

The Torah of Eden and the Conception of Ishmael: Genesis 3:6 and 16:3–4

RON BERGEY*

Abstract

Abram and Sarah's plight of childlessness turns into the drama of a hapless Egyptian servant. Fewer than twenty Hebrew words suffice to relate Sarah's taking Hagar, her giving her as surrogate to Abram, and his having relations with Hagar. The key words are drawn from another story, that of Eve's taking the forbidden fruit, her giving it to Adam, and his eating it. The latter story is retold in the former by reemploying the same verbs and sentence structures, only replacing the characters' names and roles. The purpose of this study is to explore the literary and theological import of this intertextuality.

* The present text is, to a large degree, the translation and expansion of a presentation in a public lecture held on February 21–22, 2014, and subsequently published as Ron Bergey, "La Torah d'Éden et la conception d'Ishmaël: La chute réactualisée Genèse 16.3–4 et 3.6," *La Revue réformée* 65.5 (2014): 59–70. The author wants to thank his daughter, Natacha, for the first English drafts.

Introduction

Medieval and modern commentators draw attention to the series of linguistic correspondences between the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis 4 and the narrative of the fall in Genesis 3. Juxtaposing both accounts suffices to enable the reader to see their similarities. As examples: “Your desire [*teshuqatekh*, תְּשׁוּקֶתְךָ] shall be toward your husband” (3:16) and “Its [sin’s] desires [*teshuqatho*, תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ] are toward you” (4:7); Adam and Eve are banished “at the east of the garden of Eden” (3:24), and Cain is driven “east of Eden” (4:16). Why would the narrator take pains to redact the story of Abel’s murder and its consequences using language drawn from the story of his parents’ disobedience?¹ The reason seems clear. He wanted to show that fratricide is a consequence. Sin is communicable, and it spreads! Can one assume this authorial intention even if it is never stated as such? As illustrated here, literary devices weave a purposeful narrative pattern into a story by drawing language and thereby themes into a formative story.

Accordingly, such stories echo Eden. Eden’s story becomes torah. In Genesis, torah is expounded not in precepts and judgments but through literary subtleties wrapped in narrative form as instruction.² These stories beckon the reader not to lose sight of the fall, its consequences, and the dire need of redemptive grace. They serve “as examples for us” (1 Cor 10:6).³

The first object here is to shed light on the literary or linguistic affinities that signal intertextuality, that is, the importation of language from one text into another with the intention that the source text influence the reading of the target text.⁴ This literary device also leads to thematic or theological relationships between these texts. The latter is a second object of this study.

As the title of this article indicates, attention shall be devoted to the relationship between the fall narrative focusing on the specific act in Genesis 3:6

¹ Michael Fishbane points out ten textual correspondences of these stories, including these two, in Michael Fishbane, *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts* (New York: Schocken, 1979), 26–27.

² “Torah” (תּוֹרָה < *yrah*, יָרָה) may be judicial law (e.g., Exod 12:49) or parental instruction (Prov 1:8). The verb derivative (*yarah*, יָרָה) means “to point one’s finger at,” by extension “to show how, teach” (cf. *moreh*, מוֹרֶה [< *yrah*], “teacher,” Isa 30:20). Genesis 46 recounts the arrival of Jacob and his family in Goshen and Joseph meeting his father (vv. 28–34). Prior to his arrival, Jacob sent Judah to Joseph so that Joseph would “show” the way (v. 28, *yarah*) in Goshen where the family would settle.

³ Paul is referring to the divine judgment of the golden calf incident (Exod 32; see Rom 15:4).

⁴ On this subject, see Ron Bergey, “The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1–43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.1 (2003): 33–54.

and the narrative of the actions leading directly to the conception of Ishmael in Genesis 16:3–4. Before taking a closer look at the latter story, a brief collation of other narrative extracts will shed light on a literary device that links them to Genesis 3:6, which appears here:

So when the woman *saw* [*wattere*’, וַתִּרְאֵהָ] that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she *took* [*wattiqqakh*, וַתִּקַּח] of its fruit and *ate* [*watto’khal*, וַתֹּאכַל], and she also *gave* [*wattiten*, וַתִּתֵּן] some to her husband who was with her, and he ate.

