and Jellicoe 1975; Mitchell 1994; Spirn 1998; Olwig 2002.

57 What is the main feature of this transition? Cosgrove writes, "In a natural economy the relationship between human beings and land is dominantly that of the insider, an unalienated relationship based on use values and interpreted analogically. In a capitalist economy it is a relationship between owner and commodity, an alienated relationship wherein man (*sic*) stands as outsider and interprets nature causally" (1998: 64).

58 Cosgrove writes, "[L]andscape represents an historically specific way of experiencing the world developed by, and meaningful to, certain social groups. Landscape, I shall argue, is an ideological concept. It represents a way in which certain classes of people have signified themselves and their world through their imagined relationship with nature, and through which they have underlined and communicated their own social role and that of others with respect to external nature" (1998: 15).

59 In discussing the work of Italian architect and philosopher Leon Battista Alberti, Cosgrove writes, "[T]here is no suggestion [by Alberti] that these paintings should represent landscape as a place of ordinary life in which the daily world of the insider, at work or at leisure, is sympathetically portrayed. Landscape painting is intended to serve the purpose of reflecting back to the powerful viewer, at ease in his (*sic*) villa, the image of a controlled and well-ordered, productive and relaxed world wherein serious matters are laid aside" (1998: 24). For Cosgrove, the viewer is further emphasized by the use of linear perspective,

Landscape expresses and facilitates control.[60] The gap between portrayal and reality, between an artistic work and what it depicts, is not neutral but disguises relations of power. Landscape is ideological.

The Social Approach

The latter five of these six approaches to studying space—the legal, the political, the economic, the ecological, and the visual—share both an interest in space and a recognition of society's role in shaping and giving meaning to it.[61] By focusing broadly on the social, a seventh approach to space provides a robust framework for apprehending these five and other approaches to space. This seventh approach can be traced directly to Henri Lefebvre.[62] His oft-cited maxim, "(social) space is a (social) product," bordering on the tautologous as he himself acknowledged (1991: 26), is best appreciated against the background of his larger oeuvre and its relationship to intellectual currents in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially Marxism.[63] Indeed, Lefebvre's terse description of himself emphasizes Marxism, "Born in 1901, of a family belonging to the middle class. A strongly religious (Catholic) education. Youth tormented, rebellious, anarchistic. Found balance around his thirtieth year in and through Marxism" (Lefebvre 1950: 298 n. 1; English trans. from Elden 2004: 1). Because of Lefebvre's Marxism, I speak here of space as a social product and

---

an important effect of which is to "arrest the flow of history at a specific moment, freezing that moment as a universal reality. Secondly, perspective, in structuring and directing universal reality at a single spectator, acknowledges only one, external subject for the object it represents" (1998: 26).

60 Cosgrove writes, "Landscape is indeed the view of the outsider, a term of order and control, whether that control is technical, political or intellectual" (1998: 36).

61 Our first approach, the sacred, is quite different in so far as Eliade treats the sacred as an irreducible concept, that is, a concept that cannot be explained in terms of another concept such as society.

62 Lefebvre's voluminous writing are not always readily available to an Anglophone audience, being originally published in French and sometimes in obscure venues. But some of his most important books are available in English translation (1968a [French original, 1939]; 1968b [French original, 1966]; 1969 [French original, 1968]; 1971 [French original, 1968]; 1976 [French original, 1973]; 1991 [French original, 1974]; 1991–2014 [French original, 1947; 1961; 1981]; 1995 [French original, 1962]; 2003b [French original, 1970]) and a few edited volumes contain translations of other works (1996; 2003a; 2004; 2009). An extensive, though not exhaustive, bibliography, of Lefebvre's writings can be found in Elden 2004: 257–62. A more complete list is provided in Shields 1999: 190–204.

63 The intellectual heritage of Lefebvre's oeuvre has been traced compelling by Stuart Elden (2004; 2007).

not of space as a social construct.[64] For Lefebvre, space is not merely constructed by society through language and shared cultural codes of meaning. Rather, space is produced by concrete economic forces operating within society—"the forces of production (nature; labour and the organization of labour; technology and knowledge) and, naturally, the relations of production" (Lefebvre 1991: 46)—even as space is also shaped by language, culture, and ideology. Social space is especially connected to the family in so far as it is the locus through which the relations of production also reproduce themselves.[65] Space is shaped by, expresses, and reproduces relationships between society's members that are characterized by inequalities of power.[66]

Lefebvre advocates a science of space that would take into account a dialectical relationship between three concepts: spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces—what he also refers to as perceived space, conceived space, and lived space (1991: 33, 38–40). In developing this triad, Lefebvre emphasizes his alignment with Marx and Hegel against

64 On Lefebvre's understanding of the significance of Marx's insights, see, for example, Lefebvre 1968a; 1968b; 1969. More overtly economic analyses of space, within the legacy of Marx, are offered by Doreen Massey (1995; cf. Massey and Catalano 1978; Massey and Meegan 1979), David Harvey (2000; 2001; 2006; 2007), and Neil Smith (2008). The history of the relationship between land, capital, and labor is taken up by Perry Anderson (1974a; 1974b).

65 Lefebvre writes, "Social space contains—and assigns (more or less) appropriate places to—(1) the social relations of production, i.e., the bio-physiological relations between the sexes and between age groups, along with the specific organization of the family; and (2) the relations of production, i.e., division of labour and its organization in the form of hierarchical social functions. These two sets of relations, production and reproduction, are inextricably bound up with one another: the division of labour has repercussions upon the family and is of a piece with it; conversely, the organization of the family interferes with the division of labour. . . . The advent of capitalism, and more particularly 'modern' neocapitalism, has rendered this state of affairs considerably more complex. Here three interrelated levels must be taken into account: (1) biological reproduction (the family); (2) the reproduction of labour power (the working class per se); and (3) the reproduction of the social relations of production—that is, of those relations which are constitutive of capitalism and which are increasingly (and are increasingly effectively) sought and imposed as such" (1991: 32). On the relations of production, see also Lefebvre 1976.

66 Lefebvre writes, "Thus space may be said to embrace a multitude of intersections, each with its assigned location. As for representations of the relations of production, which subsume power relations, these too occur in space: space contains them in the form of buildings, monuments and works of art. Such frontal (and hence brutal) expressions of these relations do not completely crowd out their more clandestine or underground aspects; all power must have its accomplices—and its police" (1991: 33).

Cartesian and Nietzschean conceptions of space (1991: 21–24). Nevertheless, in Lefebvre's triad, no two concepts give way to the third in a historical process akin to the kind of dialectic materialism associated with the legacy of Marx. Rather, the three concepts always exist in relationship to one another. As such, Lefebvre's approach is perhaps better defined as applying a nonteleological dialectic to space, as Elden (2004: 37) has emphasized. Furthermore, Lefebvre does not deploy his perceived-conceived-lived triad as a system of exclusive categorization, as though one particular space could be isolated and slotted into one conceptual element of his triad.[67] Rather, taken together, the conceptual triad opens up expansive ways of thinking about space. Indeed, in outlining this triad Lefebvre emphasizes the relationships and contradictions within space (e.g., 1991: 39).

What does Lefebvre mean by each concept within his spatial triad? Edward Soja's (1996) interpretation of Lefebvre's triad and Soja's own concept of thirdpsace have been influential in biblical studies.[68] But I find Stuart Elden a more reliable guide to Lefebvre (e.g., 2004; 2007). And, especially as so much of Lefebvre's work is now accessible in English translation, I would recommend that the curious reader dive straight into Lefebvre's explanation of the triad in *The Production of Space* (1991) rather than relying on Soja's interpretation of it. As I understand Lefebvre, spatial practice, which Lefebvre also calls perceived space, refers to space as it is experienced sensorily, that is, physically, in real form. Lefebvre emphasizes not just sensory observation of perceived space, but its use, its connections to everyday life.[69] Representations of space, which Lefebvre also calls conceived space, refers especially to the intellectual constructs through which space is appropriated and controlled.[70] It refers to maps, blueprints, and other tools employed by architects, urban planners, and social

67 Lefebvre writes, "The perceived-conceived-lived triad (in spatial terms: spatial practice, representations of space, representational spaces) loses all force if it is treated as an abstract 'model.' If it cannot grasp the concrete (as distinct from the 'immediate'), then its import is severely limited, amounting to no more than that of one ideological mediation among others. That the lived, conceived and perceived realms should be interconnected, so that the 'subject', the individual member of a given social group, may move from one to another without confusion—so much is a logical necessity" (1991: 40).

68 For a critique of Soja's influence on biblical studies, see Meredith 2013.

69 Lefebvre tersely delineates perceived space as "Spatial practice, which embraces production and reproduction, and the particular locations and sets characteristic of each social formation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion" (1991: 33).

70 For Lefebvre, representations of space "are tied to the relations of production and to the 'order' which those relations impose" (1991: 33).

engineers.[71] Representational space, which Lefebvre also calls lived space, emphasizes the use of space as mediated through cultural symbols.[72]

By means of analogy, Lefebvre applies this triad to the body (1991: 40). Bodily practice—the perceived body—refers to the use of the body, its hands, sensory organs and the like, both in relation to work and other activities. Representations of the body—the conceived body—refers to scientific knowledge about the body and its systems. While bodily representation—the lived body—is mediated through culture, such as through Judaeo-Christian traditions about the body. As this corporeal analogy illustrates, Lefebvre's perceived, conceived, and lived triad does not offer a system for categorizing space. Neither the body nor space can be neatly divided up into three separate entities. Rather, Lefebvre's trialectics provides a framework for thinking about the dynamic relations of power through which space is produced at all scales.[73]

Lefebvre does not isolate space from time. On the contrary, "every society—and hence every mode of production with its subvariants (i.e. all those societies which exemplify the general concept)—produces a space, its own space" (1991: 31; cf. 2009: 210–22). He outlines a diachronic sequence of spaces—what he terms analogical, cosmological, symbolic, and logical or logistical spaces—that roughly correspond to Marx's modes of production (2009: 223–53). Lefebvre's analysis of space, then, is deeply historical. And for Lefebvre, space is related to time at another scale: through the rhythms of everyday life (1991: 59, 89, 95; 2004). In Lefebvre's work, the history and rhythms of space are related. Thus, for example, he argues that industrialization has produced a particular form of urban life with certain programmed rhythms.[74] In sum, then, Lefebvre

---

71 Lefebvre writes, "[C]onceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers, as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent—all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived. . . . This is the dominant space in any society (or mode of production)" (1991: 38–39).

72 Lefebvre defines representational space as "space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users,' but also of some artists and perhaps of those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who describe and aspire to do no more than describe. This is the dominated—and hence passively experienced—space which imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects. Thus representational spaces may be said, though again with certain exceptions, to tend towards more or less coherent systems of non-verbal symbols and signs" (1991: 39).

73 Although cognizant of space at all scales, Lefebvre focuses especially on the rural, the urban, and the global (cf. Elden 2007: 103–05).

74 Lefebvre writes, "[T]he great event of the last few years is that the effects of industrialisation on a superficially modified capitalist society of production and property have

provides a framework for thinking about space that moves between the body and the planet, and between global history and everyday life.[75]

The Urban Approach

An eighth approach to space merits brief separate mention even though it draws largely on the methods described above: the urban. I note it here because of its growing prominence in the humanities and social sciences, an importance spurred by the increasing urbanization of the world's expanding population and the related conviction that humanity's future is urban.[76] This approach treats the city—from legal, political, economic, ecological, visual, social, and other perspectives. Classic studies of the city include Weber 1958 and Mumford 1961.[77] The signal contribution, in my view, once more comes from Lefebvre (2003b [French original, 1970]), who argues that the world is already completely urbanized in so far as the process of urbanization has

---

produced their results: a programmed *everyday life* in its appropriate *urban setting*. Such a process was favoured by the disintegration of the traditional town and the expansion of urbanism" (1971: 65, cited in Elden 2007: 103). Elden offers a cogent summary, "Lefebvre's notion of everyday life suggests that capitalism, which has always organized the working life, has greatly expanded its control over the private life, over leisure. This is often through an organization of space" (2007: 105).

75 With regard to the relationship between the body and space, architects will recall Le Corbusier's Modulor system of proportion devised in relation to an idealized body (1968 [French original, 1954]). But Lefebvre's politics are very different from Le Corbusier's, which were expressed in his 1920s design for a Contemporary City of three million inhabitants and in his later proposal for a Radiant City (1967). Though Le Corbusier abandoned the class stratification of his earlier design, Lefebvre criticizes Le Corbusier's failure to adequately apprehend social dimensions of urban life (Lefebvre 1996: 207; see Elden 2004: 146). Corbusier's city design celebrated the centrality of the automobile, which Lefebvre regarded as a sign of technological domination of human life (Elden 2004: 146).

76 At an institutional level, the growing importance of urban studies is signaled, for example, by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's substantial funding of the Harvard Mellon Urban Initiative; the Princeton-Mellon Initiative in Architecture, Urbanism and the Humanities; the Urban Humanities Initiative at the University of California, Los Angeles; the Global Urban Humanities Initiative at the University of California, Berkeley; and the New York University Marron Institute on Cities and the Urban Environment.

