

Daniel J. Vos, Boston College
SBL Annual Meeting
November 22, 2016

One methodological note: This paper reads 2 Kings 8:1–6 in the light of 2 Kings 4:8–37. Some scholars, notably Alexander Rofé, have argued that 2 Kings 4:8–37 is a further development of a tale that had 2 Kings 8:1–6 as a more original version; however, in its current setting, 2 Kings 8:1–6 seems to depend on 2 Kings 4:8–37 for several details—for example, it speaks only of the woman whose son Elisha had restored to life.

Restoring the Shunammite’s Land: Law or Justice?

The story of the Shunammite’s reclamation of her property in 2 Kings 8:1–6 is noteworthy for missing details. Raymond Westbrook leveled this complaint against the portrayal of law in

Kings in general, arguing that the legal scholar is forced to glean details from the narrative.¹

This narrative leaves few details to be gleaned—pertinent facts about the Shunammite’s property and legal concern are not provided. Despite this, several scholars have pieced together a general legal framework. I will use Pietro Bovati’s comments as a representative example:

it may be assumed from the account that, upon her return to the land of Israel, she could not take back possession of her house and lands because others (not identified in the account) had usurped them; it may also be deduced that the local magistrates could not or would not intervene on behalf of the woman; she then “goes out” to address herself to the king’s tribunal.²

Note that this is a reconstruction—Bovati “assumed” or “deduced” several steps.³ In the first part of this paper, I reconsider the reconstruction of the Shunammite’s legal request. The language of 2 Kings 8 describes a request for restored tenancy rather than a request for the

¹ Raymond Westbrook, “Law in Kings,” in *The Book of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. Andre Lemaire and Baruch Halpern; VTSup 129; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 445.

² Pietro Bovati, *Re-Establishing Justice: Legal Terms, Concepts and Procedures in the Hebrew Bible* (trans. Michael J. Smith; JSOT Sup. 105; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 313.

³ Raymond Westbrook offers comments on 2 Kings 8 in several footnotes that suggest a similar reconstruction. He describes the land as “abandoned,” asserts that the king had not taken it, and that the Shunammite appeals to the king to expel an illegal occupant of her property. (Cf. “Biblical Law,” in *Law from the Tigris to the Tiber* [vol. 2; ed. Bruce Wells and F. Rachel Magdalene; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009], 307; and “Law in Kings,” 450.)

intervention of the highest court of the land. In the second part of the paper, I address whether the remedy the king provides is strictly legal or whether its expression of justice reflects a concern for the Shunammite's social status.

1. Where is the Adversary?

While Bovati assumes the usurpation of her land, 2 Kings 8 does not mention a local adversary whose actions spark the Shunammite's request. This is noteworthy because the usage of קֶצַע in the Qal stem in the Elijah/Elisha narratives typically signals a legal situation in which there is a recognizable legal adversary. When Burke Long describes 2 Kings 6:26–29 as a type scene in which a formal legal procedure is laid out, he notes that the type scene often includes “a statement about the matter in question, which often accuses another party implicitly of wrongdoing.”⁴ The other party is often explicitly named: a creditor in 2 Kings 4:1, the breacher of a contract in 2 Kings 6:26–29, or a superior officer in the legal fiction presented in 1 Kings 20:39. The other party is implied in 2 King 6:5 in the loss of a borrowed iron tool: the man who lost it now has a creditor he cannot repay. Thus, contrary to expectations formed by other occurrences of קֶצַע in the Elijah/Elisha narratives, 2 Kings 8 neither explicitly nor implicitly indicates the Shunammite's antagonist.

2. What kind of land is this?

Nor does the narrative suggest a lack of local adjudication, instead bringing the Shunammite immediately into the presence of the king. There are good reasons for seeing the king as something other than an appellate judge. The first is an omission: by contrast to the story of

⁴ Long, *2 Kings* (FOTL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 96.