The disobedience consists of actions described by the four italicized verbs: “to see” (*ra’ah*, רָאָה), “to take” (*laqakh*, לָקַח), “to eat” (*’akhal*, אָכַל), and “to give” (*nathan*, נָתַן).

1. The Torah of Eden in Other Stories

There are three narratives that appear to be linguistically linked to Genesis 3:6. In turn, they are related to each other and, as such, to the main story to be examined in this light. Only the verses directly related to the fall extract are presented below.

1. The Union of the Sons of God and the Daughters of Man

First to be examined is the story of the sons of God and the daughters of man in Genesis 6, with verses 2 and 4 quoted here: “The sons of God *saw* [*wayyir’u*, וַיִּרְאוּ] that the daughters of man were attractive. And they *took* [*wayyiqkhu*, וַיִּקְחוּ] as their wives any they chose. ... The sons of God *came in to* [*yavo’u ’el*, וַיָּבֹאוּ אֵל] the daughters of man.”

The story employs the same first pair of verbs in the same order as in Genesis 3:6, “see” and “take.”⁵ Their union is described by “came in to” (*ba’ ’el*, באַ אֵל), which is found in other examples presented below (Gen 6:4). But it should be borne in mind that this is somewhat unexpected given the recurrent use, up to this point, of “know” to describe sexual relations (Gen 4:1, 17, 25) now purposely avoided in Genesis 6:4. Also, one can legitimately ask what the verb has to do with the third verb “ate” in chapter 3. It is in the same sequential position as “eat” in the fall narrative, and “eat” can refer metaphorically to coitus. Proverbs 30:20 reads, “This is the way of an adulteress: she *eats* and wipes her mouth and says, ‘I have done

⁵ In Genesis 9:23, concerning Shem and Japheth, sons of Noah, the order of the verbs is “they took” a garment, and walked backwards, “they did not see” followed by the complement “their father’s nakedness.” The latter term can refer to his genitals (see Lev 18:6) or an improper sexual act (Deut 23:15).

no wrong.”⁶ In Song of Songs consummation of marriage is presented as eating: the young bride in the ardor of her passion says, “Let my beloved come to his garden and *eat* its choicest fruits” (Song 4:16b). The husband expresses his pleasure: “I came to my garden, my sister, my bride ... I *ate* my honeycomb with my honey, I drank my wine with my milk” (Song 5:1).

The narrative extract of the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men employs the same two verbs describing Adam and Eve’s disobedience and a third verb falling into the semantic range of the source verb. Having heard by echo “saw” and “took,” the ear is tuned into the metaphorical use of “ate,” even though here a concrete verb is necessarily employed. The latter verb, following in the same order as the verbs describing the fall, is purposefully assimilated to the former, thereby clearly—although literarily discretely!—reproving the sexual relations in the Genesis 6 narrative as was reproved the eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree in Genesis 3.

2. The Defilement of Dinah

The narrative of the family of Jacob’s arrival at Shechem relates the tragedy of his daughter’s rape by a man of the same name: “Shechem ..., the prince of the land, *saw* her, he *took* her and *lay* [*wayyishkav*, וַיִּשְׁכַּב] with her” (Gen 34:2).

Here too the same verbs, “see” and “take,” appear in the same order as in the fall narrative. As in the former story, a verb meaning “have sexual relations” follows, which overlaps the semantic domain of “eat.” Shechem’s act is condemned from three angles. First, the verb “lay” (*shakhav*, שָׁכַב) refers to an illicit union (e.g., Gen 19:32–33; Exod 22:18). Then, it is deplored in an editorial note: “an outrageous thing in Israel ... for such a thing must not be done” (v. 7). Last, by following the two other verbs, “lay” echoes by assimilation the first couple’s eating the fruit in the garden of Eden, a violation of the will of God.

3. The Marriage of Judah with a Canaanite

The third and last example before the main passage is treated deals with Judah’s marriage to a Canaanite: “There Judah *saw* the daughter of a certain Canaanite whose name was Shua. He *took* her and *went in to* [*wayyavo’ eleyha*, וַיָּבֹא אֵלֶיהָ] her” (Gen 38:2).

⁶ In the warnings the father gives his son regarding adultery, Proverbs 5 says, “Drink water from your own cistern, flowing water from your own well. Should your springs be scattered abroad ...?” (vv. 15–16; see also vv. 5 and 20).