77 More recent treatments include Harvey 1989; Katznelson 1992; Soja 1996; Pile 1996; Merrifield and Swyngedouw 1997; Soja 2000; Merrifield 2002; Brenner and Theodore 2002; Parker 2004; Brenner and Keil 2006; Massey 2007; Parker 2011; Millington 2011; Harvey 2012; Brenner, Marcuse, and Mayer 2012; Brenner 2013; Corner 2014; Merrifield 2014; Fraser 2015; Brenner 2016; Lees, Shin and López Morales 2016; Waldheim 2016.

created the conditions for capitalism (see Brenner 2013: 14–35).[78] For Lefebvre, the influence of the city is felt far beyond its porous boundaries. Lefebvre (2003b) traces the history of the process of urbanization by noting several discontinuous transformations—the political city, the mercantile city, and the industrial city.[79] The notion of a global city, with its international flows of labour and capital, has been traced with particular rigor by Saskia Sassen (1988; 1991; 1994; 1996; 1998; 1999; 2008). Since recent studies of the city largely employ methods I describe elsewhere in this section, I will refrain from summarizing them here. Biblical and ancient Near Eastern scholars are well positioned to contribute to the discussion of planetary urbanization in so far as they have access to the earliest recorded history of urban life.[80]

---

78 Lefebvre writes, "I'll begin with the following hypothesis: Society has been completely urbanized. This hypothesis implies a definition: An urban society is a society that results from a process of complete urbanization. This urbanization is virtual today but will become real in the future. . . . Here, I use the term 'urban society' to refer to the society that results from industrialization, which is a process of domination that absorbs agricultural production" (2003b: 1–2). He continues, "Thoughtful people no longer see themselves reflected in nature, a shadowy world subject to mysterious forces. Between them and nature, between their home (the focal point of thought, existence) and the world, lies the urban reality, an essential mediating factor. From this moment on society no longer coincides with the countryside. It no longer coincides with the city, either. The state encompasses them both, joins them in its hegemony by making use of their rivalry" (2003b: 11–12).

79 Lefebvre is sensitive to regional differences during any given period of history. For example, consider his brief discussion of feudalism: "Thus in Western feudalism, the territorial lord threatens the re-emerging city, where the merchants find their meeting place, their homebase, the place of their strategy. The city responds to this action of landed power, and a class struggle ensues, sometimes quiescent, sometimes violent. The city liberates itself, not by integrating itself by becoming an aristocracy of commoners, but by integrating itself with the monarchic State (for which it provided an essential condition). On the other hand, during the same period, in so far as one can speak of Islamic feudalism, the 'lord' rules over the city of craftsmen and shopkeepers and from it, over a surrounding countryside, often reduced to gardens and to spare and insignificant cultivations. In such a relationship, there is neither the kernel nor the possibility of class struggle" (1996: 119).

80 Lefebvre writes, "The city of the ancient world cannot be understood as a collection of people and things in space; nor can it be visualized solely on the basis of a number of texts and treatises on the subject of space, even though some of these, as for example Plato's *Critias* and *Timaeus* or Aristotle's *Metaphysics A*, may be irreplaceable sources of knowledge. For the ancient city had its own spatial practice: it forged its own—appropriated—space. Whence the need for a study of space which is able to apprehend it as such, in its genesis and its form, with its own specific time or times (the rhythm of daily life), and its particular centres and polycentrism (agora, temple, stadium, etc.)" (1991: 31). As the invocation of the agora and stadium suggests, Lefebvre is primarily interested in Greco-Roman tradition.

Much of the scholarly work I have discussed above is theoretical and global, at times even abstractly universal. Readers wishing to get a more concrete sense of how geographers, anthropologists, and historians influenced to varying degrees by these theoretical approaches have offered compelling analyses of empirical data should read Coronil (1997) on Venezuela, Mukerji (1997) on France, Hart (2002) on South Africa, Goswami (2004) on India, Moore (2005) on Zimbabwe, or Kosek (2006) on New Mexico. Their work illustrates the value of thinking in theoretically sophisticated ways about space while pursuing research that is empirically driven. In Part 2, to illustrate the same, I highlight the work of some biblical scholars who read the Bible while attending to questions about space.

Part 2. An Overlay: Important Works on the Bible and Space

Although spatial concepts—land, territory, city, temple, and so on—have long been central concerns of biblical scholarship, in recent decades biblical scholars have also begun to pay attention to conversations about space taking place across the humanities and social sciences.[81] By attending to the approaches to space I outlined in Part 1, biblical scholars have presented fresh readings of biblical literature and insightful analyses of the social, legal, and political world that produced it. In this section, I highlight some of this expanding body of scholarship. For each of seven approaches to space that I outlined in Part 1—the sacred, the legal, the political, the economic, the ecological, the visual, and the social—I note one biblical scholar whose work has been influenced by that approach.[82] Part 2 thus serves as a biblical studies overlay to the spatial studies map offered in Part 1.

---

81 Perhaps the most influential and visible forums supporting scholarly work at the intersection of spatial studies and biblical studies have been the Constructions of Space Ancient Seminar jointly organized by the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblcial Literature from 2000 to 2005, and the Space, Place, and Lived Experience in Antiquity Program Unit of the Society of Biblical Literature, from 2005 to the present. Out of these have come several volumes of collected essays that together constitute a sustained treatment of ancient space as it was perceived, conceived, and lived (e.g., Berquist and Camp 2007; Camp and Berquist 2008; Økland, de Vos, and Wenell 2013; George 2013; Prinsloo and Maier 2013). Other collections of essays at the intersection of spatial studies and biblical studies include Gunn and McNutt 2002 and Boer and Conrad 2003.

82 Since the urban approach to space treats the city using a variety of methods discussed in my treatment of other approaches to space, I do not present here a biblical scholar working within the urban approach to space.

The Sacred Approach

Within biblical studies, Eliade's sacred approach to space has shaped the work of Robert S. Kawashima.[83] In a forthcoming monograph tentatively titled *The Archaeology of Ancient Israelite Knowledge*, Kawashima traces the rupture between what he calls the archaic episteme and the classical episteme, as witnessed in biblical narrative (cf. Kawashima 2003; 2006; 2014). He borrows the term episteme from Michel Foucault (1970) and uses it to refer to the *a priori* structures underlying human knowledge in a particular time and place. Eliade's treatment of the sacred—especially as worked out in relation to myth, sacred time, and sacred space—influence Kawashima's exposition of the archaic episteme.[84] For Kawashima, the archaic episteme conceives of the universe as a monistic whole while the classical episteme distinguishes between "this time," in which the contingent processes of history operate (2014: 52), and the mythological time of origins.[85] An episteme does not describe one discrete aspect of thought but refers to deep structures undergirding all concepts. For Kawashima, then, the epistemic rupture between the archaic and the classical manifests itself across several concepts. He treats transformations in three primary concepts: God, nature (i.e., the world), and human. And he probes shifts in the relationships between these concepts: sacred space (i.e., the relationship between God and nature), the human condition and the concept of covenant

83 Note also Jonathan Z. Smith (1978; 1987), who revises Eliade's insights by paying special attention to the role of ritual in constructing the sacred.

84 For example, in a landmark essay Kawashima writes, "In this chapter, I adopt Mircea Eliade's structural-symbolic definition of myth. Properly mythical events, in his view, take place in a qualitatively distinct past he refers to as *illud tempus*, 'that time': 'This primordial situation is not historical, it is not calculable chronologically; what is involved is a mythical anteriority, the time of origin, what took place "in the beginning," *in principio*' (1959, 92). In other words, it does not precede reality in chronological fashion, but underlies it as its paradigm. What this means, as I have argued elsewhere at greater length, is that mythical thought conceives of the cosmos as a static system, composed of various elements and relations that are eternal, necessary, and essential" (Kawashima 2014: 52).

85 Kawashima writes, "History, in contrast, belongs to what I call 'this time'—a concept implied but apparently not explicitly developed by Eliade. The historical past, too, may be irreversible and therefore necessary, but the properly historical event was not always already a fait accompli. Rather, by virtue of the fact that it takes place within 'this time,' it had to emerge at a certain 'measurable' moment (the date of the event) out of the contingency of an unknown future. Historical thought thus apprehends the world as a realm of accidence, contingence, and time. This properly empirical reality is thinkable as such only in opposition to some strictly utopian ideal beyond the empirical—Israel's God, Plato's forms. Historical thought, in other words, constitutes a dualism" (2014: 52).

(i.e., the relationship between God and human), and possession of territory (i.e, the relationship between human and nature). The result is a systematic exposition of how biblical narrative radically broke with archaic thought, including with its own mythic mode of thought preserved still in some old poems.

I find Kawashima's work on spatial concepts wholly original. In his exploration of the relationship between God and nature, Kawashima distinguishes between two modes of establishing sacred space. In the mythic mode, sacred space is established in what Eliade calls "that time" and remains an intrinsic part of the structure of the world. For example, *Enuma elish* conceives of Marduk's temple in Babylon—a physical structure potentially visible to the story's ancient audience—as being established in time immemorial. It is part of the very structure of the world. In the historical mode, by contrast, sacred space is established through contingent processes and so is conceptualized as extrinsic to the structure of the world. For example, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History conceive of a time in Israelite history when YHWH had not yet chosen Jerusalem (compare Deut. 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26 with 1 Kgs 11:13, 32, 36; 14:21). For Kawashima, this difference in conceptualizing sacred space is one manifestation of the underlying rupture between the archaic episteme and the classical episteme.

In his exploration of the relationship between the concepts human and nature (i.e., human possession of territory), Kawashima examines the concept of the foreigner in the biblical portrayal of Israel's past and compares it to the concept of the native in other ancient origin stories. He finds *Enuma elish* strikingly parochial in so far as it is ultimately concerned with a very specific place, Babylon. In the myth, Mesopotamians are autochthonous, springing from the very soil. The land and the people constitute a kind of unity. Kawashima points out that the standard biblical picture of Israel's past contained in the Deuteronomistic History imagines Israel as outsiders to the land they came to occupy. Israel does not acquire its land in the mythological time of origins. Israel does not spring from its very soil. Rather, Israel comes to posses the land through the contingent processes of history. The land and the people are not a unity. Instead, in Kawashima's view, Deuteronomistic tradition conceptualizes Israel's land as an alienable possession.

The Legal Approach

The legal approach to space has influenced my own work on the Bible, no doubt in part because I view biblical law as central to the Bible. I have traced the relevance of Max Gluckman's work to understanding the portrayal of land rights in Genesis 23 (2013) and 2 Samuel 24 (2016: 16–39). In Part 3, I present a detailed

study of 1 Kgs 21:1–16 in light of the legal approach to space. Here, let me briefly summarize my previous treatment of Genesis 23. Biblical scholarship has struggled to understand three aspects of the narrative of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Macpelah. First, although silver is exchanged between Abraham and Ephron only, the narrative summarizes the transaction by noting that Abraham acquired the land from the Bnei Het (compare v. 16 and v. 20). In the same vein, although—within the narrative world of the text—Abraham knows which land he wishes to purchase and is able to name its owner (v. 8–9), he approaches the Bnei Het first and asks them to speak to Ephron on his behalf (vv. 3–4, 8). What legal role do the Bnei Het play in this transaction? Second, although the characters mention Sarah's burial again and again during their negotiations, some seven times (vv. 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15; cf. v. 20), the narrator almost completely glosses the burial itself (v. 19). Does the burial—that is, the use to which the land will be put—play some part in the legal transaction? Third, the terse narrative devotes considerable space to the characters' performance of politeness and deference (vv. 6, 7, 11, 12, 15). Is status integral to the transaction itself?

In light of Gluckman's work and several ancient Near Eastern analogs, I provide answers to these questions and an integrated reading of the narrative. Following Gluckman, I distinguish between different kinds of rights and acknowledge that different individuals and groups can have different kinds of rights in the same piece of land. Within the narrative world of the text, Ephron holds productive rights in the land, but only the Bnei Het hold sufficient administrative rights in the property to securely transfer it to an outsider. As such, Abraham approaches them first. Like Gluckman, I explicate ownership in terms of the right to use land in specified ways. Abraham doesn't seek the right to pasture his flock or build a house, but to bury his deceased wife. The use to which the land will be put is specified several times in the transaction since it forms an integral part of the sale. Finally, like Gluckman, I recognize a connection between rights held in land and social standing in the community. In performing acts of deference the characters acknowledge each other's rights in land and confirm the validity of the transaction itself.

The Political Approach

Nili Wazana's (2013) analysis of biblical descriptions of Israel's land illustrates how a political approach to space can generate compelling readings of the Bible. Wazana draws on John R. V. Prescott (1965; 1987) and other spatial studies scholars in order to distinguish between a border and a frontier. The former reflects a multicentric worldview, which acknowledges several legitimate centers of power. The latter reflects a monocentric worldview, which distinguishes one legitimate center from the uncivilized lands at its periphery. By observing

monocentric and multicentric conceptualizations of Israel's land in the Hebrew Bible, Wazana offers fresh insights into the literary history of the Bible and the history of the social world that produced it. For example, she traces in Joshua varying conceptualizations of the scope of the Promised Land, the process of its possession, the degree of Israelite success in conquering it, and the locations of any remaining non-Israelites within it. These parameters allow her to reconstruct four differing views of the Promised Land encoded in Joshua: (1) the Book of Settlement (Josh. 13:7–21:45), including descriptions of tribal allocations in Josh. 13:7–19:49; (2) the first two conquest resumés in Joshua 10, 11; (3) the third conquest resumé in Joshua 12; and (4) the remaining-land document in Josh. 13:1–6 (2013: 185–276). She shows that the Book of Settlement is an independent source in so far as "[i]t does not refer to any of the other views [of the Promised Land], nor does it engage in any polemics with them" (2013: 299). But all four views "share a common multicentric perspective, in which the land forms a delineated and delimited territorial unity promised by God to the Israelites" (2013: 301). Attention to a political approach to space thus allows Wazana to go beyond traditional analyses of the editorial history of Joshua.