Naboth, whose vineyard is described as the נהלת אבוהי, the Shunammite’s property is described as “her house and her field” (שדה and ביתה). There is no reference to her ancestral property. Note also that the Septuagint has “her fields” (τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐαυτῆς) in the plural, which feels a little more grand.⁵ The description of the Shunammite’s property as “house and field” is economic in nature; Moshe Weinfeld comments on the pairing in Deuteronomy 5:21: “‘Field’ forms a pair with ‘house’ and is a typical formulaic expression for immovable property in the legal documents of the ancient Near East and especially in the documents from Ugarit....”⁶ However, Weinfeld’s comment should be taken a step further: House and field do not simply describe immovable property. Rather, coupled with the slaves and animals listed in Deuteronomy 5:21, house and field describe the economic apparatus possessed by the neighbor.⁷

Who has claim to this “house” and “field”? The location of Shunem may be significant. Shunem was situated on the eastern edge of the Jezreel Valley and was of strategic importance in guarding the valley.⁸ Nadav Na’aman argues that the Jezreel Valley was treated as crown property by great empires from the late Bronze Age to the Second Temple period.⁹ More significantly, the prophet’s offer to speak to the king or the military commander on the Shunammite’s behalf in 2 Kings 4:13 alludes to royal interest. (This need not be seen as a unique situation—property comes with taxes and kings like revenue.) If the Shunammite’s

⁵ It is difficult, given the lack of manuscripts from Qumran, to adjudicate between the MT and OG on this point. [McCarter notes that the MT is generally sound and that 2 Kings in B reflects the *kaige* recension.]

⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 318–319.

⁷ Cf. Weinfeld’s insistence that “The Decalogue is, rather, a fundamental list of concrete commands applicable to every Israelite....The second part of the list has a socio-moral character....” (*Deuteronomy 1–11*, 250)

⁸ Marvin Sweeney, *1 and 2 Kings: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007) 289.

⁹ Nadav Na’aman, “Pharaonic Lands in the Jezreel Valley in the Late Bronze Age” pp. 232–241 in his *Collected Essays* vol. 2: *Canaan in the Second Millennium B.C.E.* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006). Na’aman states, “The Jezreel Valley was regarded as crown property that had a special administrative and juridical status from ancient times to the period of the Second Temple and even later. These royal estates had been maintained for centuries and were transferred from one conquering power to another.” (232)

request does not concern her ancestral property, but rather an economic unit in an area with known royal interest, then her request might well relate to a resumption of previous tenancy rather than an appeal for judicial redress.

3. What Happens to Abandoned Property?

Westbrook makes the significant point that the Shunammite's property is abandoned rather than unowned: "The [Shunammite's] land was abandoned, not ownerless, and the assumption that the king had acquired ownership of it unwarranted."¹⁰ Other commentators have not found the idea of royal appropriation so unwarranted; nor do I.¹¹ As already noted, royal interest in revenue and service obligations attached to the property are alluded to in 2 Kings 4:13, thus placing the story of the Shunammite within a context in which abandoned property might draw further royal interest.

Abandoned property is a legal *topos* in the laws of Hammurabi. LH §§30–31 concern the desertion of a property with a service obligation by a *rēdûm* or a *bā'irum*. Subsequently, the service obligation has been assumed by another individual; at a still later point, the original tenant wishes to resume his obligation.¹² §30 states that if the other individual has fulfilled the obligation for three years, the original tenant has no claim—the land will not be returned. §31 states that if the original tenant has been absent for only one year, the original tenant is free to resume his tenancy and its attendant obligation. While this portion of LH is not concerned with

¹⁰ Westbrook, "Law in Kings," 450.

¹¹ Cf. John Gray, *1 and 2 Kings: A Commentary* (2nd revised ed.; OTL; London: SCM, 1970), 527 and Volkmar Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 273.