If what has been proposed concerning the preceding examples be granted, it is difficult not to draw the same conclusion here. By using the verbs “see” and “take,” the narrator creates an echo effect of Genesis 3:6 amplified by the third verb “went in to” (*ba’ ’el*) which, as also suggested earlier, semantically concretizes a metaphorical sense of “ate.” This torah instruction censure will become codified torah, proscribing mixed marriages of this type (Deut 7:3; cf. Gen 28:1, 8).

II. *The Torah of Eden in the Story of the Conception of Ishmael*

Attention shall now be given to the key passage, the story of the conception of Ishmael in Genesis 16. The opening verses set the scene. The narrator informs the reader that after ten years in Canaan, despite the renewed divine progeny-promises, Sarai has still not been able to bear a child to Abram (vv. 1 and 3). Sarai advises Abram to take her Egyptian servant, Hagar, so that through her she might “obtain children” (v. 2).⁷ According to customary Mesopotamian law, a woman who could not give a son to her husband was to give him a maid to establish his lineage.⁸ Hagar is probably one of the female servants Pharaoh had given Abram in Egypt (Gen 12:16).⁹ If so, Abram had given her to Sarai.

The linguistic parallels between this story and the fall narrative inextricably weave the two together.¹⁰ The roles of Sarai and Abram in the conception of Ishmael intentionally echo those of Eve and Adam. So much is drawn from the source text—vocabulary and syntax—that virtually only the names are substituted in the target text. The two texts are juxtaposed below in the author’s word-for-word translation:

*She [Eve] TOOK of its fruit ... she also GAVE **some** to her husband [Adam] ... and he ATE [it].* (Gen 3:6b).

*Sarai ... TOOK Hagar ... and she GAVE **her** to her husband Abram And he WENT IN TO **Hagar*** (Gen 16:3–4a)¹¹

⁷ Or “I may be built” (passive, Niphal of *banah*, בָּנָה), which here means founding a family, viewed as “building a house” (Ruth 4:11).

⁸ In the preceding chapter, Abram’s plan to adopt his male servant as heir was nullified (15:2–4).

⁹ According to the haggadah (Genesis Rabbah), she was one of Pharaoh’s daughters. Louis Ginsberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1937), 1:237.

¹⁰ Cf. Ron Bergey, *Découvrir Dieu à travers le Pentateuque* (Romanel-sur-Lausanne: Maison de la Bible, 2016), 104.

¹¹ Literally translated, the entire verse 3 reads, “Sarai, Abram’s wife, took Hagar, the Egyptian, her maid, ten years after Abram had settled in the country of Canaan, and she gave her to Abram, her husband, to him as a wife.” The woman (Sarai) is the one who establishes the formal

Both women act the same way: they “took” something, Eve the fruit and Sarai the servant Hagar. The link is thus established between the forbidden fruit and Hagar. Like the fruit, Hagar is the object of the verb “to take.” Both women “gave” what they had taken. The identical complement heightens the linguistic concordance: “to her husband.”¹²

What of the two men? Adam “ate” the fruit given him by Eve, and Abram “went in to” Hagar, the servant Sarai had given him. His doing so is undeniably echoic of Adam’s eating the fruit. As indicated in the three preceding examples, having sexual relations is metaphorically in the semantic range of “eat.” Like a judge before pronouncing a sentence, God issues indictments, both containing the same charge: Adam, “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten ...” (Gen 3:17); Abram, because he “listened to the voice of Sarai. ... And he went in to Hagar” (Gen 16:2, 4).¹³

On the one hand, if “listened” means Eve had to convince Adam to eat the fruit, the narrator does not make the reader aware of her persuasive speech. On the other hand, what Adam listened to may be his wife’s responses to the serpent’s questioning. If so, he did so passively, neither intervening nor helping her resist the temptation. In either case, the text underlines that Abram, like Adam, was both complicit (by not preventing) and an accomplice (by participating).¹⁴ Both men failed to remind their wives of the

bond between the husband and the other woman (Hagar). Like later Keturah, she would have been Abram’s legal wife, having the status of concubine (cf. Gen 25:1, 6). Rabbinic tradition holds that Abram, in sending her away (Gen 21:14), had divorced Hagar. “Send away” (*shalakh*, שָׁלַח) may mean “divorce” (Deut 24:1).