The Economic Approach

Roland Boer (2015) has offered a sophisticated treatment of ancient economy in Southwest Asia that attends to land, territory, and the flow of labor. Boer adapts Marxist *régulation* theory, with its focus on structural crises and their regularization, to interpret ancient archaeological and textual data. For Boer, ancient economy was characterized by crisis rather than stability. He offers a one-sentence definition of this *régulation* approach: "[G]iven the normal state of economic instability and crisis, a *régulation* approach is interested in how specific economic systems stabilize crises in order to gain some continuity for certain periods" (2015: 31–32). Boer treats economic activity at three levels: (1) institutional forms, to which the bulk of the book is devoted; (2) constellations of these forms that constitute economic regimes; and (3) the mode of production made up of such regimes (2015: 1). He distinguishes between allocative patterns of economic activity, which "depend on the allocation and reallocation of labor and the produce of labor" among producers and extractive patterns of economic activity, which is characterized by the "appropriation of the produce of labor by those who do not work (the willing unemployed, namely, the ruling class and its hangers-on)" (2015: 1).[86]

86 Boer writes, "Extraction takes place by means of either exploitation or expropriation: the former designates the extraction of surplus from what one possesses—land, machinery,

Boer maps these three levels of economic activity in more detail than can be recounted here. He outlines three institutional forms of allocation—"Subsistence survival" (i.e., basic subsistence planting and herding), "kinship-household" (i.e., social networks based on an ideology of shared ancestry), and "patron-client" (a relationship of mutual, but unequal obligation, that can cut across kinship lines), as well as two institutional forms of extraction: the "state-estate" (i.e., the temple and the palace and their relationships to producers) and "tribute-exchange" (i.e., imperial acquisition of luxury goods through plunder, tribute, tax, and trade). In addition, he maps the relationships between these institutional forms of allocation and extraction within three regimes: (1) the "subsistence regime," which Boer regards as the most stable; (2) the "palatine regime," in which rulers of states maintained themselves and their dependents through agricultural estates; and (3) the "regime of booty," which was characterized by large militaries and bureaucracies and which depended on imperial forms of plunder, taxation, and tribute (2015: 7, 193–216). Boer uses the term "sacred economy" to refer to the overarching mode of production he traces in ancient Southwestern Asia, thereby acknowledging the pervasiveness of the religious practice of everyday life (2015: 2, 217). In this way, Boer offers a much more sophisticated model of human exploitation of land in the ancient world than some previous models, which were often one-dimensional in so far as they attended to only one form of economic structure. I use the term "model" because the scope of his analysis, covering almost three thousand years and the full sweep of Mesopotamia and the Levant, makes it impossible for him to treat the voluminous evidence in detail. His work provides a framework for future scholarship to explore the evidence for human exploitation of land at particular sites or during particular time periods in more detail.[87]

The Ecological Approach

Within biblical studies, an ecological approach to space is elegantly taken up by Ellen F. Davis (2009). Rather than advocating an agricultural method of reading that could be transferred to any text, Davis moves with great literary

---

labor—while the latter concerns the extraction of surplus from what one does not possess but is possessed by another" (2015: 1–2).

87 Boer readily admits the abstracted nature of the model. For example, he writes, "I have unashamedly set out to provide an overarching framework for understanding the economies of ancient Israel within the context of ancient Southwest Asia" (2015: 217). Or, for example, in discussing kinship-household and patronage as institutional forms of allocation, he writes, "Of course, the reality was quite different, for they run into, overlap, and conflict in myriad ways" (2015: 82).

and ethical sensitivity between ancient texts, the social world that produced them, and contemporary practices of agriculture and land use. Together, the essays in her book highlight the pervasive concern of the Bible with the "health of the land" (2009: 1). I noted in Part 1 that, compared to other approaches to space, the ecological approach often places greater emphasis on praxis.[88] In this vein, Davis writes, "[A]grarianism is nothing less that a comprehensive philosophy and practice—that is, a culture—of preservation" (2009: 66). Davis challenges her readers by bringing ancient traditions and contemporary thinkers—especially Wendell Berry—into conversation.

In one essay, Davis reads Exodus 16, in which YHWH provides manna and quail for Israel as a corrective to indulgence that is not satisfied. She writes, "[T]he ban on hoarding and manna that spoils overnight are symbols that touch us closely, living as we do in a culture of unprecedented hoarding, consumption, and waste" (2009: 76). For Davis the excesses of modern society do not lead to sustainable satisfaction. In fact, restraint is beneficial. Davis observes, "Both forms of restraint enjoined here, not hoarding and Sabbath observance, are meant to heal Israel through daily and weekly acts of recognition that YHWH is God, whose 'hand' is steadily manifested for their good" (2009: 78). Seen in this light, the biblical text serves as an exhortation to contemporary communities to be more satisfied by consuming less.

In another chapter, Davis reads the multifaceted biblical portrayal of Jerusalem as she observes the role of the city in contemporary society. While some view the city with suspicion, the biblical vision of Jerusalem allows Davis to hold out the possibility of a faithful city. She finds apt for Detroit, which is reemerging as a postindustrial green city, the words of comfort offered in exilic Isaiah's promise that the people will no longer be called "Abandoned," nor their land "Devastated," but rather "My Delight is in Her," and their land "Husbanded" (Isa. 62:4; Davis 2009: 178). For Davis, sustainable, healthy cities are an integral part of biblical prophetic hope.

The Visual Approach

Denis E. Cosgrove's visual approach to space has influenced a section of Mary E. Mills's (2012) examination of the image of the city in biblical prophecy. The primary interpretive lens for her book as a whole comes from Steve Pile's (2005) work on the urban imaginary. In this study Piles "develops his earlier approaches of applying language regarding the human body and psyche to city life, stressing the role of imagination in constructing and interpreting urban

88 Davis (2009: 2) observes how her approach differs from the more typical focus of biblical studies on territoriality, what I termed above the political approach to space.

affairs" (Mills 2012: 4 n. 3). We might thus classify Mills's books as utilizing an urban approach to space in so far as her main object of inquiry is the symbolic cityscape of biblical prophetic literature (2012: ix), especially the urban temple and palace. She examines both cosmic and political models of the city in several biblical texts (2012: 49–71). She reads Ezekiel's temple journeys in conversation with Bachelard's (1964) poetics of space. And she explores in the book of Joel the role of ritual in resisting the chaos wrought by drought, locusts, armies, and storm on land, city, and temple (2012: 95–115).

Here, I wish to highlight Chapter 9 of Mills's book, which is shaped by Denis E. Cosgrove's visual approach to space. In this chapter, she explores in Isaiah 40–65 the imagery of the natural landscape and the relationship of that rural portrait to the city. Cosgrov'e work on vision and geography allows Mills to go beyond traditional scholarly treatments of the natural landscape in Isaiah 40–65 by drawing attention to the urban viewer who apprehends the scene. For Mills, the city and urban dwellers remain at the center of Isaiah 40–65 even as so much of the language used, especially in Isaiah 40–49, is natural—"wilderness, grass, flowers, mountains and valleys, waters, grasshoppers, chaff, rivers, pools, sea and sand, scorching wind" (2012: 196). She writes, "It can be argued that the center of interest in this sequence of chapters is the city, but that the value of urban existence can best be measured by an imaginative use of rural iconography" (2012: 197). Mills argues that the urban imaginary here helps readers come to terms with radical political and social changes.

The Social Approach

Lefebvre's social approach to space, especially his trialectics of space as refracted through the work of Edward Soja (1996), has been especially influential within biblical studies.[89] To varying degrees his legacy can be felt in Roland Boer's (2003) examination of 1 Samuel, Karen J. Wenell's (2007) treatment of millenarian approaches to land in the first century CE, Christl M. Maier's (2008) exploration of the gendered language used of Jerusalem in exilic and postexilic literature, Eric C. Stewart's (2009) mapping of Jesus's spatial practice in the Gospel of Mark, Jaime L. Waters's (2015) analysis of threshing floors in the Hebrew Bible, Mark S. Smith's (2016) probing of spatial elements of biblical anthropomorphism, John M. Vonder Bruegge's (2016) investigation of the portrayal of Galilee, and my own study of royal power in Iron Age Israel and Judah (Russell 2016). In allied fields, Lefebvre's influence is evident in Ömür Harmanşah's (2013) examination of Assyrian and Hittite royal texts depicting

89 For a critique of how Soja's work has been applied within biblical studies, see Meredith 2013.

the founding of cities and Paul J. Kosmin's (2014) delineation of Seleucid royal territorial practices.

As an elegant example of how the social approach to space can lead to fresh readings of the Bible, consider Mark K. George's (2009) treatment of the Priestly tabernacle account (Exodus 25–31, 35–40). Biblical scholars have struggled to account adequately for the depth of detail provided in the Priestly description of the tabernacle. George shows that the description is more than a blueprint for a particular building or a Priestly conceit. For George, the description creates a particular space. He argues, "The narratives express a social configuration and Priestly understanding of Israelite society, social organization, and Israel's role in the divine creation" (2009: 8). In describing the tabernacle and its creation in such detail, the Priestly writers "encode an idealized social organization" (2009: 8). Insights from Lefebvre allow George to remain agnostic on the question of the tabernacle's material existence (2009: 12) while still offering a sophisticated analysis of how the Priestly tabernacle account functioned during the post-monarchic period.

George's attention to archaeological evidence from ancient Israel (e.g., 2009: 81, 157) and other ancient Near Eastern literary depictions of religious spaces (e.g., 2009: 58, 149–57) shape his interpretation of the biblical text and make this study a sophisticated synthesis of theoretical insights and ancient evidence. For example, he outlines the archaeological and textual evidence for foundation deposits—tablets with descriptions of temples that were placed in stone boxes in Mesopotamian temples and that were considered part of the buildings themselves (2009: 149–57). George argues, "[T]he ark in the tabernacle parallels the function of stone-box building deposits" (2009: 160; cf. 167–74). But the Priestly portrayal of the ark differs from these ancient Near Eastern analogs by virtue of its portability. Indeed, George observes the emphasis on portability in various aspects of the tabernacle account (e.g., 2009: 75–79). For George, the Priestly writers succeeded in portraying their deity as one "who had no fixed place for his (*sic*) divine dwelling because he (*sic*) dwelt in a portable space that moved with the people and was the equivalent of any Mesopotamian temple" (2009: 174).

These wide-ranging studies illustrate how attention to scholarly conversations about space taking place in other fields can bring analytical clarity to discussions of the Bible and other literature from the ancient world. They provide models for readers who wish to pursue theoretically sophisticated work on space that remains anchored in ancient textual and archaeological evidence. In Part 3, I offer another example of such work by reading the narrative of Naboth's vineyard, 1 Kgs 21:1–16, in light of the legal approach to space I discussed in Part 1.

Part 3. An Inset: Naboth's Vineyard and the Legal Approach to Space

In the preceding sections, I offered a map of scholarly literature on space and an overlay for that map showing work being done at the intersection of spatial studies and biblical studies. The ground covered was vast and my treatment of the material correspondingly terse. In this section, I offer an inset for our map by treating in more detail one biblical text, 1 Kgs 21:1–16, in light of one approach to space, the legal.[90] According to 1 Kgs 21:1–16, king Ahab of Israel offered to purchase the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite, who refused to sell it. Ahab's wife Jezebel arranged for the execution of Naboth on false charges, paving the way for Ahab to take possession of Naboth's land.[91] An alternative tradition in 2 Kgs 9:25–26 stresses Naboth's bloody murder in connection with other narrative themes, as noted below. First Kings 21:1–16, however, emphasizes land. The story describes in vivid terms Naboth's refusal to dispose of his property by placing in his mouth the protestation, "Yahweh forbid that I should sell the inheritance of my ancestors to you!" (1 Kgs 21:3). But scholars have struggled to understand the story's assumptions about land rights, leading to proposals that contradict the narrative logic of the episode. In this section, I argue that the portrayal of royal and non-royal power over land in 1 Kgs 21:1–16 is best understood within the framework of Max Gluckman's (1965) approach to land rights. As I noted in Part 1, Gluckman showed that more than one individual or group at different levels in any society can hold different kinds of rights in the same piece of land, nested in a hierarchy. At every level of the hierarchy, rights entail and are contingent upon responsibilities. These themes are borne out in the textual evidence for ancient Near Eastern land rights and they help to clarify the conflict over land described in 1 Kgs 21:1–16.

This approach has interpretive advantages over treatments of 1 Kgs 21:1–16 that do not adequately account for the legal basis of land rights assumed by the narrative. Several commentators, for example, have analyzed the story in light

90 This section is a revised version of an article previously published in the *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (Russell 2014). I am grateful to SAGE Publications for permission to use it here.