¹² Katrien de Graef argues that desertion envisioned in LH §§30–31 may have been due to the relocation of soldiers. See her "An Account of the Redistribution of Land to Soldiers in Late Old Babylonian Sippar-Amnānum," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 45 (2002): 146.

property in general, but rather with the property of those military functionaries whose rights are subject to special protection, it nevertheless implies that abandoned land would not be left unattended.¹³ As Volkmar Fritz states with regard to 2 Kings 8,

In cases of abandonment...land could be confiscated as the king's property. The ownership of the land was dependent upon the actual use of property, the legal claim therefore tied to its possession rather than mere ownership.¹⁴

A further element of LH §§30–31 is worthy of note: the duration of one's absence impacts the request to repossess the land.¹⁵ While absence makes the heart grow fonder, it makes the legal claim grow weaker. At the risk of placing the Shunammite's request too firmly in its "original Old Babylonian context," LH §§30–31 suggest that the Shunammite's absence would have led to a legal redistribution of her abandoned property by the king. Upon her return seven years after abandoning the property, her claim for restored possession would not be legally compelling.

4. A "Great Woman"

In 2 Kings 4:8, the Shunammite is introduced as a "great woman" (אשה גדולה), a designation not otherwise found in the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁶ Recent articles by Mark Roncace and Yairah Amit argue that both wealth and status are likely conveyed by the designation.¹⁷ The description of

¹³ LH §§26–41. Note also the fragmentary OB letter, VAS 16:75, that also addresses the matter; after a broken introduction, it states "do you not know the decree concerning absentee field holders (lit. "field holders' absenting themselves") is (still) valid?" Cf. CAD 3:187.

¹⁴ Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 273.

¹⁵ The matter of timing in the redemption of urban property occurs in Leviticus 25:29–30. NOTE: Gross questions whether LH fits b/c it is concerned with prebend rather than ownership of land. But Slanski??

¹⁶ By referring to her husband as a *gibbōr hayil* (גבר חיל), Gray appears to equate the אשה גדולה with the אשת חיל (*1 and 2 Kings*, 496). אשת חיל occurs twice in Proverbs (12:3 and 31:10) and in the book of Ruth.

¹⁷ Roncace, "Elisha and the Woman of Shunem: 2 Kings 4.8–37 and 8.1–6 Read in Conjunction" *JSOT* 91 (2000): 126: "The Shunammite is portrayed as a wealthy woman whose social status was not contingent upon her having a son." Amit, "A Prophet Tested: Elisha, the Great Woman of Shunem, and the Story's Double Message,"

Naaman in 2 Kings 5:1 includes a comparable designation—Naaman is a “great man” with respect to his king (איש גדול לפני מלך ארם). This leads to perhaps the single greatest interpretive challenge in reconstructing the Shunammite’s situation. Does the narrative intend to suggest that as a “great woman” the Shunammite is able to operate independently in a patriarchal society? Most commentaries and reconstructions have tried to place the Shunammite in relationship to a patriarchal household, that is, to the status of her husband or her son. If she is not able to function independently, then her interaction with the king most naturally reads as that of a desperate woman seeking the only possible means of legal redress—direct appeal to the king. If, however, a great woman has a level of status that demands respect even in a patriarchal society, then the other details in the narrative may point toward a business request for restored tenancy rather than a desperate plea for the return of stolen property.

Pamela Barmash’s arguments that biblical law and biblical narrative mutually influence each other may help resolve this quandary. While each genre has its own particularities, each also may provide what is lacking in the other: narrative may provide a backstory or a rationale not explicit in legal material, while law may explain details and order in a narrative plot. Barmash asserts that “[t]he literary conventions and motifs on which narrative is built bear a relationship to actual law, or else they would be neither recognizable nor acceptable to the readers of their time.”¹⁸ What does this say about our “great woman?”

Biblical legal material makes it clear that the status of women was limited by the structure of the patrimonial household. Thus, Westbrook states that inheritance of property in

Biblical Interpretation 11 (2003): 279 n. 2: “Here the adjective ‘great’ (*gedola*) means rich or a high social status; compare Gen. 26:13; 1 Sam. 25:2; 2 Sam. 19:33; Job 1:3.”