¹² A parallel text can be found in the story of Leah and her maid Zilpah: “When Leah *saw* that she had ceased bearing children, she *took* her servant Zilpah and *gave* her to Jacob as a wife. ... Zilpah bore Jacob a son” (Gen 30:9–10). There was implicit sexual intercourse. The verb “give” is an echo of Eve’s act who “gave” the fruit to her husband.

¹³ In Genesis 3:17 and 16:2, “voice” is preceded by the preposition *le-* (לְ) as complement of the verb “listen” (see also Exod 15:26; 1 Sam 15:1). The complement can also be introduced by *’et* (עִתְּ, Gen 3:8; 21:17) or *be-* (בְּ; 21:12; 22:18) the latter normally meaning “obey.”

¹⁴ Ramban (Rabbi Moshe ben Nahman, 1194–1270) interprets the expression “listen to the voice” as a sign of Abram’s deep respect for Sarai. He would never have taken Hagar without his wife’s permission. According to the rabbi, other elements support this claim. It was Sarai, “Abram’s wife,” who “took” and “gave” Hagar to “her husband.” In accepting this act, Abram wanted nothing but to satisfy Sarai’s desire to have a son. That Sarai gave Hagar “as a wife” and not a concubine also shows Sarai’s just character and her respect for her husband. Nechama Leibowitz, *Studies in Bereshit* (Jerusalem: Haomanim, 1974), 154. To us, this interpretation of “listen to the voice” does not adequately account for the linguistic correspondences with the fall narrative. John Calvin’s commentary more accurately states, “It is true Abram’s faith wavers, when he draws back from the Word of God, allowing himself to be carried away by his wife’s solicitation to seek a remedy God had forbidden.” John Calvin, *Genèse* (Aix-en-Provence: Kerygma, 1978), 246. In another comment, his reproach is more biting: “Abram ... cannot be excused for obeying his wife’s foolish and perverse advice” (Calvin, *Genèse*, 244).

promises the Lord had made to them. This was as much a lapse of the men's faith as it was their wives', if not more so. Like Adam, Abram tried to obtain by human effort what the Lord had graciously promised. Their being formally accused places upon them the responsibility for the condemned act and its consequences.

1. *Immediate Consequences*

As in the "pains" Adam and Eve suffered as a result of their disobedience (Gen 3:16–19),¹⁵ the consequences are also bitter for Abram and Sarai. Once Hagar is pregnant, the simmering tension in the story will boil over. Hagar stirs the pot by despising her mistress (Gen 16:4). Since she rose to the status of wife¹⁶ and is bearing Abram's child, Hagar feels secure in her household position. She will be the one to fulfill Abram's most profound desire, whereas his barren wife will likely be marginalized.

Sarai confronts Abram with the problem as he is now Hagar's husband. Resentment gives way to harsh words. Sarai says to her husband: "May the wrong [*khamas*, חָמָס, 'violence'; cf. Gen 6:11] done to me be on you! ... May the Lord judge between you and me!" (Gen 16:5). The irony is that now they each will have what they desired: a child, and if a son, an heir. However, the intimacy leading to Hagar's pregnancy—"your embrace"¹⁷—became too bitter a pill for Sarai to swallow.

Abram washes his hands of the matter by telling Sarai to deal with it: "Behold, your servant is in your power; do to her as you please" (Gen 16:6a). Does he renege on his responsibility? Does he want to avoid conflict? Be it one or the other, or both, the door is open for Sarai to mistreat her servant.¹⁸ No doubt fearful for her child's life and her own, Hagar flees (v. 6b). Granted, the pregnant woman in the eye of the storm is no longer there, but the child she is bearing, on which Abram and Sarai's hopes lay, is gone with her. Abram and Sarai are back to where they started, except now their relationship is whipped by the winds of discord.

¹⁵ Ron Bergey, "Pathologie et guérison spirituelle: la 'douleur' et le remède en Genèse 3," *La Revue réformée* 62 (2011): 7–22.

¹⁶ Cf. notes 11 and 14 above.

¹⁷ Literally "in your breast/on your chest" (v. 5; cf. Deut 13:7; 28:54; see also 2 Sam 12:8; 1 Kgs 1:2). Here it is contextually paired with making love.