91 For a recent comprehensive treatment of the story, including extensive discussion of previous scholarship, see Cronauer 2005 and Seidel 2012. In an appendix, Cronauer surveys scholarly approaches to the legal assumptions in the narrative (2005: 211–18). Seidel also examines previous scholarly work, especially work on the relationship of 1 Kings 21 as a whole to the larger Deuteronomistic History (2012: 4–42). An earlier, though still very helpful, survey of scholarship, is Martin-Achard 1991.

of the warning against royal power in 1 Sam. 8:14, "He will seize your choice fields, vineyards, and olive groves, and give them to his courtiers" (Rehm 1982; Walsh 2000: 78; Domeris 2007: 81; Ziegler 2008: 141 n. 57; cf. Seidel 2012: 162–63). Such power over land is, in turn, understood against the purported royal confiscation of land in other ancient Near Eastern texts.[92] Ancient Near Eastern royal power over land, however, has been exaggerated in some contexts. Even a king as wealthy and powerful as the Egyptian pharaoh Akhenaten found it necessary, in his so-called "Earlier Proclamation," to declare that the land on which he had founded a temple and administrative center for his god the Aten had not previously been owned by god nor king, nor had it been used for cultivation. Rather, the land had been found by him, "widowed."[93] Whether or not one is inclined to believe his claims here, his language suggests that royal power over land in the ancient Near East was not absolute but required diplomacy and negotiation.[94] Royal power in 1 Kgs 21:1–16 is likewise limited. The portrayal of Ahab's sulking (1 Kgs 21:4) rests on the assumption that Naboth's refusal cannot be trumped by monarchic right (Seebass 1974: 475–76; Sarna 1997: 119–20; Cogan 2001: 486; cf. Matthews and Benjamin 1993: 157). Such an interpretive approach, then, does not fit the narrative logic of the episode.

Yet scholars who acknowledge the text's assumptions about the limitations of royal power over land face a further interpretive problem: on what legal basis should the property of Naboth come into Ahab's possession after Naboth's death? One solution has been to posit that Ahab was a distant relative of Naboth, from the tribe of Issachar and perhaps even from Jezreel itself (Šanda 1911–1912: 1.461–62). As a distant relative of the deceased, Ahab would have been entitled to redeem the land. In fact, this suggestion was already made in the Talmud (b. Sanh. 48b; t. Sanh 4.6; see Cogan 2001: 481). But there is nothing in the text to indicate such a relationship. In fact, the rhetorical force of Naboth's appeal to his ancestors rests on the assumption that he and Ahab do not share the same lineage. A second solution has been to suggest that a very specific legal charge was brought against Naboth during the mock trial: he had agreed to sell the land to Ahab under oath but had subsequently rescinded the offer (Andersen 1966: 51–56). The proposal has a certain explanatory power, but goes far beyond the available evidence. The narrator lists the

92 On ancient Near Eastern royal power over land, see Weinfeld 1970; Labuschagne 1974; Greenfield 1977; Ben-Barak 1981; Ben-Barak 1981–1982; Oden 2012; Russell 2013.

93 For text and translation, see Murnane and Van Siclen 1993: 11–68, esp. 37–38.

94 On limited royal power over land, see also Schloen 2001: 230; Nam 2012: 43; Oden 2012; Russell 2016: 24–31.

charge simply as "blessing"—that is, cursing—God and king.[95] In the narrative logic of the episode, the substance of the charge is less important than the parties involved. Problems therefore remain in understanding the portrayal of royal and non-royal power over land in 1 Kgs 21:1–16. These difficulties are resolved, I suggest, by attending to the legal approach to space outlined by Max Gluckman.

A Story about Land

Before turning to the relevance of Gluckman's work for understanding 1 Kgs 21:1–16, let us briefly consider the narrative's traditio-historical background in order to bring into focus its thematic emphasis. While the date of composition of 1 Kgs 21:1–16 and the redactional history of the surrounding narrative remain debated, it is clear that the text emphasizes land as it develops the tradition about Naboth's death.[96] Two explanations of Naboth's death are preserved in the Book of Kings (Rofé 1988: 95–97).[97] According to one of these traditions,

---

95 On this euphemism, see Job 1:11; 2:5, 9; Ps. 10:3. See also Cogan 2001: 480.

96 Scholars locating the story in the Persian period include Alexander Rofé (1988), Erhard Blum (2000), Patrick T. Cronauer (2005: 167–85), and Ernst Axel Knauf (2011). Rofé's argument is primarily linguistic and he cites six features of the text that in his view point to a postexilic date. Blum's argument rests on Rofé's lingusitic work and he further draws redactional connections between 1 Kings 21 and 1 Kgs 16:1–4. Knauf likewise builds on Rofé's linguistic argument, believing the story to best fit the cultural and social context of the Persian period. Cronauer cites Rofé and observes narrative themes that he regards as best suited to a Persian context. The linguistic arguments of Rofé, however, have been strongly challenged by Nadav Na'aman (2008). Without them Blum's argument collapses, as Na'aman shows, and Knauf's and Cronauer's arguments carry little persuasive force since the preexilic period provides just as compelling a setting for the cultural, legal, and social themes of the story. On the possibility of an Israelite redaction of some material now contained in Kings that would have served the political interests of the House of Jehu and would have included a tradition of Naboth's death at the hands of Ahab in 2 Kings 9, see Lemaire 2000; Campbell and O'Brien 2000: 24–31; Hutton 2009: 125, 153; see also Seidel 2012: 256–69. On the portrayal of Jezebel in 1 Kgs 21:1–16 serving the political interests of Jehu's dynasty and thus most likely being composed while his dynasty was still in power, see Halpern and Lemaire 2010: 145. Seebass (1974: 477) points out that the story seems ignorant of the whole institution of the Jubilee since Ahab's offer to purchase the vineyard is presented as perfectly reasonable. On the redactional history of 1 Kings 21, see also Würthwein 1978; Oeming 1986; White 1997: 33–36; Cronauer 2005: 167–98; Seidel 2012: 198–272, 276–82. For a synchronic treatment of 1 Kings 21, see Walsh 1992.

97 Marsha C. White (1994: 67–68) argues that where the 1 Kings 21 account differs from the 2 Kings 9 account, it does so in ways that take up themes from the David and Bathsheba story. She thus sees 2 Kings 9 as the older tradition. On thematic connections to the Bathsheba

2 Kgs 9:25–26, Jehu justified his sacrilegious disposal of the body of king Joram, son of Ahab, by citing a prophetic word that he had overheard, "I swear, as surely as I saw the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons last night—utterance of Yahweh—I will requite you in this plot (חלקה), according to Yahweh's word" (v.26). The brief mention here of Naboth, blood, and a plot of land is cryptic. The events alluded to remain unclear. The verse shares common themes with the events surrounding Naboth's vineyard in 1 Kgs 21:1–16. However, there are significant differences between the two texts, suggesting that they represent two separate accounts. According to 1 Kings 21, Naboth owned a "vineyard" (כרם), ownership of that vineyard was the focus of his dispute with Ahab, the crime related to Naboth and his fathers, and his execution was public. On the other hand, 2 Kgs 9:25–26 mentions only a plot of ground belonging to Naboth (חלקת שדה נבות), that plot served merely as the location for the bloody crime committed by Ahab—note the use of the deictic, "this plot"—and was not the focus of the dispute itself, the crime was against Naboth and his sons, and his murder took place during the secrecy of night. Although they share similar themes, then, 2 Kgs 9:25–26 reflects an alternative Naboth tradition to that found in 1 Kgs 21:1–16. The logic of 2 Kgs 9:25–26 is that of the *lex talionis*, an eye for an eye, in which punishment matched crime. That tradition assumes that Naboth and his sons had been murdered by Ahab but no motive is given for the crime, merely its stark reality. It was the blood of Naboth that required vengeance, not his plot. First Kings 21:1–16 contains a different Naboth tradition that emphasizes instead the vineyard, Naboth's ancestral inheritance. In other words, 1 Kgs 21:1–16 developed the tradition about Naboth's death at the hands of Ahab in a particular direction, one that emphasized conflict over land.[98]

The conflict over land is sharply painted.[99] For Ahab, the vineyard is purchasable.[100] Naboth, however, regards the offer to purchase his land as an insult. His oath vehemently expresses his indignation, "Yahweh forbid that

---

incident, see Lange 2000: 32. Na'aman (2008: 212–13) emphasizes the similarities between the two traditions, but does not propose that one tradition is older than the other. On the discrepancies between the two traditions, see also Rofé 1988: 95–97. On the tradition in 2 Kgs 9:25–26, see Seebass 1974: 485–86; Thiel 1999: 73–76; Cronauer 2005: 22–39; Seidel 2012: 180–92.

98 Zakovitch (1984: 382) observes that Josephus misses the point of the opening of the narrative when he paraphrases, "Now a certain Naboth from the city of Jezreel . . ." (*Antiquities* VIII 13:8). The original narrative began, "Once there was a vineyard. . . ." The emphasis from the start is land.

99 On the special status of the vineyard in ancient Israelite society, see Bendor 1996: 138.

100 The discrepancy in wealth between the protagonists is highlighted in Rofé 1988: 90.

I should sell the inheritance of my fathers to you!" (1 Kgs 21:3). His refusal to sell the land is not based on purchase price, nor personal dislike for Ahab, nor the fact that he would no longer be able to make a living from the land—Ahab, according to the narrative, offers a fair price and replacement land with greater agricultural potential.[101] Naboth's objection lies not in such trivial matters but in the fact that the land was not merely a vineyard but his ancestral inheritance.[102] In fact, as noted by Yair Zakovitch (1984: 383), the narrative has hinted in this direction from the outset with its redundancy: "a vineyard belonging to Naboth the Jezreelite at Jezreel" (1 Kgs 21:1).[103] The double reference to Jezreel is the first clue that Naboth's property holds special significance for him, being located at his ancestral town. Ahab's recounting of the incident to Jezebel is telling. According to the narrative, Ahab reports to Jezebel that Naboth refused him with the words, "I will not sell my vineyard to you" (1 Kgs 21:6). But the narrative has just indicated twice that Naboth refused him with the words, "my ancestral inheritance" (1 Kgs 21:3, 4; cf. Rofé 1988: 91).[104] The characters, in other words, do not conceive of the land in the same terms, and their opposing perspectives on the land's significance are at the center of the dramatic tension here.

The Legal Approach to Space

The legal approach to space described in Part 1 sheds light on this story about land. The land conflict in 1 Kgs 21:1–16 is best understood against the background of the hierarchy of rights and responsibilities in land outlined by Max Gluckman (1965: 75–112). As I noted in Part 1, Gluckman emphasized the extent to which individuals and groups at different levels in society could hold different kinds of rights in the same piece of land. Among the Lozi of Zambia, where Gluckman conducted his anthropological fieldwork, the king held the right to

101 On exchange of property without payment in silver, see RE 4 in Beckman 1996: 7–8. Na'aman (2008: 211) cites, as parallel to Ahab's offer, an inscription of Sargon II, c. 721–705 BCE, that describes his acquisition of land in exchange for silver or better land elsewhere.

102 On the connections between households, ancestors, and land, see Brichto 1973: 31–32; Stavrakopoulou 2010: 11; Seidel 2012: 163–64. Albrecht Alt (1953–1959: 3.357 n. 1) had regarded the confrontation between Ahab and Naboth as founded on a misunderstanding: Ahab incorrectly assumed that the vineyard was part of Naboth's private property rather than his ancestral inheritance. See also the discussion of Alt's treatment of this text in Bendor 1996: 138.

103 On the location of the episode in Jezreel and the archaeology of Jezreel and Samaria, see Na'aman 2008: 204–11.

104 Compare the elegant observations in Zakovitch 1984: 384–92, esp. 388. Zakovitch (1984: 387) suggests that Naboth's name is a play on "my ancestral inheritance" (נחלת אבתי).

distribute large swaths of land to local leaders. However, the king's rights to such land are best understood as territoriality or sovereignty rather than private ownership. His access to land for private use—what traditionally might be termed ownership—was restricted. Local elites had the right to assign plots of land to individual households, who had the right to cultivate the land and establish their households on it.

Relevant to our examination of land rights in 1 Kgs 21:1–16 is Gluckman's further observation that rights entailed and were contingent upon responsibilities.[105] Households had the responsibility to render, depending on context, taxes, obedience, respect, support, or tribute to local officials or elites, to the king, or to the government. Failure to do so jeopardized their rights to land.[106] Those with administrative rights were responsible for guaranteeing all members of society access to land and for defending the rights of local households against trespassers. If administrators failed in such duties, they became susceptible to replacement or overthrow. Among the Lozi, although the king held administrative rights, he could not simply seize land in use by a landholder.[107] Rather, the land would only revert back up the hierarchy of rights with good reason, such as the death of a household head with no heir or failure of the

105 Gluckman writes, "Each holder of an estate owes obligations to every hold senior to him (*sic*) in the series, as well as to the one who has granted him (*sic*) his (*sic*) holding. Correspondingly, every senior owes similar obligations to all the holders subordinate to him (*sic*). That is every subject owes obligations directly to the king, and the king has a direct obligation to every subject to see that he (*sic*) has land" (1965: 92–93). Gluckman consistently uses masculine pronouns in his general descriptions of status and rights in land, but it is clear from his discussion of specific cases that Lozi women could hold rights in land. For example, he notes that once a wife was given a *simu yamusali* garden by her husband, she held rights in it that excluded her husband from using it without permission (1965: 147). And Gluckman lists queens among those who could hold primary estates of administration over cultivable lands and fishing sites (1965: 91).

106 For example, in describing legal disputes over land among the Lozi, Gluckman writes, "Since land is held by virtue of position in a series of groups or a complex of relationships, disputes over land frequently hinge on whether individuals have fulfilled the multifarious duties of their stations. . . . [The] court may hold that a litigant has so fragrantly broken these obligations or conventions, which are not themselves enforceable at law, that he (*sic*) must forfeit his (*sic*) status and with this his (*sic*) rights to land. Thus they are indirectly enforced" (1965: 104).