¹⁸ Barmash, “The Narrative Quandary: Cases of Law in Literature,” *VT* 54 (2004), 4. Derek Beattie made a similar, but stronger, argument in his “The Book of Ruth as Evidence for Israelite Legal Practice” *VT* 24 (1974), 252: “since legal procedure forms, in a sense, the framework of civilization and law is, by its nature, both definite and widely known, a story-teller, if he is to maintain the credibility of his fiction, will not create a legal situation which his audience will know to be impossible.”

ancient Israel was strictly agnatic.¹⁹ This was generally true of the ancient Near East as well.²⁰ And yet, there are several varieties of exceptions to these general rules. Women could serve as solutions to several crises in the patrimonial household, namely, the premature death of the patriarch²¹ and the lack of a male heir.²² Additionally, in a few biblical narratives, women are given prominent roles: Miriam and Huldah are named prophetesses, Deborah is a judge. In these cases, social roles that are typically filled by men are filled by women. The Shunammite, as an אשה גדולה, seems to occupy this kind of exceptional space. Commentators have remarked that in both 2 Kings 4:8–37 and 8:1–6, she interacts remarkably with a variety of male characters—the prophet and his assistant and the king—while her husband and son are nearly invisible.²³ The Shunammite, not the men of her household, drives the narrative.

¹⁹ Raymond Westbrook, “Redemption of Land,” in *Property and Family in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 65.

²⁰ Westbrook, “Scope and Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law,” in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (Raymond Westbrook, ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:39: “In theory, women had the legal capacity to own property, make contracts, litigate, and give evidence in court. In practice, they were restricted in these activities by their status as daughter or wife. Married women did not act on their own account but more frequently together with or on behalf of their husbands. Examples of independent action tend to be confined to widows, divorcées, or members of the few professions open to women: priestess, prostitute, wetnurse, or taverness. Documents from Syria in the late second millennium recognize the normal disadvantage of women when applying legal fictions such as ‘father and mother’ to a widow in order to strengthen her legal position.”

²¹ See Marten Stol’s discussion of “Powerful Widows” in *Women in the Ancient Near East* (trans. Helen and Mervyn Richardson; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 284–287. See also LH §§28–29 for the situation of a captive soldier, in §29, the mother of a minor son will raise the minor until he can assume the service obligation.

²² See Zafriira Ben-Barak, *Inheritance by Daughters in Israel and the Ancient Near East: A Social, Legal and Ideological Revolution* (Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center Publications: 2006).

²³ Claudia Camp describes the Shunammite as “one of the most remarkable [women] in the Bible. Both independent and maternal, powerful and pious, she brings to mind a number of other female characters, yet surpasses them all.” (Camp, “1 and 2 Kings” in *The Women’s Bible Commentary* [expanded ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998], 113)

Part II: Restoring the Shunammite's Status

With that, we turn to the question of the legal remedy in 2 Kings 8. Bernard Jackson, reflecting on Moshe Weinfeld's *Social Justice in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East*, offers a refinement to Weinfeld's distinction between law and justice. Jackson makes law more restrictive—focused on legislation and its execution—and makes justice a broader commitment to preserving social order. Jackson writes, “In liberating his subjects from various kinds of oppression, the king was restoring an original divinely-mandated social order, one whose legitimacy derived not from some conception of inherent human rights, but from the fact that it had been divinely mandated.” This insight lays the foundation for recasting the Shunammite's restoration as a matter of social justice (restoration of the social order) rather than an issue of law.

1. The Importance of Social Place

Ancient Near Eastern culture was hierarchical and patrimonial and Israel and Judah were not exceptions.²⁴ A culture whose literature warns against slaves (עבדים) ruling over princes (שרים) is not egalitarian.²⁵ Rather, ancient Israelite and Judahite societies were conscious of patrimony and social place. David Schloen writes,

In a patrimonial regime, the entire social order is viewed as an extension of the ruler's household—and ultimately of the god's household. The social order consists of a hierarchy of subhouseholds linked by personal ties at each level between individual “masters” and “slaves” or “fathers” and “sons.”²⁶

²⁴ David Schloen's *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2001) argues that a Weberian Patrimonial Household Model best fits the data provided by ancient Near Eastern texts and archaeology.

²⁵ See Proverbs 19:10 and Ecclesiastes 10:7.