¹⁸ According to Ramban, by mistreating Hagar in this way, Sarai sinned; Abram did too by letting Sarai do so. Cited by Nahum Sarna, *JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 120. The verb "mistreat" (Piel of 'anah, אָנָה) implies removing someone's rights, leaving that person in a precarious position, like the Israelites afflicted as slaves in Egypt (Gen 15:13; Exod 3:7) or a humiliated rape victim (Gen 34:2; Deut 21:14) no longer by custom marriageable except by the rapist (Deut 22:29).

These relational challenges resonate with those of the first couple because of their disobedience. In shame they covered themselves, each hiding intimate parts from the other's regard. They mutually accuse and shift blame, both unable to take responsibility for their own faults. In addition, the first parallel mentioned at the beginning of this study (Gen 3:16 and 4:7) suggests Eve would henceforth challenge Adam's headship,¹⁹ and Sarai will dictate her terms concerning Hagar and her son to Abram (Gen 21:10).

2. *The Ultimate Outcome*

After the fall, the Lord sought out the hiding couple and spoke one-on-one to Adam and Eve. Here in Genesis 16, he comes unannounced and unexpectedly speaks to Hagar first. No doubt intending to return to Egypt by the northern Negev route to Shur—on foot, pregnant, and alone—she is in grave danger. The angel of the Lord (v. 7, first mention), however, appears and comes to rescue her from her distress. He questions her (v. 8) as the Lord did the couple in Eden (Gen 3:8, 13). After instructing her to return to her mistress (Gen 16:9), he assures her with a promise—"I will surely multiply your offspring so that they cannot be numbered for multitude" (v. 10b)—virtually identical to the one God had made to Abram (cf. Gen 15:5 and 13:16). Moreover, he tells Hagar to name the son she is bearing Ishmael (God hears/listens) as a reminder that "the Lord has listened to [her] affliction" (Gen 16:11). The conception story ends with Hagar giving birth to a son, Ishmael (v. 15), echoing the aftermath of the Eden story; Eve gives birth to a son, Cain (Gen 4:1).²⁰

Despite Abram and Sarai's attempt by carnal means to resolve their problem of not having a son and their mistreating Hagar, no reprimand is explicitly voiced. The text does, however, implicitly make the point in an echoic literary way that they fell short, like the first couple, of God's standards. Instead of reproof, Abram and Sarai receive a promise. Not only is a previous promise renewed; it is also greatly enlarged. To Abram:

¹⁹ Interpreting *teshuqah* in Genesis 3:16 as a desire to dominate, as in 4:7. Cf. Susan T. Foh, "What Is the Woman's Desire?," *Westminster Theological Journal* 37 (1975): 376–383. Compare "Your desire shall be contrary to your husband" (ESV 2016) and "your desire shall be for [note, 'against'] your husband" (ESV 2001). The literary technique described above also supports this interpretation. Cf. Ron Bergey, "Le Cantique des cantiques, la célébration de la sexualité," in *Bible et Sexualité*, ed. Paul Wells (Aix-en-Provence: Kerygma; Charols: Excelsis, 2005), 11–25, esp. 20; Bergey, *Le Pentateuque*, 54–55, 63.

²⁰ Both sons will end up being driven from their homes (Gen 4:12, 16; 21:10, 14).

Behold, my covenant is with you, and you shall be the father of a multitude of nations. No longer shall your name be called Abram, but your name shall be Abraham, for I have made you the father of a multitude of nations. I will make you exceedingly fruitful, and I will make you into nations, and kings shall come from you. And I will establish my covenant between me and you and your offspring after you throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and to your offspring after you. (Gen 17:4–7; cf. Gen 12:2; 15:5)

Concerning Sarai, now called Sarah (Gen 17:15): “I will bless her, and moreover, I will give you a son by her. I will bless her, and she shall become nations; kings of peoples shall come from her” (v. 16). She will bear the heir, Isaac, through whom the covenant promises will be transmitted (vv. 19, 21). As if this were not enough, Ishmael too is included: “As for Ishmael, I have heard you; behold, I have blessed him and will make him fruitful and multiply him greatly. He shall father twelve princes, and I will make him into a great nation” (v. 20).²¹ Even though he will not be the heir so longed for, God does not abandon him.²² This florilegium of “seed” promises also has Edenic roots. The first seed promise was made immediately after the fall, the *protoevangelium* (Gen 3:15), a promise of redemption through the seed of the woman.