107 Gluckman writes, "In saying that the primary holder retains his (*sic*) holding in the secondary estate granted in his (*sic*) estate, I again emphasize that this is a revisionary or residual right; i.e., he (*sic*) can exercise it only if the secondary holder abandons the estate or is expelled from the group. Any estate, once granted, is held securely against all comers, including the grantor—and I repeat, even if he (*sic*) be the king" (1965: 92).

household to fulfill the social obligations due superiors. For Gluckman, then, the nature of an individual's rights to land reflects social and political status within society. Rights are mediated through relationships, including the public performance of such relationships. The particular system of land rights among the Lozi is not directly analogous to the varying systems of land tenure in the ancient Near East, but Gluckman's generalized model provides a framework for exploring land rights in a variety of contexts, including as they are portrayed in 1 Kgs 21:1–16.

Given the extent to which ancient Israel shared a common legal culture with its ancient Mediterranean neighbors (Westbrook 2003), let me briefly demonstrate the relevance of Gluckman's framework to understanding the ancient Near Eastern textual evidence for land rights before returning to an analysis of 1 Kgs 21:1–16. A full exposition of systems of land tenure in the ancient Near East lies well beyond my goals here—the nature of land exploitation, whether by dry farming or irrigation, the extent of a military class who might have been rewarded with land, and the nature of the relationships between the royal administration, the temple, and social structures based on assumed kinship all played some role with respect to the nature of land rights.[108] A few examples, however, illustrate the relevance of Gluckman's model to widely varying situations. I. M. Diakonoff (1954) showed that the earliest Mesopotamian land sale documents contain the names of relatives of the seller not merely as witnesses to the transaction but also as recipients of payment.[109] The seller, in other words, held one kind of right in the land while the seller's relatives held another. Both received monetary compensation upon the sale of land, their different rights being acknowledged. The parade example is the Obelisk of Maništušu, second king of the Akkad Dynasty founded by Sargon, which records his purchase of several fields. Ignace J. Gelb (1979: 16–17, 81–84; cf. Postgate 1994: 95) demonstrated that the 98 sellers in the document far outnumbered the fields sold, suggesting that several individuals held rights in each parcel of land. Moreover, Gelb traced kinship lineages among the sellers and clarified the distinction between those "lords of the field" (who received the

108 On the question of private, collective, and institutional ownership of land in different periods and regions in the ancient Near East, see Diakonoff 1954; Diakanoff 1963; Gelb 1971; Postgate 1971; Ellis 1976; Batto 1980; Adams 1982; Foster 1982: 113; Postgate 1982; Liverani 1984; Brentjes 1988; Gelb, Steinkeller, and Whiting 1991; Foster 1994; Renger 1995; Jursa 2008; Westbrook 2003: 55–56.

109 Benjamin R. Foster (2005: 74) notes that although Diakonoff's philological analyses have been superseded, his central insights in this regard have continued to generate discussion. Compare Krecher 1980: 493; Steinkeller 1989: 121; Postgate 1994: 94.

price, additional payments, and gifts), other "lords of the field" (who received the price and additional payments, but not gifts), and "brother-lords of the field" (who received nothing but were evidently named because their approval was required for the transaction). In Gluckman's terms, the text witnesses to a hierarchy of rights in the fields being sold: while the primary seller had the right to use the land, an extended social group had administrative rights in the land and also required, in some cases, compensation.

As a second example, consider a text from Late Bronze Age Emar that records the disposal of a building after the death of its owner, who apparently left no heir (RE 7 in Beckman 1996: 11–13). In place of the customary name of the seller, the text lists five "brothers," with four different patronymics. Evidently, the term "brothers" here refers not to biological siblings of the deceased but to an extended social group who took responsibility for the building after the death of their kinsman, its former owner. They received payment for the building from the purchaser and list themselves as legally liable should a future claimant appear. The text stipulates clear procedures should relatives of the deceased later make a claim against the building. The document addresses an unusual situation, bringing to the fore aspects of the land tenure system. It acknowledges different kinds of rights held by several individuals: the deceased, his "brothers," the purchaser, and unknown relatives of the deceased. In Gluckman's terms, on the death of a landowner with no heir the property reverted back up the hierarchy of rights and his "brothers" assumed the administrative right to dispose of the property.

Finally, to take an example more proximate to ancient Israel, Michael Heltzer (1976: 65–71, 84–101) has traced the relationship between rural land ownership and the royal administration at Ugarit. Two texts speak of ownership of land by a village, even of lands adjacent to another village (RS 16.170, RS 17.123).[110] These texts include a judgment rendered by the Hittite overlord settling a dispute between the king of Ugarit and the king of Siaynnu over the lands surrounding one of the villages. The language of the text shows that the village—presumably represented by its elders—local kings, and the Hittite suzerain all possessed various administrative rights in the same piece of land, though that land apparently continued to be used by local landholders. Raymond Westbrook (1991: 32–34), drawing especially on the work of G. Boyer (1955), has highlighted the king's role in certain private land

110 See also RS 16.276, according to which Niqmadu, king of Ugarit, gave the village of Uḫnapu to Kar-Kushuḫ and Apapa, daughter of the king, along with its tithe. The text exempts Kar-Kushuḫ from claims by the temple of Baal and its priests. On village tithes, see RS 10.044, which evidently records tithes of barley from several villages.

transactions from Ugarit (e.g., RS 15.119).[111] These suggest that in certain situations the king may have played some role in guaranteeing the permanent transfer of property without being directly involved as buyer or seller—in Gluckman's terms, the king's rights of administration are evidenced here. The details of the system in any particular location and time period do not concern me here, but simply the observation that individuals and groups at various levels of society could hold different kinds of rights in the same land, as Gluckman's work suggests.

Particularly relevant to an analysis of 1 Kgs 21:1–16 is the application of Gluckman's thesis to administrative confiscation of land in the ancient Near East. Daniel Oden (2012) traces the possibility of royal or sacerdotal land confiscation in the ancient Near East, arguing that monarchies and temples could not simply seize land that belonged to private landholders.[112] In the several texts Oden discusses, he finds in each case a reason for the retroversion of land to the crown. For example, a text from Emar, RE 16 (Beckman 1996: 29–30), describes Bulālu's purchase of ancestral property once owned by Amur-ša. Although the property sold adjoined Amur-ša's and had been owned by him, the sale proper was conducted by "Ninurta and the elders of Emar," who received payment for the land. The text is at pains to establish the legality of the transaction and so notes that the temple had assumed rights to the land because Amur-ša had committed "a serious offense against his lord and the city of Emar." The presence of this line in the text suggests that the elders and temple could not simply seize land at will but needed to justify such seizure. As suggested by Gluckman's work, land could only revert back up the administrative hierarchy with good cause. The nature of Amur-ša's offense, being immaterial, is not specified. Its importance lies in the fact that it was against "his lord and the city of Emar." In failing to fulfill the social obligations due superiors, upon which his right to land depended, Amur-ša forfeited that right and a portion of his estate reverted to those who held administrative rights in the land. The retroversion of land up the hierarchy of rights for one reason or another is also reflected in several other texts from Emar (RE 34,[113] Emar 144,[114] Emar

111 See also Jonas C. Greenfield 1977: 87–91; Labuschagne 1974: 177.

112 Note also observations on the limitations of Ahab's power and the legal forfeiture of ownership by convicted individuals in Sarna 1997: 119–26.

113 Beckman 1996: 54–56.

114 Arnaud 1985–1987: 3.156–58.

197[115]), as well as texts from Ekalte (Ekalte 2[116]), Alalakh (AT 17[117]), Ugarit (RS 16.249[118]), Assur (*Middle Assyrian Laws* B ii 22–26[119]), and Babylon (contract from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II[120]).[121] In several of these texts, mention of an offense committed by the landowner serves to establish the legal basis of the seizure. The offense is sometimes represented by its elders against the city, sometimes against the deity, or sometimes against the monarch. The precise nature of the offense is not important and as such need not be specified. What the situations represented in these texts share in common is failure of the landowner to fulfill obligations due a social superior. The texts thus demonstrate the widespread ancient Near Eastern legal principle according to which land could revert up the hierarchy of rights with good cause.[122]

Ahab's Acquisition of Naboth's Land

Biblical texts concerning power over land in general and 1 Kgs 21:1–16 in particular may be understood profitably against this broader background of ancient Near Eastern land rights as illuminated by Max Gluckman's work.[123] Although Ahab as king may have enjoyed administrative rights in land akin to sovereignty or territoriality, he had no right to seize Naboth's land for private use at will. As such, he sought to entice Naboth into selling it by offering a generous price or land with greater agricultural potential. Naboth, however, had an attachment to the land and refused to sell. Ahab's sulking following Naboth's refusal to sell confirms that, in the narrative world of the text, he had no power to seize Naboth's land.

---

115 Arnaud 1985–1987: 3.207–08.

116 Mayer 2001: 74.

117 Wiseman 1953: 40.

118 Nougayrol 1955: 96–98.

119 Roth 1997: 176.

120 Weidner 1954–1956.

121 See also Emar 6; Emar 154; Arnaud 1991: no. 13; Tsukimoto 1990: 189, no. 7. Note also the discussion in Leemans 1988: 214, 221; Durand 1989: 168.

122 See Ben-Barak 1981–1982: 101–17; Westbrook 2010: 455.

123 For example, the biblical right of redemption may also be understood against this background. An individual household head held rights of use in the land while his nearest male relatives held the right of redemption in the same land (e.g., Lev. 25:8–23; Jer. 32:6–15; Ruth 2:20; 3:12–13; 4:1–9). On the ancient Near Eastern background of the year of release legislation in Leviticus 25, see Weinfeld 1995: 175–78. On the nature of the Jubilee legislation, see also Westbrook 1991: 36–57. On the idealism of the Jubilee and its embodiment of themes from the Priestly system of thought, see Kawashima 2003.

His wife Jezebel, understanding the political complexity of the situation, was prepared to exercise another kind of power, one with a particular strategic basis. According to the narrative, she followed an oddly circular route to secure Naboth's death. Narratives about kings in Samuel–Kings suggest that Naboth's death could have been arranged by the intervention of one of the military commanders of Ahab's retinue (cf. Benaiah's execution of Joab at Solomon's command in 1 Kgs 2:29–34). This may even be the situation assumed in the alternative tradition about Naboth's death in 2 Kgs 9:21–26.[124] But, as the evidence I have outlined above shows, Naboth's death in itself was insufficient grounds for royal seizure of his land.[125] Upon his death, his land would normally have passed to his children or to other relatives. The text therefore specifies that Jezebel arranged for a particular kind of death for Naboth. She wrote letters in the king's name to the elders of Naboth's town, Jezreel, and instructed them to charge Naboth with failure to fulfill his social obligation of respect to king and God.[126] The trial took place in a public assembly.[127] False witnesses accused Naboth of reviling king and God, and the complicit elders convicted him and arranged for his execution. The question of possible heirs who might inherit his vineyard are thus immaterial to the narrative in 1 Kgs 21:1–16. Again, Naboth's rights to the land entailed and were contingent upon responsibilities. His conviction publicly demonstrated his failure to fulfill the social obligations due to the king and ensured the reversion of his land up the hierarchy of rights.[128] The same legal principle underlies David's seizure of Mephiboseth's land following his treason in 2 Sam. 9:9–10; 16:1–4; 19:25–30 and the several ancient Near Eastern texts I mentioned above.[129] Ahab was thus free to take private possession of the vineyard.

---

124 See Rofé 1988: 96.

125 See related comments in Westbrook's (2010: 450) critique of Rofé.

126 On the nature of Naboth's crime, see Brichto 1963: 163; Phillips 1970: 43; Whitelam 1979: 177.

127 On the relationship between monarchic and local juridical authority in 1 Kings 21, see Whitelam 1979: 178–80; Halpern 1981: 187–216, esp. 200; Westbrook 2010: 453. Note also Rofé's (1988: 92) hypothesis that Jezebel proclaimed a fast in order to suggest that a time of crisis was at hand, when sinners needed to be exposed and dealt with—see Achan in Joshua 7, Jonah in Jonah 1, and Samuel's judging of the people at Mizpah in 1 Sam. 7:6. On the occasion of the fast separating Naboth from the community, see Whitelam 1979: 178–79.

128 See Ben-Barak 1981: 85; Sarna 1997: 121–26; Cogan 2001: 486; Matthews and Benjamin 1993: 157; Ben-Barak 2006: 17.

129 On David's seizure of Mephibosheth's land, see Ben-Barak 1981; Westbrook and Wells 2009: 91.

The narrative logic of 1 Kgs 21:1–16 thus coheres nicely with an understanding of ancient Near Eastern land rights that is informed by Max Gluckman's work. This section thus demonstrates how the legal approach to space I outlined in Part 1 can shed light on the biblical text. In the Conclusion, I summarize this essay and point to some promising avenues for future inquiry at the intersections of spatial studies and biblical studies.

Conclusion: Interdisciplinary Conversations about Space

This essay introduces biblical scholars to the vast literature on space. The Introduction briefly defined some key terms, including space, place, land, and territory. Space, the broadest term used by spatial studies scholars to denote their object of inquiry, often refers to the terrestrial space in which humans make their home, ranging in scale from the body to the planet. For spatial studies scholars, space is not an abstract, empty grid but is composed of objects and relations between them. As such, space has a history. It is produced by societal actors. The term place connotes an affective relationship to a particular space. To emphasize the economic value of space and the right to exploit it, spatial studies often uses the term land. Human power over land, especially at a societal scale, is denoted by the term territory. These and other terms I introduced there have considerable semantic overlap, but the Introduction serves as a succinct guide to some key terms biblical scholars will encounter as they read literature on space.