²⁶ Schloen, *House of the Father*, 51.

As I read it, Schloen suggests that social standing is not simply tied to wealth or possession of property. The Shunammite is described as the head of the household in 2 Kings 8; she stands at the head of a household whose significance has been hinted at in 2 Kings 4. The Shunammite is an אשה גדולה... and should be treated as such even after a seven-year absence from her house and field.

2. Social Justice as Restoring Social Place

Domonique Charpin has recently made the argument that social justice measures in Old Babylon intended to return an individual to his or her previous or original status. That is, social justice is designed to be restorative. It does not change the underlying dynamics of economic systems, but rather, resets the system to a previous state. Charpin argues that this return is embodied in the Akkadian term *andurārum*, a meaning confirmed by the Sumerian ideogram *ama-ar-gi₄*, “return to the mother” often used to inscribe it.²⁷ Charpin’s arguments were anticipated by J. J. Finkelstein, in his analysis of the *mīšarum* edict of Ammišaduqa. According to Finkelstein, the purpose of the *mīšarum* edict was to wipe the slate clean after imbalances had built up during the previous king’s reign:

The *mīšarum*-act, in the strict sense then, consisted of a series of measures designed to restore “equilibrium” in the economic life of the society, which, once presumed to have created the necessary effect of a *tabula rasa* for certain types of financial or economic obligations, ceases to have any force.²⁸

By cancelling debts or requiring the return of property, the edict prolonged or preserved the livelihood of various dependent classes. Charpin notes that these measures were only temporary:

²⁷ Domonique Charpin, “The ‘Restoration’ Edicts of the Babylonian Kings,” in *Writing, Law, and Kingship in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia* (trans. Jane Marie Todd; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 89.

²⁸ Jacob J. Finkelstein, “Ammišaduqa’s Edict and the Babylonian ‘Law Codes’,” *JCS* 15 (1961): 100.

“In fact, these were not reform edicts but exceptional measures; hence, the edict cancelled debts not yet repaid, but interest rates did not change. In other words, the cards were reshuffled, but the rules of the game remained the same.”²⁹

In the case of the Shunammite, justice restores her to her previous significant status. The answer to her request is a precise reshuffling of the cards. She requests her house and her field, and she receives everything which had been hers as well as the revenue from the fields. Royal care is taken to ensure that the exact deficit is restored. The apparent ease and precision with which this action can be accomplished by a royal functionary increases the impression that the land was under some kind of royal control. In the end, the great woman can be a great woman again; her social place has been reaffirmed and her livelihood has been reestablished.

Conclusion:

The story of the Shunammite in 2 Kings 8:1–6 has been read and reconstructed as the case of a desperate widow seeking redress for a legal wrong. This pattern is well attested in the Hebrew Bible. However, I have argued in this paper that a reconsideration of the text suggests more greatness and less desperation on the part of the Shunammite. There is no adversary and no hint of a prior level of ineffective adjudication. The narrative portrays just the Shunammite and the king, and the Shunammite asks for and receives the renewal of her previous economic arrangement. This act fits a model of justice as the restoration of social order, in which, as Volkmar Fritz states, “the king uses his regal privilege to reestablish a status quo to which there existed not even a right claim, thus proving himself to be ... a guarantor of justice.”³⁰

²⁹ Charpin, “‘Restoration’ Edicts,” 94.

³⁰ Fritz, *1 and 2 Kings*, 273.