Conclusion

On a linguistic, literary level, the use of keywords (and syntax) borrowed from the fall narrative in the story of the conception of Ishmael draws attention to the guilt and the just judgment of those involved. On a thematic level, the sequel highlights the Lord’s showing mercy and grace, mercy in mitigating the judgment and grace in lavishing blessings upon them. The emphasis on the promise in the narrative following the conception of

²¹ The names of these twelve nations are given in Genesis 25:13–16. In Genesis 16:12, it is said of Ishmael: “He shall be a wild donkey of a man, his hand against everyone and everyone’s hand against him, and he shall dwell over against all his kinsmen.” The wild donkey (*pere’*, אֲרֵיָה), the desert’s most noble creature, is independent and untamable. The picture of the onager is not negative (see Ps 104:11; Job 24:5; 39:5–8; Hos 8:9). In this figure, he represents nomadic life, that of the bedouin, in contrast with the farmer’s sedentary life (see Gen 25:18; 37:25; 1 Chron 27:30). Rather than a prophecy of the conflict between Ishmaelites and Israelites, the conflict suggested in this verse may be due to the cultural confrontation between those leading these very different lifestyles. The Ishmaelites initially lived in the northern region of the Sinai peninsula, in the desert of Paran (Gen 21:21), just south of the Negev, the southern border of Judah, and west of the desert of Shur, the eastern border of Egypt (Gen 25:18).

²² Chapter 17 ends with Ishmael’s circumcision at the age of thirteen (v. 25). He was the first child to receive the covenant sign (cf. vv. 2, 11). It is interesting to note that the first recorded circumcision also involves adults and Abram’s household.

Ishmael, especially taking into consideration the ultimate realization in Christ, highlights a crucial theological principle. This principle is summed up in two New Testament statements that certainly apply to the fall narrative and its echo in the conception of Ishmael story: “Where sin increased, grace abounded all the more” (Rom 5:20), and similarly, “Mercy triumphs over judgment” (Jas 2:13). Of course, for the grace of redemption to be efficaciously applied, faith must seize the promises. Should one spurn this grace, like Ishmael, he may still taste God’s temporal goodness.²³

Genesis 16:15–16 exudes this divine beneficence by emphatic recurrence involving the three characters with a threefold reference to “Hagar” and to “Abram” and with a quadruple reference to “a son ... his son ... Ishmael ... Ishmael.” John Calvin emphasizes this note of grace in his commentary on these last two verses of chapter 16, saying that Abram was grateful for God’s grace “because he names his son ... and celebrates God’s goodness in showing compassion for Hagar’s misery.”²⁴ Abraham discerned grace in God’s dealing with him and those he loved. Carl Keil concludes on a similar note: “Thus, instead of securing the fulfillment of their wishes, Sarai and Abram had reaped nothing but grief and vexation. ... But the faithful covenant God turned the whole into a blessing.”²⁵ To this we can join Isaac Watts’s third stanza of “Joy to the World” which equally applies to the torah of Eden woven into the story of the conception of Ishmael:

No more let sins and sorrows grow,
Nor thorns infest the ground;
He comes to make his blessings flow
Far as the curse is found.

²³ Referring to the topic, Calvin says: “For in promising [Ishmael] wealth, dignity, and other things pertaining to the present life, he proves him to be a son according to the flesh ... not for the sake of cutting Ishmael off from the hope of eternal life” (Calvin, *Genèse*, 269). Ishmael had a long life of 137 years (Gen 25:17) but was not a spiritual heir to the promise (Gen 21:9 and Gal 4:23, 29). On this question, on the promise made concerning Ishmael, Calvin says in his commentary, “Even though the covenant of eternal life does not belong to Ishmael, however, for him not to be entirely cut off from grace, God makes him father of a great people. In that we can see how in regards to the present life his goodness extended to Abram’s carnal posterity.” He goes on in qualifying Ishmael’s name of “a memorial to his temporary grace” (250).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 254.

²⁵ Karl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, “The First Book of Moses,” *Commentary on the Old Testament: The Pentateuch* (repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 219.