Part 1 provided a map of scholarly literature on space produced in recent decades, with overlapping pathways through sacred, legal, political, economic, ecological, visual, social, and urban scholarly approaches to the study of space. A sacred approach to space emphasizes the distinction between profane, chaotic space and the structured space that connects religious humans to the mythic time of origins. A legal approach to space maps rights to land enjoyed by individuals and groups within society, within an established set of norms. A political approach to space treats struggles for territory—modes of imposition, resistance, and negotiation that characterize relations of power between humans. An economic approach to space examines the monetary value of land and the spatial flows of labour, capital, and goods. An ecological approach to space treats nature and culture, country and town, and is keenly aware that nature itself is ideological in so far as the concept serves political ends. Deriving its methods from the study of the history of art, a visual approach treats landscape and emphasizes the gap between the powerful viewer and what is depicted. The legal, political, economic, ecological, and visual approaches to

space recognize the role society plays in making space and imbuing it with meaning. A social approach to space provides a broad framework for thinking about these five and other approaches to space. For Henri Lefebvre, "(Social) space is a (social) product" (1991: 26). It has a history and a rhythm. And it can be analyzed in terms of a non-teleological dialectic relationship between three elements: perceived space, conceived space, and lived space. An eighth approach to space, the urban, examines the city from a variety of perspectives. Part 2 provided an overlay for our map by highlighting the work of biblical scholars who read the Bible while attending to approaches to space I outlined in Part 1.

Part 3 offered an inset for our map by treating in more detail one biblical narrative, 1 Kgs 21:1–16, in light of one approach to space, the legal. Commentators have long puzzled over the legal basis of Ahab's acquisition of Naboth's land in this biblical narrative. Drawing on Max Gluckman's delineation of the hierarchy of rights in land, I argued that Naboth was publicly shown to have failed in his responsibility to honor those with administrative rights in land. He thus forfeited his rights to the vineyard, which then reverted to the administrative control of the king.

I hope that this essay will further the conversation between biblical studies and other fields of inquiry. Space and its related concepts—land, place, territory, city—are profoundly central themes in the Hebrew Bible. And the New Testament emerges out of a particular spatial practice in the first centuries of the Common Era. Listening to what scholars in other disciplines have to say about space will, I hope, bring analytical clarity to discussions of the Bible, including both its literary artistry and its historical context and development.

With regard to the Hebrew Bible, I think an analytically rigorous approach to space can help biblical scholars navigate between the biblical text and two discontinuities in the world that produced it. It follows from Lefebvre's thesis that where economy, politics, culture, and society differ, spatial practice also differs. As such, texts produced in the monarchic period have a different perspective on land, place, territory, and architecture than texts produced in the exilic or postexilic periods, as scholars have long recognized. The approaches to space I have outlined here can clarify these differences in perspective, with implications for reconstructing the literary history of major blocks of the Hebrew Bible. A second, and less well-studied discontinuity was that between Israel and Judah. If there were differences in political structure between Israel and Judah, there were also differences in spatial practice. The analytical approaches to space I have outlined here can further clarify the distinction between tribal and royal perspectives on land and territory, again with important implications for reconstructing the literary history of the Hebrew Bible and Israelite and Judahite history.

I hope this interdisciplinary conversation will go both ways. I am convinced that biblical studies has something valuable to say to the wider academy, and to society more broadly. In closing, I note one intervention we can make in wider discourse about space. Although the ancient Near East is widely acknowledged as the birthplace of urban life and literacy, histories of the city, land, and territory have tended to emphasize Greek and Roman models or to be unduly influenced by Marx's notion of an Asiatic mode of production, which profoundly shapes the narrative they tell of the history of human spatial practice.[130] Scholars in biblical studies and related fields can offer the humanities and social sciences a fresh perspective on the history, philosophy, and ethics of human power over land. This intervention is especially valuable since so much of the Bible was produced outside of the ancient centers of imperial power. The Bible, and we who study it, can offer an alternative history and politics of space.

Works Cited

Adams, Robert McC. 1982. "Property Right and Functional Tenure in Mesopotamian Rural Communities," in J. N. Postgate et al. (eds.), *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff* (Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips): 1–14.

Allan, William, et al. 1948. *Land Holding and Land Usage among the Plateau Tonga of Mazabuka District: A Reconnaissance Survey, 1945* (Capetown: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute).

Alt, Albrecht. 1953–1959. "Der Anteil des Koenigtums an der sozialen Entwicklung in den Reichen Israel und Juda," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (3 vols.; Munich: C. H. Beck): 3.348–72.

Andersen, Francis I. 1966. "The Socio-Juridical Background of the Naboth Incident," *JBL* 85: 46–57.

Anderson, Malcolm. 1996. *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Anderson, Perry. 1974a. *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* (London: New Left Books).

Anderson, Perry. 1974b. *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: New Left Books).

130 For example, Elden's (2013) study of the history of territory begins with the Greek polis. Lefebvre discusses ancient Greece in, for example, 1991: 31, 42, 47–48, 121, 127, 156–59, 222, 231, 237–41, 246–51, 260, 271, 295, 232; 1996: 10, 87, 97, 175, 207, 214; 2003b: 1, 72, 104, 139. But I do not recall any passage in which he treats spatial practice in ancient Mesopotamia or the Levant. A notable exception is Casey 1997, who discusses Genesis 1 and *Enuma elish*; with no formal training in biblical or ancient Near Eastern studies, however, his treatment of these is understandably uneven.

Ardrey, Robert. 1966. *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations* (New York: Atheneum).

Arnaud, Daniel. 1985–1987. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata* (Emar VI.1–4; 4 vols.; Paris: ERC).

Arnaud, Daniel. 1991. *Texts syriens de l'Âge du Bronze Récent* (Barcelona: AUSA).

Bachelard, Gaston. 1964. *The Poetics of Space* (trans. Maria Jolas; New York: Orion Press [French original, 1958]).

Bagrow, Leo. 1964. *History of Cartography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).

Batto, Bernard F. 1980. "Land Tenure and Women at Mari," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 23: 209–39.

Batty, Michael. 1976. *Urban Modelling: Algorithms Calibrations, Predictions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen* (History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 2; Padova: Sargon).

Bekker-Nielsen, Tønnes. 1988. "*Terra Incognita*: The Subjective Geography of the Roman Empire," in Aksel Damsgaard-Madsen, Erik Christiansen, and Erik Hallager (eds.), *Studies in Ancient History and Numismatics Presented to Rudi Thomsen* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press): 148–61.

Ben-Barak, Zafrira. 1981. "Meribaal and the System of Land Grants in Ancient Israel," *Biblica* 62: 73–91.

Ben-Barak, Zafrira. 1981–1982. "The Confiscation of Lands in Israel and the Ancient Near East," *Shnaton* 5–6: 101–17 (in Hebrew).

Ben-Barak, Zafrira. 2006. *Inheritance by Daughters in Israel and the Ancient Near East: A Social, Legal, and Ideological Revolution* (trans. Betty Sigler Rozen; Jerusalem: Archaeological Center Publications).

Bendor, Shunya. 1996. *The Social Structure of Ancient Israel: The Institution of the Family* (*Beit 'ab*) *from the Settlement to the End of the Monarchy* (Jerusalem: Simor).

Berquist, Jon L. and Claudia V. Camp (eds.). 2007. *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative* (LHB/OTS 481; New York: T & T Clark International).

Berry, Wendell. 1977. *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books).

Blum, Erhard. 2000. "Dier Nabotüberlieferung und die Kompositionsgeschichte der Vorderen Propheten," in Reinhard G. Kratz, Thomas Krüger, and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65 Geburtstag* (BZAW 300; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter): 111–28.

Boer, Roland. 2003. *Marxist Criticism of the Bible* (London: T & T Clark International).

Boer, Roland. 2015. *The Sacred Economy of Ancient Israel* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox).

Boer, Roland and Edgar W. Conrad (eds.). 2003. *Redirected Travel: Alternative Journeys and Places in Biblical Studies* (JSOTSup 382; London: T & T Clark International).

Boyer, G. 1955. "L'intervention de l'autorité publique dans les actes de droit privé," in J. Nougayrol (ed.), *Le palais royal d'Ugarit III: Textes Accadiens des Archives Sud* (Mission de Ras Shamra 6; Paris: C. Klincksieck): 283–95.

Brenner, Neil (ed.). 2013. *Implosions/Explosions: Towards a Study of Planetary Urbanization* (Berlin: JOVIS).

Brenner, Neil. 2016. *New Urban Spaces: Urban Theory and the Scale Question* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Brenner, Neil and Nikolas Theodore (eds.). 2002. *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Brenner, Neil and Roger Keil (eds.). 2006. *The Global Cities Reader* (London: Routledge).

Brenner, Neil, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer (eds.). 2012. *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City* (London: Routledge).

Brentjes, Burchard (ed.). 1988. *Das Grundeigentum in Mesopotamien* (Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte Sonderband 1987–1988; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

Brichto, Herbert C. 1963. *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible* (JBLMS 13; Philadelphia: SBL).

Brichto, Herbert C. 1973. "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—A Biblical Complex," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44: 1–54.

Camp, Claudia V. and Jon L. Berquist (eds.). 2008. *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces* (LHB/OTS 490; New York: T & T Clark).

Campbell, Antony F. and Mark A. O'Brien. 2000. *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Campbell, J. B. 2000. *The Writings of the Roman Land Surveyors: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies).

Carson, Rachel. 1951. *The Sea Around Us* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Carson, Rachel. 1955. *The Edge of the Sea* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin).

Carson, Rachel. 1962. *Silent Spring* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin).

Carter, Alan. 1989. *The Philosophical Foundations of Property Rights* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Casati, Roberto and Achille C. Varzi. 1994. *Holes and Other Superficialities* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT).

Casati, Roberto and Achille C. Varzi. 1999. *Parts and Places: The Structures of Spatial Representation* (Cambridge: MIT).

Casey, Edward S. 1997. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Castree, Noel. 2007. "David Harvey: Marxism, Capitalism and the Geographical Imagination," *New Political Economy* 12: 97–115.

Cogan, Mordechai. 2001. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 10; New York: Doubleday).

Corbusier, Le. 1967. *The Radiant City: Elements of a Doctrine of Urbanism to be Used as the Basis of Our Machine-Age Civilization* (New York: Orion).

Corbusier, Le. 1968. *The Modulor: A Harmonious Measure to the Human Scale, Universally Applicable to Architecture and Mechanics* (trans. Peter de Francia and Anna Bostock; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT [French original, 1954]).

Corner, James. 2014. *The Landscape Imagination: Collected Essays of James Corner 1990–2010* (ed. Alison Bick Hirsch; Princeton: Princeton Architectural).

Coronil, Fernando. 1997. *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Cosgrove, Denis E. 1998. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 2nd edn [original, 1984]).

Cosgrove, Denis E. 2001. *Apollo's Eye: A Cartographic Genealogy of the Earth in the Western Imagination* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Cosgrove, Denis E. 2008. *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World* (London: I. B. Tauris).

Cosgrove, Denis E. and Stephen Daniels (eds.). 1988. *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Cox, Kevin R. 2002. *Political Geography: Territory, State, and Society* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Cresswell, Tim. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

Cresswell, Tim. 2004. *Place: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Cresswell, Tim. 2013. *Geographic Thought: A Critical Introduction* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell).

Cronauer, Patrick T. 2005. *The Stories about Naboth the Jezreelite: A Source, Composition, and Redaction Investigation of 1 Kings 21 and Passages in 2 Kings 9* (LHB/OTS 424; London: T & T Clark).

Davis, Ellen F. 2009. *Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture: An Agrarian Reading of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Dawson, Allan Charles, Laura Zanotti, and Ismael Vaccaro (eds.). 2014. *Negotiating Territoriality: Spatial Dialogues between State and Tradition* (New York: Routledge).

Delaney, David. 2005. *Territory: A Short Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell).

Diakonoff, I. M. 1954. "Sale of Land in Pre-Sargonic Sumer," in *Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the XXIII International Congress of Orientalists* (Moscow: Pub. House of USSR Academy of Sciences): 5–32.

Diakanoff, I. M. 1963. "The Commune in the Ancient Near East as Treated in the Works of Soviet Researchers," *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 2: 32–46.

Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen (eds.). 2010. *Borderlines and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield).

Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen. 2012. *Borders: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Dilke, O. A. W. 1985. *Greek and Roman Maps* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Domeris, William. 2007. *Touching the Heart of God: The Social Construction of Poverty among Biblical Peasants* (HB/OTS 466; London: T & T Clark).

Durand, Jean-Marie. 1989. "Review of Arnaud, *Emar VI/1–3*," *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 83: 163–91.

Durkheim, Émile. 1915. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (New York: Free [French original, 1912]).

Elden, Stuart. 2001. *Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of a Spatial History* (London: Continuum).

Elden, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible* (Continuum Studies in Philosophy; London: Continuum).

Elden, Stuart. 2007. "There is a Politics of Space Because Space is Political: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Space," *Radical Philosophy Review* 10.2: 101–16.

Elden, Stuart. 2009. *Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press).

Elden, Stuart. 2013. *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Eliade, Mircea. 1958. *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (New York: Sheed & Ward).

Eliade, Mircea. 1959. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World [French original, 1957]).

Elias, Taslim Olawale. 1951. *Nigerian Land Law and Custom* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Ellerman, David P. 1992. *Property and Contract in Economics* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Ellis, Maria de Jong. 1976. *Agriculture and the State in Ancient Mesopotamia: An Introduction to Problems of Land Tenure* (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 1; Philadelphia: University Museum).