Appendix 1: 2 Kings 8:1-6

<p>¹ וְאֵלִישָׁע דָּבַר אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר־הַחִיָּה אֶת־בְּנָהּ לֵאמֹר קוּמִי וּלְכִי אִתִּי וּבֵיתְךָ וּגְוָרֶי בְּאֲשֶׁר תִּגְוָרִי כִּי־קָרָא יְהוָה לָרֶעֶב וּגְסָבָא אֶל־הָאָרֶץ שִׁבְעַ שָׁנִים:</p>	<p>Now Elisha spoke to the woman whose son he had revived, “Rise and go, you and your household and sojourn wherever you might sojourn, since YHWH now proclaims a famine, and also it is about to come to the land for seven years.</p>
<p>² וְתָקַם הָאִשָּׁה וַתַּעַשׂ כַּדְּבַר אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים וַתֵּלֶךְ הִיא וּבֵיתָהּ וַתֵּגֵר בְּאֶרֶץ־פְּלִשְׁתִּים שִׁבְעַ שָׁנִים:</p>	<p>So the woman rose and did according to the word of the man of God and she and her household went and sojourned in the land of the Philistines for seven years.</p>
<p>³ וַיְהִי מִקְצֵה שִׁבְעַ שָׁנִים וַתָּשָׁב הָאִשָּׁה מֵאֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַתֵּצֵא לְצַעֵק אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־בֵּיתָהּ וְאֶל־שָׂדֶה:</p>	<p>At the end of seven years, the woman returned from the land of the Philistines and entered in order to cry out to the king concerning her house and her field.</p>
<p>⁴ וְהַמֶּלֶךְ מְדַבֵּר אֶל־גִּחְזִי נַעַר אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר סַפֵּר־נָא לִי אֵת כָּל־הַגְּדֹלוֹת אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה אֵלִישָׁע:</p>	<p>Now the king was speaking to Gehazi, the servant of the man of God, “Recount for me all the great acts that Elisha did.”</p>
<p>⁵ וַיְהִי הוּא מְסַפֵּר לַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הַחִיָּה אֶת־הַמֵּת וְהִנֵּה הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר־הַחִיָּה אֶת־בְּנָהּ צַעֲקָת אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל־בֵּיתָהּ וְעַל־שָׂדֶה וַיֹּאמֶר גִּחְזִי אֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ זֹאת הָאִשָּׁה וְזֶה־בְּנָהּ אֲשֶׁר־הַחִיָּה אֵלִישָׁע:</p>	<p>He was recounting for the king the one where he had revived the dead, when right there was the woman for whom he had revived her son, crying out to the king concerning her house and her field. Then Gehazi said, “O my master the king, this is the woman and this is her son, whom Elisha revived!”</p>
<p>⁶ וַיִּשְׁאַל הַמֶּלֶךְ לָאִשָּׁה וַתְּסַפֵּר־לוֹ וַיִּתְּנָהּ הַמֶּלֶךְ סָרִיס אֶחָד לֵאמֹר הָשִׁיב אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לָהּ וְאֵת כָּל־תְּבוֹאת הַשָּׂדֶה מִיּוֹם עֲזָבָהּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְעַד־עַתָּה: פ</p>	<p>The king inquired from the woman and she recounted to him. Then the king gave to her an official, “Return everything that was hers and all the income of the field, from the day she abandoned the land until now.”</p>

Appendix 2: The G stem of צעק in the Elijah / Elisha Narratives

Reference	Text	Protagonist	Opponent	Concern
1 Kings 20:39	ויהי המלך עבר והוא צעק אל־המלך...	אחד מבני הנביאים	Superior Officer	Death or Massive Fine
2 Kings 4:1	ואשה אחת מנשי בני־הנביאים צעקה אל־אלישע לאמר עבדך אישי מת ואתה ידעת כי עבדך היה ירא את־יהוה והנשה בא לקחת את־שני ילדי לו לעבדים:	Woman	Creditor	Debt-slavery of sons
2 Kings 4:40	והמה צעקו ויאמרו מות בסיר איש האלהים	מבני הנביאים		Death
2 Kings 6:5	ויצעק ויאמר אהה אדני והוא שאול:	אחד מבני הנביאים	Lender	Potential debt-slavery
2 Kings 6:26	ואשה צעקה אליו לאמר הושיעה אדני המלך...	Woman	Another Woman	Breach of Contract (to eat children)
2 Kings 8:3	ותצא לצעק אל־המלך אל־ביתה ואל־שדה	Shunammite		Property
2 Kings 8:5	והנה האשה אשר־החיה את־בנה צעקת אל־המלך על־ביתה ועל־שדה...	Shunammite		Property