Firth, Raymond. 1936. *We, the Tikopia; a Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia* (London: G. Allen & Unwin).

Fleming, Daniel E. 2004. *Democracy's Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Foster, Benjamin R. 1982. *Administration and Use of Institutional Land in Sargonic Sumer* (Mesopotamia 9; Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

Foster, Benjamin R. 1994. "Review of Ignace J. Gelb, Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, *Earliest Land Tenure Systems*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114: 440–52.

Foster, Benjamin R. 2005. "Shuruppak and the Sumerian City State," in Leonid Efimovich Kogan (ed.), *Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff* (Babel und Bibel 2; Orientalia et classica 8; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns): 71–88.

Fotheringham, Stewart A. 1984. "Spatial Flows and Spatial Patterns," *Environment and Planning A* 16: 529–43.

Foucault, Michel. 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon).

Foucault, Michel. 1973. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (New York: Pantheon).

Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Des Espace Autres," *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5: 46–49.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics* 16: 22–27.

Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage).

Fraser, Benjamin. 2015. *Toward an Urban Cultural Studies: Henri Lefebvre and the Humanities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Gallaher, Carolyn. 2009. *Key Concepts in Political Geography* (London: SAGE).

Garnsey, Peter. 2007. *Thinking about Property: From Antiquity to the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Gelb, Ignace J. 1971. "On the Alleged Temple and State Economies in Ancient Mesopotamia," *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra* (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di giurisprudenza dell'Università di Roma 40–45; 6 vols.; Milan: A. Giuffrè): 6.137–54.

Gelb, Ignace J. 1979. "Household and Family in Early Mesopotamia," in *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the International Conference Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 10th to the 14th of April 1978* (OLA 5; 2 vols.; Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 1979): 1.1–97.

Gelb, Ignace J., Piotr Steinkeller, and Robert M. Whiting, Jr. 1991. *Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient Kudurrus* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago).

George, Mark K. (ed.). 2013. *Constructions of Space IV: Further Developments in Examining Ancient Israel's Social Space* (LHB/OTS 569; London: T & T Clark).

George, Mark K. 2009. *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Glacken, Clarence J. 1967. *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Gluckman, Max. 1943. *Essays on Lozi Land and Royal Property* (Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute).

Gluckman, Max. 1965. *The Ideas in Barotse Jurisprudence* (Storrs Lectures on Jurisprudence 1963; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Goodenough, Ward H. 1951. *Property, Kin and Community on Truk* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Goswami, Manu. 2004. *Producing India: From Colonial Economy to National Space* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Gottman, Jean. 1973. *The Significance of Territory* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia).

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith; New York: International Publishers).

Greenfield, Jonas C. 1977. "Našû-nadānu and its Congeners" in Maria de Jong Ellis (ed.), *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19; Hamden, Conn.: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences): 87–91.

Gunn, David M. and Paula M. McNutt (eds.). 2002. *Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (JSOTSup 359; London: Sheffield Academic).

Halpern, Baruch. 1981. *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel* (HSM 25; Atlanta: Scholars).

Halpern, Baruch and André Lemaire. 2010. "The Composition of Kings," in André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern (eds.), *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010): 123–54.

Hann, Chris. 2005. "Property," in James G. Carrier (ed.), *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar): 110–24.

Hann, Chris. 2007. "A New Double Movement? Anthropological Perspectives on Property in the Age of Neoliberalism," *Socio-Economic Review* 5: 287–318.

Harmanşah, Ömür. 2013. *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hart, Gillian Patricia. 2002. *Disabling Globalization: Places of Power in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Urban Experience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Harvey, David. 2000. *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Harvey, David. 2001. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography* (New York: Routledge).

Harvey, David. 2006. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* (New York: Verso).

Harvey, David. 2007. *The Limits to Capital* (New York: Verso, rev. edn).

Harvey, David. 2012. *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution* (New York: Verso).

Heltzer, Michael. 1976. *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert).

Hohfeld, Wesley Newcomb. 1919. *Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning and Other Legal Essays* (ed. Walter Cook; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Holloway, Sarah L. and Stephen P. Rice. 2003. *Key Concepts in Geography* (London: SAGE).

Hubbard, Phil and Rob Kitchin (eds.). 2004. *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (London: SAGE).

Humphrey, Caroline. 1998. *Marx Went Away—But Karl Stayed Behind* (updated edition of Karl Marx Collective: Economy, Society and Religion in a Siberian Collective Farm; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Hutton, Jeremy M. 2009. *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 39; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. 1970. *Landscapes: Selected Writings of J. B. Jackson* (ed. Ervin H. Zube; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press).

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. 1980. *The Necessity for Ruins, and Other Topics* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press).

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. 1984. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. 1994. *A Sense of Place, a Sense of Time* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. 1997. *Landscape in Sight: Looking at America* (ed. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Jackson, Wes. 1980. *New Roots for Agriculture* (San Francisco: Friends of the Earth).

Jacob, Christian. 2006. *The Sovereign Map: Theoretical Approaches in Cartography Throughout History* (ed. Edward H. Dahl; trans. Tom Conley; Chicago: University of Chicago).

Janni, Pietro. 1984. *La mappa e il periplo: Cartografia antica e spazio odologico* (Rome: Bretschneider).

Jellicoe, Geoffrey A. 1960–1970. *Studies in Landscape Design* (3 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Jellicoe, Geoffrey A. 1961. *Motopia: A Study in the Evolution of Urban Landscape* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger).

Jellicoe, Geoffrey A. and Susan Jellicoe. 1975. *The Landscape of Man: Shaping the Environment from Prehistory to the Present Day* (New York: Viking).

Johnston, Ronald J. 1995. "Territoriality and the State," in Georges Benko and Ulf Strohmayer (eds.), *Geography, History, and Social Sciences* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers): 213–25.

Johnston, Ronald J. 2001. "'Out of the Moribund Backwater': Territory and Territoriality in Political Geography," *Political Geography* 20: 677–93.

Jursa, Michael. 2008. "Economic Change and Legal Innovation: On Aspects of Commercial Interaction and Land Tenure in Babylonia in the First Millennium BC," in Mario Liverania and Clelia Mora (eds.), *I diritti del mondo cuneiforme: Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti ca. 2500–500 A.C.* (Pavia, Italy: IUSS): 601–628.

Katznelson, Ira. 1992. *Marxism and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Kawashima, Robert S. 2003. "The Jubilee Year and the Return of Cosmic Purity," *CBQ* 65: 370–89.

Kawashima, Robert S. 2006. "The Priestly Tent of Meeting and the Problem of Divine Transcendence: An 'Archaeology' of the Sacred," *Journal of Religion* 86: 226–57.

Kawashima, Robert S. 2014. "Covenant and Contingence: The Historical Encounter between God and Israel," in Dexter E Callender (ed.), *Myth and Scripture: Contemporary Perspectives on Religion, Language, and Imagination* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 51–70.

Knauf, Ernst Axel. 2011. "Inside the Walls of Nehemiah's Jerusalem: Naboth's Vineyard," in Israel Finkelstein and Nadav Na'aman (eds.), *The Fire Signals of Lachish: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Israel in the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age, and Persian Period in Honor of David Ussishkin* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns): 185–94.

Kosek, Jake. 2006. *Understories: The Political Life of Forests in Northern New Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Kosmin, Paul J. 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Krecher, J. 1980. "Kauf.A.I," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 5: 490–541.

Labuschagne, C. J. 1974. "The Našû-nadānu Formula and its Biblical Equivalents," in M. S. H. G. Heerma van Voss, P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, and N. A. van Uchelen (eds.), *Travels in the world of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Prof. M. A. Beek at the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (SSN 16; Assen: Van Gorcum): 176–80.

Lange, Jan. 2000. "Die Gleichniserzählung vom Mordfall Nabot," *Biblische Notizen* 104: 31–37.

Laxton, Paul. 2001. *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography* (with an introduction by J. H. Andrews; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Leemans, Wilhelmus F. 1988. "Aperçu sur les textes juridiques d'Emar," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31: 207–42.

Lees, Loretta, Hyun Bang Shin, and Ernesto López Morales. 2016. *Planetary Gentrification* (Cambridge: Polity).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1950. "Connaissance et critique sociale," in Marvin Farber (ed.), *L'Activité philosophique contemporaine en France et aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: P.U.F): 298–319.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1968a. *Dialectical materialism* (trans. John Sturrock; London: Cape [French original, 1939]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1968b. *The Sociology of Marx* (trans. Norbert Guterman; New York: Pantheon [French original, 1966]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1969. *The Explosion: Marxism and the French Revolution* (trans. Alfred Ehrenfeld; New York: Monthly Review [French original, 1968]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1971. *Everyday Life in the Modern World* (trans. Sacha Rabinovitch; New York: Harper & Row [French original, 1968]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1976. *The Survival of Capitalism: Reproduction of the Relations of Production* (New York: St. Martin's [French original, 1973]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space* (trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith; Oxford: Blackwell [French original, 1974]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991–2008. *Critique of Everyday Life* (3 vols; New York: Verso [French original, 1947, 1961, 1981]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1995. *Introduction to Modernity: Twelve Preludes* (trans. John Moore; London: Verso [French original, 1962]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 1996. *Writings on Cities* (ed. and trans. Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas; Oxford: Blackwell).

Lefebvre, Henri. 2003a. *Key Writings* (ed. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas, and Eleonore Kofman; Athlone Contemporary European Thinkers; New York: Continuum).

Lefebvre, Henri. 2003b. *The Urban Revolution* (trans. Robert Bononno; Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press [French original, 1970]).

Lefebvre, Henri. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time, and Everyday life* (trans. Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore; London: Continuum).

Lefebvre, Henri. 2009. *State, Space, World: Selected Essays* (ed. Stuart Elden; trans. Neil Brenner and Gerald Moore; Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press).

Lehman, Hugh. 1995. *Rationality and Ethics in Agriculture* (Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Press).

Lemaire, André. 2000. "Toward A Redactional History of the Book of Kings," in Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville (eds.), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (SBTS; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns): 446–61.

Leopold, Aldo. 1949. *A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Liverani, Mario. 1984. "Land Tenure and Inheritance in the Ancient Near East: The Interaction between 'Palace' and 'Family' Sectors," in Tarif Khalidi (ed.), *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East* (Beirut: American University of Beirut): 33–44.

Locke, John. 1821. *Two Treatises of Government* (London: Brown, corrected edn).

Lopez, Barry. 1986. *Arctic Dreams: Imagination and Desire in a Northern Landscape* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).

Lovejoy, Thomas E. 1976. "We Must Decide Which Species Will Go Forever," *Smithsonian Magazine* 7.4: 52–59.

Lovejoy, Thomas E. 1978. "Global Changes in Biological Diversity," *The Dodo: Journal of the Jersey Wildlife Preservation Trust* 15: 7–11.

Lovejoy, Thomas E. 1979. "The Epoch of Biotic Impoverishment," *Great Basin Naturalist Memoirs* 3: 5–10.

Maier, Christl M. 2008. *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress).

Malmberg, Torsten. 1980. *Human Territoriality: Survey of Behavioural Territories in Man with Preliminary Analysis and Discussion of Meaning* (The Hague: Mouton).

Malpas, Jeff. 1999. *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Malpas, Jeff. 2006. *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge: MIT).

Martin-Achard, Robert. 1991. "La vigne de Naboth (1 Rois 21) d'après des études récentes," *Études théologiques et religieuses* 66: 1–16.

Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press).

Massey, Doreen. 1995. *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production* (New York: Routledge, 2nd edn).

Massey, Doreen. 2005. *For Space* (London: SAGE).

Massey, Doreen. 2007. *World City* (Cambridge: Polity).

Massey, Doreen and Alejandrina Catalano. 1978. *Capital and Land: Landownership by Capital in Great Britain* (London: Arnold).

Massey, Doreen and Richard A. Meegan. 1979. *The Geography of Industrial Reorganization: The Spatial Effects of the Restructuring of the Electrical Engineering Sector Under the Industrial Reorganisation Corporation* (New York: Pergamon).

Matthews, Victor H. and Don C. Benjamin. 1993. *Social World of Ancient Israel 1250–587 BCE* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).

Mayer, Walter. 2001. *Ausgrabungen in Tall Munbāqa-Ekalte II: die Texte* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 102; Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag).

Meredith, Christopher. 2013. *Journeys in the Songscape: Space and the Song of Songs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix).

Merrifield, Andy. 2002. *Metromarxism: A Marxist Tale of the City* (New York: Routledge).

Merrifield, Andy. 2014. *The New Urban Question* (London: Pluto).

Merrifield, Andy and E. Swyngedouw (eds.). 1997. *The Urbanization of Injustice* (New York: New York University Press).

Mill, John Stuart. 1891. *Principles of Political Economy, with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy* (London: Routledge).

Millington, Gareth. 2011. *'Race,' Culture and the Right to the City: Centres, Peripheries, Margins* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Mills, Mary E. 2012. *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy* (LHB/OTS 560; New York: T & T Clark).

Mitchell, W. J. T. (ed.). 1994. *Landscape and Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Moore, Donald S. 2005. *Suffering for Territory: Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Mukerji, Chandra. 1997. *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Mumford, Lewis. 1961. *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World).

Murnane, William J. and Charles C. Van Siclen III. 1993. *The Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten* (Studies in Egyptology; London: Kegan Paul).

Murphy, Alexander B. 1996. "The Sovereign State System as Political-Territorial Ideal: Historical and Contemporary Considerations," in Thomas Biersteker and Cindi Weber (eds.), *State Sovereignty as a Social Construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 81–120.

Na'aman, Nadav. 2008. "Naboth's Vineyard and the Foundation of Jezreel," *JSOT* 33: 199–204.

Nam, Roger S. 2012. *Portrayals of Economic exchange in the Book of Kings* (BibInt 112; Leiden: Brill).

Newman, David. 2006. "The Lines That Continue to Separate Us: Borders in Our 'Borderless' World," *Progress in Human Geography* 30: 143–61.

Nougayrol, J. (ed.). 1955. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit III: Textes Accadiens des Archives Sud* (Mission de Ras Shamra 6; Paris: C. Klincksieck).

Nozick, Robert. 1974. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (New York: Basic).

Oden, Daniel. 2012. "Grapes from a Distant Vineyard: Power over Land in Ancient Syrian Legal Documents and Its Characterization in 1 Kings 21:1–16" (Ph.D. diss., New York University).

Oeming, Manfred. 1986. "Naboth, der Jesreeliter Untersuchungen zu den theologischen Motiven der Überlieferungsgeschichte von 1 Reg 21," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98: 363–82.

Økland, Jorunn, Cornelis de Vos, and Karen J. Wenell (eds.). 2013. *Constructions of Space III: Biblical Spatiality and the Sacred* (LHB/OTS 540; New York: T & T Clark).

Olwig, Kenneth. 2002. *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Otto, Rudolf. 1958. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational* (trans. John W. Harvey; New York: Oxford University Press [German original, 1917]).

Parker, Simon. 2004. *Urban Theory and the Urban Experience: Encountering the City* (London: Routledge).

Parker, Simon. 2011. *Cities, Politics, and Power* (London: Routledge).

Peet, Richard. 1998. *Modern Geographical Thought* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).

Phillips, Anthony. 1970. *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law: A New Approach to the Decalogue* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Pile, Steve. 1996. *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space, and Subjectivity* (London: Routledge).

Pile, Steve. 2005. *Real Cities, Modernity, Space and the Phantasmagorias of City Life* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE).

Popescu, Gabriel. 2012. *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-First Century: Understanding Borders* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).

Postgate, J. N. 1971. "Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Period: A Reconstruction," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34: 496–520.

Postgate, J. N. 1982. "Ilku and Land Tenure in the Middle Assyrian Kingdom—A Second Attempt," in J. N. Postgate et al. (eds.), *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff* (Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips): 303–12.

Postgate, J. N. 1994. *Early Mesopotamia: Society and Economy at the Dawn of History* (London: Routledge).

Prescott, J. R. V. 1965. *The Geography of Frontiers and Boundaries* (Chicago: Aldine).

Prescott, J. R. V. 1987. *Political Frontiers and Boundaries* (Boston: Allen & Unwin).

Prinsloo, Gert T. M. and Christl M. Maier (eds.). 2013. *Constructions of Space* V*: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (LHB/OTS 576; New York: Bloomsbury).

Raffestin, Claude. 1980. *Pour une geographie du pouvoir* (Paris: Librairies techniques).

Raffestin, Claude. 1988. "Repères pour une théorie de la territorialité humaine," in Gabriel Dupuy et al. (eds.), *Réseaux territoriaux* (Caen, Calvados: Paradigme): 263–79.

Raffestin, Claude. 2007. "Could Foucault Have Revolutionized Geography?" in Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden (eds.), *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography* (Aldershot: Ashgate): 129–37.

Rehm, Martin. 1982. *Das zweite Buch der Könige: ein Kommentar* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag).

Renger, J. 1995. "Institutional, Communal and Individual Ownership or Possession of Arable Land in Ancient Mesopotamia from the End of the Fourth to the End of the First Millennium BC," *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 71: 269–320.

Richards, Audrey I. 1939. *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia: An Economic Study of the Bemba Tribe* (London: International Institute of African Languages & Cultures).

Rofé, Alexander. 1988. "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story," *VT* 38: 89–104.

Roth, Martha. 1997. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Atlanta: Scholars, 2nd edn).

Russell, Stephen C. 2013. "Abraham's Purchase of Ephron's Land in Anthropological Perspective," *BibInt* 21: 153–70.

Russell, Stephen C. 2014. "The Hierarchy of Estates in Land and Naboth's Vineyard," *JSOT* 38: 453–69.

Russell, Stephen C. 2016. *The King and the Land: A Geography of Royal Power in the Biblical World* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Ryan, Alan. 1984. *Property and Political Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Sack, Robert David. 1983. "Human Territoriality: A Theory," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 73: 55–74.

Sack, Robert David. 1986. *Human Territoriality* (Cambridge Studies in Historical Geography 7; New York: Cambridge University Press).

Sack, Robert David. 1997. *Homo Geographicus: A Framework for Action, Awareness, and Moral Concern* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Šanda, Albert. 1911–1912. *Die Bücher der Könige: übersetzt und erklärt* (EHAT 9; 2 vols.; Munster: Aschendorff).

Sarna, Nahum M. 1997. "Naboth's Vineyard Revisited (1 Kings 21)," in Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns): 119–26.

Sassen, Saskia. 1988. *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Sassen, Saskia. 1994. *Cities in a World Economy* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge).

Sassen, Saskia. 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in An Age of Globalization* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money* (New York: The New Press).

Sassen, Saskia. 1999. *Guests and Aliens* (New York: The New Press).

Sassen, Saskia. 2008. *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Saxonhouse, Arlene W. 1992. *Fear of Diversity: The Birth of Political Science in Ancient Greek Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Schapera, Isaac. 1943. *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate* (Lovedale, South Africa: Lovedale).

Schloen, J. David. 2001. *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East* (SAHL 2; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns).

Schulten, Susan. 2012. *Mapping the Nation: History and Cartography in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Seebass, H. 1974. "Der Fall Naboth in 1 Reg. XXI," *VT* 24: 474–88.

Seidel, Hans-Joachim. 2012. *Nabots Weinberg, Ahabs Haus, Israels Thron: textpragmatisch fundierte Untersuchung von 1 Kön 21 und seinen Bezugstexten* (Berlin: LIT).

Sheddick, Vernon G. J. 1954. *Land Tenure in Basutoland* (London: H. M. Stationery Office).

Shields, Rob. 1999. *Lefebvre, Love, and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics* (London: Routledge).

Shipton, Parker. 2009. *Mortgaging the Ancestors: Ideologies of Attachment in Africa* (Yale Agrarian Studies Series; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Sikor, Thomas. 2004. "Conflicting Concepts: Contested Land Relations in North-western Vietnam," *Conservation and Society* 2 (2004): 75–95.

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2011. *Bubbles: Spheres Volume I, Microspherology* (trans. Wieland Hoban; Cambridge: MIT).

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2014. *Globes: Spheres Volume II, Macrospherology* (trans. Wieland Hoban; Cambridge: MIT).

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2016. *Foams: Spheres Volume III, Plural Spherology* (trans. Wieland Hoban; Cambridge: MIT).

Smith, Jonathan Z. 1978. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill).

Smith, Jonathan Z. 1987. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Smith, Mark S. 2016. *Where the Gods Are: Spatial Dimensions of Anthropomorphism in the Biblical World* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press).

Smith, Neil. 2008. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (Atlanta: University of Georgia Press, 3rd edn).

Soja, Edward W. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Cambridge: Blackwell).

Soja, Edward W. 2000. *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (Malden: Blackwell).

Spirn, Anne Whiston. 1998. *The Language of Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca. 2010. *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims* (LHB/OTS 473; London: T & T Clark).

Steinkeller, Piotr. 1989. *Sale Documents of the Ur III Period* (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 17; Wiesebaden: F. Steiner).

Stewart, Eric C. 2009. *Gathered around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark* (Eugene: Cascade).

Storey, David. 2012. *Territories: The Claiming of Space* (New York: Routledge, 2nd edn).

Sutherland, Alistair J. 1980. "Grass Roots Land Tenure among Yeyi of North-Western Botswana," *Journal of African Law* 24: 62–84.

Talbert, Richard J. A. (ed.). 2012. *Ancient Perspectives: Maps and Their Place in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece & Rome* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Talbert, Richard J. A. and Kai Brodersen. 2004. *Space in the Roman World: Its Perception and Presentation* (Münster: Lit Verlag).

Talbert, Richard J. A. and Richard W. Unger (eds.). 2008. *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Fresh Perspectives, New Methods* (Leiden: Brill).

Thiel, Winfried. 1999. "Der Todesrechtsprozeß Nabots in 1 Kön 21," in Stefan Beyerle, Günter Mayer, and Hans Strauss (eds.), *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament: Gestalt und Wirkung. Festschrift für Horst Seebass zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener): 73–81.

Thompson, Paul B. 1995. *The Spirit of the Soil: Agriculture and Environmental Ethics* (New York: Routledge).

Thrower, Norman J. W. 2008. *Maps & Civilization: Cartography in Culture and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

Tsukimoto, A. 1990. "Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (1)," *Acta Sumerologica* 12: 177–227.

Tuan, Yi-fu. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press).

Tuan, Yi-fu. 1991. "A View of Geography," *Geographical Review* 81: 99–107.

Tuan, Yi-fu. 2007. *Coming Home to China* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press).

Tuori, Kaius. 2015. *Lawyers and Savages: Ancient History and Legal Realism in the Making of Legal Anthropology* (New York: Routledge).

Verdery, Katherine. 2003. *The Vanishing Hectare: Property and Value in Postsocialist Transylvania* (Culture and Society after Socialism; Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Verdery, Katherine. 2004. "The Property Regime of Socialism," *Conservation and Society* 2: 189–98.

Vollard, Hans. 2009. "The Logic of Political Territoriality," *Geopolitics* 14: 687–706.

Von Benda-Beckmann, Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann. 1999. "A Functional Analysis of Property Rights: With Special Reference to Indonesia," in Toon van Meijl and Franz von Benda-Beckmann (eds.), *Property Rights and Economic Development: Land and Natural Resources in Southeast Asia and Oceania* (London: Keegan Paul): 15–56.

Vonder Bruegge, John M. 2016. *Mapping Galilee in Josephus, Luke, and John: Critical Geography and the Construction of an Ancient Space* (AJEC 93; Leiden: Brill).

Wagner, Philip L. 1960. *The Human Use of the Earth* (Glencoe: Free).

Waldheim, Charles. 2016. *Landscape as Urbanism: A General Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Walsh, Carey. 2000. *The Fruit of the Vine: Viticulture in Ancient Israel* (HSM 60; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns).

Walsh, Jerome T. 1992. "Methods and Meanings: Multiple Studies of 1 Kings 21," *JBL* 111: 193–211.

Warf, Barney and Santa Arias (eds.). 2009. *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London: Routledge).

Wastl-Walter, Doris (ed.). 2011. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies* (Farnham: Ashgate).

Waters, Jaime L. 2015. *Threshing Floors in Ancient Israel: Their Ritual and Symbolic Significance* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Wazana, Nili. 2013. *All the Boundaries of the Land: The Promised Land in Biblical Thought in Light of the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).

Weber, Max. 1958. *The City* (trans. and ed. Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwirth; Glencoe: Free).

Weidner, Ernst. 1954–1956. "Hochverrat gegen Nebukadnezar II: Ein Grossürdenträger vor dem Königsgericht," *AfO* 17: 1–5.

Weinfeld, Moshe. 1970. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90: 184–203.

Weinfeld, Moshe. 1995. *Social Justice in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (Jerusalem: Magnes).

Wenell, Karen J. 2007. *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism* (LNTS 334; London: T & T Clark).

Westbrook, Raymond. 1991. *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: JSOT).

Westbrook, Raymond. 2003. "Introduction: The Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law," in Raymond Westbrook (ed.), *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (HOS 72; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill): 1.1–90.

Westbrook, Raymond. 2010. "Law in Kings," in André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern (eds.), *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography* (VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010): 445–66.

Westbrook, Raymond and Bruce Wells. 2009. *Everyday Law in Biblical Israel: An Introduction* (Louisville, KY.: Westminster John Knox).

White, Marsha C. 1994. "Naboth's Vineyard and Jehu's Coup: The Legitimation of a Dynastic Extermination," *VT* 44: 66–76.

White, Marsha C. 1997. *The Elijah Legends and Jehu's Coup* (BJS 311; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars).

Whitelam, Keith W. 1979. *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT).

Williams, Raymond. 1973. *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Wilson, Alan G. 1974. *Urban and Regional Models in Geography and Planning* (London: Wiley).

Wilson, Alan G. 2000. *Complex Spatial Systems: The Modelling Foundations of Urban and Regional Analysis* (New York: Prentice Hall).

Wilson, Godfrey. 1938. *The Land Rights of Individuals among the Nyakyusa* (Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute).

Wilson, Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan (eds.). 2012. *A Companion to Border Studies* (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell).

Wiseman, D. J. 1953. *The Alalakh Tablets* (London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara).

Worster, Donald. 1993. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Würthwein, Ernst. 1978. "Naboth-Novelle und Elia-Wort," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 75: 375–97.

Zakovitch, Yair. 1984. "The Tale of Naboth's Vineyard: 1 Kings 21," in Meir Weiss, *The Bible from Within: The Method of Total Interpretation* (Jerusalem: Magnes): 379–405.

Ziegler, Yael. 2008. *Promises to Keep: The Oath in Biblical Narrative* (VTSup 120; Leiden: Brill).

Zimdahl, Robert L. 2006. *Agriculture's Ethical Horizon* (San Diego: Academic).